

THE
NORTH AMERICAN
REVIEW.

VOL. XCVIII.

LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY
LUBBOCK, TEXAS

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

BOSTON:
CROSBY AND NICHOLS,
117 WASHINGTON STREET.
1864.

cal understanding, and to natural affection, will allow more to reason and imagination, and will more successfully reconcile nature and the supernatural, science and faith, philosophy and religion. His theology served its end as a stepping-stone to something better, and will presently be left behind. But the man Theodore Parker, as a moral force, as a character, as a noble human soul, will live, as such always do, and will be immortal, as such always are. He will live in his friends as a part, and the better part, of their life. He will live in their children and their children's children as an inherited power of principle. He will live in the moral sentiments he stimulated, in the moral causes he aided. He will live in the wiser laws of the future time which he aimed at introducing, in the worthier customs which he did his best to implant, and in the nobler institutions at whose foundations he worked with such manly and self-sacrificing energy. He will not be celebrated among the great masters of philosophy, or among the great authors of religion. His life will be hid; but it will be hid in the deep heart of humanity.

- ART. II. — 1. *Lectures on the English Language.* By GEORGE P. MARSH. First Series. New York. 1862. Lecture XXII. *Orthoepical Change in English.*
2. *The Works of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, &c.* By RICHARD GRANT WHITE. Boston. 1861. Appendix: *Memorandums of English Pronunciation in the Elizabethan Era.*
3. *The English of Shakespeare illustrated in a Philological Commentary on his Julius Cæsar.* By GEORGE L. CRAIK. London. 1857.

It has come to pass that in our day we have two separate languages, — English spoken and English printed. The works of some of our authors were composed on paper; when they are read aloud, they sound almost like translations; they may not lack rhythm and euphony, but it is a rhythm and a euphony that the eye can see. Another class, on the other hand, among

whom Shakespeare is pre-eminent, can only be quite comprehended, appreciated, and accompanied in the spoken language; the print may give an indication of what that is, but it is only in that that the words breathe and are quick. It cannot, then, be useless to point out precisely how Shakespeare pronounced. It may be a small portion of the commentary upon his works, but no sincere disciple of his will despise labor bestowed even on this small object. And a knowledge of the old pronunciation is not merely a curious thing; it leads to other knowledge, highly important. It suggests many corrections of the text, and renders many previous emendations far less credible. By showing, in many places, puns hitherto unnoticed, it gives us an understanding of lines hitherto unintelligible. Besides this, it helps us in discovering the derivations of words; and finally, it renders clear and indisputable the fact that our forefathers possessed a more rational, though less constraining, system of orthography than our own.

Two methods of investigating this subject have been proposed. One is by means of rhymes, puns, misspellings, and other such indications. This is the process of Mr. White and Professor Craik. Its value is best estimated by applying it to the literature of our own day. Thus Thomas Hood is a peerless master of puns, yet, excluding those which present an identity in spelling, one out of three of his are imperfect in sound. So the "Voices of the Night" and "In Memoriam" will compare in point of polish with any poems of Shakespeare's day; yet in the former the proportion of imperfect rhymes is one in nine, and in the latter one in seven. We are aware that a notion is rife that such rhymes are not allowed in the Elizabethan era; but some extracts from Spenser, printed phonotypically by the tutor of Milton, display fully the modern proportion of them; that is to say, the lines frequently do not rhyme to the eye, as they should do when so printed, and as they are sometimes forced to do by the editor's spelling one of the words differently from his usual way. As for bad spelling, it is usually utterly irrational, or, if it be phonetic, it is the phonetics of a man whose pronunciation and ear are as rude as his spelling. Doctor Johnson observes that every language has two pronunciations: one, which is regular and sedate, is its

true orthoëpy; the other, existing in colloquial and vulgar use, is merely a corruption of the former. Now it is to this latter only that researches like Mr. White's can be directed, and it is an extremely interesting subject of antiquarian research; but it must be evident to every reader that the study of that which is irregular and various can only be successfully prosecuted when founded upon a thorough knowledge of that more stable thing about which it shifts and veers. Moreover, the conclusions to which this method has led have been very strange, and have been very frequently corrected or reversed by their authors.

The other method consists in collecting the positive statements of original orthoëpical and phonetical writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This is the process of Mr. Marsh, whose chapter on this subject is admirable both for the skilful conduct of the inquiry and for the undogmatical manner in which its conclusions are presented. Let it not be supposed that authorities are wanting for such an examination. No less than six phonographical systems of Shakespeare's day are preserved to us.* Here are their titles:—

1568. SIR THOMAS SMITH. *De rectâ et emendata linguæ Anglicę scriptiōe Dialogus.* Paris. 4°.

1569. JOHN HART. *On Orthographie: conteyning the due order and reason how to writt or paint thimage of mannes voice; most like to the life or nature.* London. 8°.

1580. [WILLIAM] BULLOKAR's Booke at large, for the amendment of Orthographie, for English speech; wherein a most perfect supplie is made for the wantes and double sound of Letters in the Olde Orthographie, with Examples for the same. With easie conference and use of both Orthographies to save expence in Bookes for a time, until this amendment grow to a generall use, for the easie, speedie, and perfect reading and writing of English, (the speech not changed, as some untruly and maliciously, or at least ignorantly blow abroad,) etc. London. 4°.

Æsops Fables in true Ortography with Grammar Notz. Herunto ar also cōioined the shorte Sentencez of the wyz Cato, imprinted with lyke form and order, etc. London. 1585. 8°.

* A seventh, by one Wade, is referred to by an old writer as exhibiting a very vulgar pronunciation; writing, for instance, 'Lūnūn' or 'Lūūn' for 'London,'—'like the linkboys and bargemen.'

1590. PETER BALES. *Writing Schoolemaster; containing three Bookes in one; the first, teaching Swift Writing; the second, True Writing; the third, Faire Writing.* London. 4°.

1619. ALEXANDER GIL. *Logonomia Anglica. Quâ Gentis sermo facilius addiscitur.* London. 4°.

1633. CHARLES BUTLER. *The English grammar or the institution of letters, syllables, and words in the English tongue.* Oxford. 4°.

The Feminin' Monarchi; or the histori of bees. Shewing their admirable Natur', and Propertis; their Generation and Colonis; their Government, Loyalti, Art, Industri; Enemy's, VVars, Magnimite, &c. together with the right ordering of them from tim' to tim' and the sweet Profit arising ther'of. Written out of experience. Oxford. 1634. 4°.

It is often said that from these works we can ascertain what words were pronounced alike, but not what sounds they had. The mode of removing this difficulty is as follows. We should first consider, in a general way, the amount of change that the language has undergone in two hundred and fifty years. This certainly is not very great. We find that almost all words which now have a peculiar pronunciation are peculiarly represented in these phonetic systems. Such, for instance, as *lieutenant, Coteswold, iron, subtle, of, borough*, etc. Hence, no very great amount of change can be admitted. We must also consider in what directions the language is changing, and how its present pronunciation differs from the Saxon. Then, with regard to each sound, we must consult the grammars from our own time backward to the time of Shakespeare, noting what changes have occurred in their rules for the sounds of the letters, and in their statements of the equivalency of our sounds with those of other languages. This process can hardly ever deceive us. Let us exemplify this mode of procedure by an actual study of the sounds. We shall be able to refer to but three of the above-mentioned phonotypical authors,—Smith, Butler, and Gil; the last is, however, probably the best of them all.*

* The last work we found in the library of Harvard College, which is very rich in school-books, new and old. The tract of Smith, and the *Feminine Monarchy* of Butler, were kindly lent to us by the trustees of the Boston Public Library. Mulcaster's *Elementarie*, and Coote's *English School-Master*, were obtained from private libraries.

In this article, words will be put under one head, which, *with us*, convey the same sound. The mode in which we shall indicate the vowel-sounds is that of Mr. Jennison, in his admirable introduction to Hillard's Reader; it is best explained by an example: 'plain' means the vowel-sound in 'plain.' Let the reader understand, therefore, when a word is enclosed in single quotation-marks, with certain letters italicized, that what is denoted is simply the sound of the italicized letters.

Of the Consonantal Sounds.

J. The substitution of *y* for *j* in old authors has occasioned the assumption that *j* was pronounced by them, as in some parts of Europe now, with the force of *y*.¹ Gil's testimony is very exact. He says:—

"*G* before *a*, *o*, or *u*, is pronounced with the pure and German sound, as it is before consonants, in *gloria* and *gratia*; before *e* or *i*, for the most part, as by the Italians in *gentile* and *giovane*; for even so we sound a *giant*, a *gibet*, *ginger*, *gentle*, *changed*, and other words. Some nations may perhaps express this sound by *dzy*, we by simple *g* before *e* or *i*, but before *a*, *o*, and *u* always by *j* consonant; for in *Jason*, *Gefrey*, *Ginger*, *Joseph*, and a *Judge*, the *g* and *j* have the same pronunciation; the *dg*, even, following the *u* in the latter word, having the same sound as the *j* preceding it."²

Judah was pronounced 'Yuda.'

Q. Mr. White has taken the ground that *qu* was pronounced "like simple *k*; and often represented by it in many words in which the full sound of the former combination is now heard."³

Sir Thomas Smith summarily ejects the letter from his alphabet, as beggarly, false, servile, infirm, and lame, having no power without its staff *u*, and with *u* no better than *k*.⁴ Baret in his "Alvearie," or Bee-Hive, doubtless the most charming dictionary of our language, leaving the alphabet to be reformed "by better learned men," contents himself with the following animadversion:—

¹ White's Shakespeare, Vol. VII. p. 141.

² Logonomia Angl., p. 2. See also B. Jonson (Gifford's ed., 1816), IX. 265; and Wallis, p. 38.

³ White's Shakespeare, II. 320 and XII. 430.

⁴ fol. 29.

"Q hath long bene superfluouslie used in writing English wordes, whereas the Greekes never knew it, neither could the English Saxons ever abide the abuse thereof, but alwaies used K when such occasion served. . . . And surelie, I thinke reason, and the verie judgement of the eare will teach a young beginner, that Quest, Quarrell, etc. maie be as well, and as easilie spelled with K, as Kuest, Kuarrell, &c., for it appeareth that Q is no single letter, but compounded of K and U, which soundeth Q."¹

CH. There is abundance of testimony that this digraph was pronounced precisely as at present. "It is the peculiarity of the English tongue," says Gil, "to express by *ch* that sound that the Italians give to *c* in *piacevole*."² White thinks that in *speech*, *besech*, &c., it had the *k* sound; but Mulcaster observes, "The strong *ch* is mere foren, and therefore endeth no word with us, but is turned into *k*."³ He speaks here of his own system of orthography. Now he has *speche*, *beseche*, *eche*, *breche*, *leche*.⁴ He also says, "For *ch*, where it is strong the number is not manie, and therefor it maie well abide the perpendicular accent over the coplement, as 'charact, ar'changell.'"⁵ Now he does not use this accent over any *ch* not now pronounced *k*. Mr. White must have come upon a provincialism of "the Scotch and Transtrentane English" noticed by Sir T. Smith.⁶

GH. The sound of this guttural must have been atonic and faint, for Baret, Smith, and Jonson make it equivalent to *h*.⁷ But Bulloker and Gil assign to it a separate character. Its sound must have been disappearing in Shakespeare's time, for in 1653 it was a provincialism.⁸ Smith and Gil sound it in almost all words, but never in *delight* &c. not always in *high*.⁹ Coote, in his "English Schoole-Master," 15th ed., 1624, one of the most valuable of our authorities, says:—

"(Gh.) Comming together, except in *Ghost*, are of most men but little

¹ Alvearie, 2d ed., 1580, *sub lit.* Q. See also Gatakerus de Diphthongis [1646], ed. 1698, p. 20 E; Gil, p. 9; Wallis, Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae, 1653, p. 40.

² Smith, fol. 21 *et seq.*; Gil, p. 2; Jonson, IX. 285; Wallis, p. 39.

³ p. 127.

⁴ p. 128.

⁵ p. 152.

⁶ fol. 23.

⁷ Baret's Alvearie, *sub lit.* H; Smith, fol. 25; Jonson, IX. 285.

⁸ Wallis, p. 31.

⁹ For *delight*, Gil, pp. 21, 114, 141. For *high*, Gil, pp. 21, 34, 74, 98, and 24, 34, 83, 100.

sounded, as *might*, *fight*, pronounced as *mite*, *fite*: but in the end of a word some countries sound them fully, others not at all: as some say, *plough*, *slough*, *bough*: other, *plow*, *slow*, *bow*. Thereupon some write *burrough*, some *burrow*: but the truest is both to write and pronounce them."¹

Gil mentions that the common pronunciation was in many respects ambiguous; and instances *enough* and *enuf*.² Smith sometimes spells 'laugh' *laf*.³ It is probable that *f* was frequently substituted for *gh*.

Sh was equivalent to the French *ch* and German *sh*.

"I say," says Smith, "that its sound comes nearer to *s* and *y* than to *s* and *h*; and that you may understand more clearly what I mean, first sound our word for the infernal regions. QUINTUS. *Hel*. SMITH. Preserve that sound entire, and prefix an *s*. QUINT. *Shel*. SMITH. You see that that does not make our word for couch. But now sound *y-el*. QU. *Yel*. SMITH. And prefix an *s*, preserving the former sound and making one syllable. QU. *Syel*. SMITH. I put it to you now, Quintus, which of these sounds comes nearer to the word *shell*."⁴

The pronunciation of *tion*, *sion*, *tial*, &c. is shrouded with difficulty and doubt. They seem in many instances to be dissyllabic in pronunciation; but Professor Craik inclines, with some hesitation, to the belief that such lines as

"But for your private satisfaction"

are to be regarded as truncated lines; and has, on the whole, no doubt that words ending in 'tion' and 'sion' had in the age of Shakespeare already come to be sounded exactly as at the present day.⁵ The unabbreviated notation of these endings in the phonetic system of Gil shows that he regarded them as dissyllabic, and we are not therefore surprised at his statement that words of these terminations are *sometimes* contracted by synæresis. Sidney, in his "Defence of Poesie," also gives 'motion' and 'potion' as instances of English dactyls, and Puttenham instructs us that 'remuneration' makes two good dactyls.⁶ Are we then to infer, with Mr. Marsh, that 'motion' and 'potion' were pronounced 'mo-shi-on' and 'po-shi-on'? To this Mulcaster would answer:—

¹ Coote, p. 21.

² p. 19.

³ fol. 40.

⁵ English of Shakespeare, p. 168.

³ fol. 24.

⁶ *Apud* Marsh, p. 530.

"*T* kepeth one force still saving where a vowell followeth after, *i*, as in *action*, *discretion*, *consumption*, whereas, *t*, soundeth like the full *s*, or strong [weak] *c*, so the words where it is so used, be altogether strangers."¹

In fewer words, Wallis:—

"*T* before *i* followed by another vowel is sounded, like the hissing *s*, but in *question*, *mixture*, and wherever else *t* follows the letter *s* or *x*, it retains its pure sound."²

These authorities, with a number of others, seem to bear out the view that *t* was pronounced in these words as in modern French.³ It seems improbable that 'tion,' even in its contracted form, was pronounced 'shun,' as the forms *shon* and *shun* are never met with in the old books and manuscripts, although we continually meet with *seon*, *syon*, *cyon*, and *son*. Could the present aspirated pronunciation have existed in the popular speech, and have failed to manifest itself in the infinitely varied cacography of the time,—especially when it is considered that in 1675 the aspirated spelling of 'tion' was the prevalent form in which the juvenile depravity manifested itself?⁴ We must, however, confess that the weight of direct authority upon this point is weakened by the following consideration. The whole vocal interval between *sh* and *si* is filled up with innumerable possible sounds, which, both with respect to their formation in the mouth and the sound itself in the ear, differ not at all in kind, but only in degree, resulting from the greater or less proximity of the tongue to the palate and teeth. The sound of *tion* was once undoubtedly *si-on*, but during the progress to *shun* it probably rested for generations on some of these intermediate semi-vocals. Now, in all grammars and dictionaries, down to the middle of the last century, 'tion' and 'sion' are still described as sounding *shon* or *syon*, although, from a chance remark in De la Touche's *L'Art de bien Parler Français* (Amsterdam, 1704), we discover that ever since that was written, at the least, they have been pro-

¹ Elem., p. 122.

² p. 47.

³ Baret, Coote, Ben Jonson, Gataker, and Gil. See also Percival's Spanish Grammar, edited by the English Minshew, and prefixed to his Spanish Dictionary, London, 1623, p. 8. Also, Cotgrave's French Dictionary, 1607.

⁴ Nat Strong, English Perfect School-Master, 10th ed. (enlarged), 1704. Licensed, 1675.

nounced exactly as they now are. Moreover, the orthoëpists of those days used ordinarily to describe *sh* as equivalent to *sy*.¹ How natural, then, for them to call what was really near *shi*, *si*. We therefore conclude,—1st, that *-tion* and *-sion* are dissyllabic, but could be contracted to one syllable; and, 2d, that they had nearly, if not quite, the modern French sound.

TH. The arguments used by a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. III. p. 241, seem to us to demonstrate that this “complément” had its two modern sounds. Wallis, whose descriptions of the sounds, renowned as they are, are even more accurate than has been imagined, says:—

“In pronouncing T, if the breath go forth more thickly, the Greek Theta is formed, the Hebrew *Thau* aspirated, and the Arabic *The*; this is the English *Th* in the words *thigh*, *thing*, *thin*, *thought*, *throng*, etc. The Anglo-Saxons used to write it with a Spina; In pronouncing the letter D, if the breath breaks forth more grossly, and as through a hole, the Arabic *Dhal* is formed, the aspirated Hebrew *Daleth*, and the Spanish *ñ* soft as that letter is used in the middle and end of words, as *Majestad*, *Trinidad*, etc. The English represent this sound in the same way as the one mentioned above, namely by *th*, as in the words *thy*, *thine*, *this*, *though*, etc.”

Mr. White thinks the sound of the French *t* in *meurtre*, and the Irish *th* in *further* is the sound indicated. But it cannot be a French or Irish sound, for both those peoples are represented, both in the plays and grammars of the period, as unable to pronounce the *th*.²

Th was probably vulgarly and provincially interchanged with *t*. At least the cacography of the period seems to indicate this, and Gil says, “Certainly, where the dialect varies, I readily suffer the writing itself to be least consistent; as, *further* or *furder*; *murther* or *murder*.”³ But this looseness must not be exaggerated. Of the hundred words given by Gil in which the *th* sound now occurs, only *author*, *Arthur*, and certain ordinal numerals have the *t*; while *murder* is the only word in which his *th* would now be *d* or *t*. Mulcaster’s general table contains one hundred and sixty-five words now sounded with *th*. Of

¹ Wilkins’s *Essay towards a Real Character*, p. 372. Wallis, pp. 38, 65.

² See Davenant’s “*Playhouse to Let*,” and Jonson’s “*Irish Mask*”; also, Palsgrave, p. 20; and Smith, fol. 5, where, however, the phrase is ambiguous.

³ Gil, Preface.

these only *author*, *authority*, *authentic*, and some ordinals, have the *t*. And the only words he gives with *th* which now have the sound of *t*, are *nostril* and *’t’other*. These authorities are entirely independent; the later of them speaks of the other as a man who had “wasted much time and good paper.”¹ Their agreement demonstrates that, notwithstanding the popular looseness, there was a correct pronunciation of words containing *th* which very nearly coincides with the orthoëpy of our times.

We will pass over the other consonants, and proceed to the

Silent Letters.

E final was, of course, silent. It remained silent when the word it ended was compounded with another; to this rule the only well-established exception was *commandement*. The vowel of the termination *-ed* was familiarly omitted, but was also frequently heard. The notion that the “usual pronunciation” of *shuffled* was “shuffleëd” is entirely unsupported, except by an argument which, if valid, would show that that was the usual spelling also. ‘*Handès*’ for ‘*hands*’ is mentioned by Gil as a poetical license.² The *t* in such words as *talk*, *calm*, *fôlk*, *half*, &c., had long been silent, (though Gil says that certain “*eruditi non ejiciunt t*,”) and this rule extended to *fault*.³ The sound of *t* lingered much longer in *would*, *should*, *could*.⁴ A *b* following an *m* at the end of a word, or preceding a *t*, was silent, as now. The same may be said of a *g* before *n*, but Gil sometimes writes *benign* and *condign*, *benign* and *condign*. *H* was silent in *honor*, *hour*, *honest*, and also in *hyssop* (“*izop*”), but apparently was sounded in *herb*. In *ha’penny*, *two*, *whole*, *Worcester*, the same letters were silent that are so now. But *k* before *n*, and *w* before *h*, would seem to have been invariably sounded.⁵ *Iron* was sounded as at present.

The Vowel Sounds.

The use of the final *e* to lengthen the preceding vowel was even more common then than now. All those words we have now, in which, though the spelling indicates a long vowel, the pronunciation is short, such as *logic*, *valor*, *spirit*, etc., were

¹ Gil, Preface.

⁴ Smith and Gil,

² p. 137.

⁵ Ibid.

³ Preface.

short then; and to these we must add *age*¹ (sometimes long), *change*,² *cider* (?),³ *diamond*,⁴ *divers* (?),⁵ *favor* (?),⁶ *over*,⁷ *silent*.⁸ *Saturn*, however, *been*,⁹ sometimes *have*, *mischiefe*, *minute*, sometimes *ire* final, *ai* in a final syllable, and a number of words in *ea*, had their vowels long. So, on the other hand, words now pronounced long, though spelt short, were then long; but to this we except *angel*¹⁰ and *chamber*.¹¹ *Challenge* was spelt with one *l* and had the *a* long.

SHORT VOWELS. 1. 'Good.' All words spelt with *oo* had the long sound, and properly took the final *e*; except *blood*,¹² *flood*,¹³ *good*,¹⁴ *hood*,¹⁵ *wood*,¹⁶ and *wool*.¹⁷ *Woman*¹⁸ and *Worcester*¹⁹ had the 'good' sound; but *could*, *would*, *should*, were long.²⁰

2. 'Up.' There is ample evidence that, in the reign of Charles II., *ū* had the same sound we now give it; and Mr. Marsh is of opinion that it was so pronounced in Shakespeare's day. This scholar, whose reasons are usually so direct and unerring, seems here to have made a curious mistake. He founds his conclusion solely upon the following words of Gil: "*V, est tenuis, aut crassa: tenuis v, est in Verbo tu vz usc: crassa brevis est u, ut in pronomine us nos.*" He does not translate this, but he evidently understands it thus: "*U* is thin or thick; the thin *u* is in the verb 'to use,' the thick *u* is short, as in the pronoun *us*." But had he turned over the page, he would have found the sentence finished thus: "*aut longa ū: ut in verbo tu ūz oone scaturio, aut sensim exeo more aquæ vi expressæ.*" Gil is in this chapter describing his own orthography. Now he has three characters for *u*; namely, *v*, which takes the place of our *u* long, *u* (short), which takes the place

¹ Gil, pp. 92, 98, 112.

² Gil, p. 38.

³ Ib., p. 93.

⁴ Ib., pp. 24, 30, 70, 98, etc.

⁵ Ib., pp. 56, 57, 58, 63, 65, etc. For the three following words see Gil.

⁶ Ib., p. 24.

⁷ Ib., pp. 4, 38, 106, 110; Smith, fol. 24.

⁸ Ib., pp. 12, 25, 39, 68, 115, etc.; Smith, fol. 25, 43.

⁹ Smith, fol. 25.

¹⁰ Gil, pp. 10, 22, 39, 113, 142; Smith, fol. 19, 42.

¹¹ Gil, pp. 39, 70; Smith, fol. 19.

¹² Ib., pp. 70, 81.

¹³ Ib., pp. 12, 20, 28; Smith, fol. 44.

¹⁴ Ib., pp. 79, 91, 107.

¹⁵ Ib., p. 82.

¹⁶ Ib., pp. 48, 110.

¹⁷ Ib., pp. 23, 24.

¹⁸ Gil, pp. 119, 124.

¹⁹ Gil, pp. 119, 124.

²⁰ Gil, pp. 41, 94, 117.

²¹ Ib., pp. 55, 56; 17, 24, 53; 54, 85.

of *ōō* and of *ū* short, and *ū* (long), which takes the place of *ōō* long. He says, then, "*U* is thin or thick; the thin '*u*' occurs in '*use*'; the thick, when short, is '*ū*' as in '*us*,' when long, is '*ū*' as in '*ooze*.'" He thus states directly that the *u* in '*us*' is the short sound of the *oo* in '*ooze*.'¹ In another place he says: "So in *Bucke* and *Booke*; nor have these any other difference in sound but that which is perceived in quantity."² The reader must remember that the *oo* in *Book* was long. In these statements Gil is fully supported by the other authorities.

Ben Jonson. "In the short time more flat and akin to *u*; as

cozen, dozen, mother,
brother, love, prove.

Note. *Uōo, vel ou Gallicum.*" (IX. pp. 266, 267.)

Coote. "You shall find some words written with (e) and (o) single, when they should be written with the diphthongs *ee, oo*, as *he, be, she, me, do, mother*; for *hee, bee, mee, doo, &c.*" (p. 22.)

Butler. "For as *i* short hath the sound of *ee* short, so hath *u* short of *oo* short." "*U* short into *oo* short (which sound is all one)." (pp. 8, 9. *Apud* White's Shakespeare, Vol. IV. p. 101.)

This sound of *oo* short extended to all the words which we now pronounce with '*up*,' whether spelt with *u, o, or ou*.

The only exceptions that we have met with are *among, nothing*,³ with the sound of *o* short, and *none* and *one* with the sound of *o* long. It is noticeable that this class of words includes nearly all those which end with *om* and *on*. The French *o* nasal was anciently pronounced '*soon*.' It is by means of this tendency to pronounce *om* '*oom*,' that the puns between *Rome* and *room* are to be explained. At any rate, it is certain that, when Pope wrote these lines,—

"From the same foes, at last, both felt their doom,
And the same age saw learning fall, and Rome,"—

he meant both words to be pronounced '*ooze*,' for Granville Sharp's "Short Treatise," an excellent work on English orthoepy, (London, 1767,) says, "in *lose, move, prove, and Rome*,

¹ Marsh's Lectures, 1st Series, 4th ed., p. 484 et seq. Gil, pp. 7, 8.

² "Sic in *Bucke* hic *dama*, et *Booke* liber: neque in his ulla soni differentia est, præter illam quæ in quantitate percipitur."—*Log. Angl.*, p. 3.

³ Gil, pp. 32, 38, 39, &c.

o is commonly pronounced like *oo*." The word *one* was commonly pronounced as spelt, down into the middle of the last century. Nevertheless, the pronunciation of the *w* is very ancient.

In 1650, *u* short had acquired its present sound, and even those words spelt with a *oo*, mentioned under the last heading, changed into 'gud,' 'hud,' 'sut,' 'blud,' 'flud'; but *good*, *hood*, *soot*, (*wood*, *foot*, and *wool*,) afterward recovered their regular pronunciation, to correspond with the many words in *oo* long, which, in consequence of the omission of the final *e*, were becoming short.

3. 'on.' A Yankee pronunciation of 'whole' and 'coat' bears the same relation to their true sounds that "bull" does to "rule," and the question arises whether *o* short, as well as *u* short, has undergone a change in sound. One thing is very clear, that, in the middle of the seventeenth century, 'on' had the same pronunciation as now, for Wallis and Wilkins describe it without ambiguity as the short sound of *a* in 'fall' and 'ball.' The latter author also states that no short sound corresponding to *o* rotund existed in the language.¹ Previous to the Rebellion, Gil is our sole authority. He makes no distinction in his phonotypy between the *o* in 'hop' and 'hope,' except by the long mark, but still he fails to tell us expressly that they are the same in sound, although he *does* say so of *e* short and *e* long, of *i* short and double *e*, of *u* short and double *o*. He remarks, in general, that, "although in a long or short syllable the time in pronunciation is different, the vicinity of the sound is not; still the same vowel sometimes sounds broader, sometimes sharper, as in *hall*, *hale*, and *Hal*."² Perhaps by *vicinity* of sound he did not mean *identity*. This matter must, therefore, remain in doubt.

Words in which *a* now has the sound of *o* short, as 'was,' 'what,' and 'quality,' were formerly pronounced regularly.³ Numerous words, as 'hot,' 'moth,' 'cloth,' which are found in books of about the date 1600 spelt 'hoate,' 'moathe,' and 'cloathe,' were nevertheless, in the year 1621, as we learn from Gil, pronounced as at present. Mr. White would place more reliance on the spelling, as an indication of the sound,

¹ Essay toward a Real Character, p. 363

² Gil.

³ Log. Angl., p. 3.

than on the orthoëpist. *O* short following *i* short was silent in a few words, as in the lines,—

"A carrion crow sat on a tree."

"To grace in captive bonds his chariot wheels."¹

"In the last syllables," says Ben Jonson, "before *n* and *w*, *o* frequently loseth its sound; as in *person*, *action*, *willow*, *willow*." These last words remind one of Chaucer's *herberw*, and the Yankee pronunciation 'willer.'

4. 'can.' Ben Jonson, following Mulcaster, whom indeed he ever closely copies, distinguishes *a* short from *a* long by calling the former flat and the latter sharp.² Wallis describes the present sound in an unmistakable manner.³ It may be safe to assume that the sound has not changed for three hundred years. In this case, it is a defect in Gil's system, that it does not distinguish between the *a* in 'cat' and that in 'cart.' This error is an easy one, for Webster's Unabridged Dictionary gives to 'grass,' 'dance,' etc. the sound of 'cart,' while his smaller Dictionaries assign to the same words the sound of 'cat.' *Have* was sounded either long or short. *Shall* was sounded generally as at present, but sometimes with the *au* sound: *Than* was spelt and pronounced with an *e*.

5. 'End.' This sound has undergone no perceptible change. *Any*⁴ and *many*⁵ had the sound of *a* short. *Friend*⁶ had the sound of *i* short, and so generally had *yet*,⁷ *yes*,⁸ and *yesterday*.⁹ These are now all Hibernicisms.

6. 'In.' Words to which we now give this sound had in general the same pronunciation in Shakespeare's day. *Women*,¹⁰ *busy*,¹¹ and *breaches*¹² were sounded as at present. *Build* was pronounced either 'byüld,' 'bïld,' 'bööld,' 'bïld,' or 'beeld,' according to Gil.¹³ *Y* or *ie* at the end of a word had indifferently its present sound, or that of the long diphthongal *i*.

LONG VOWELS. 1. 'ooze.' This sound we derive from the Saxons, and it has been in the language ever since. Wallis describes it accurately, and Baret remarks:—

¹ Gil.

² p. 8.

³ Ib., pp. 34, 39, 75, 87, 91, etc.

⁴ Ib., p. 10; Smith, fol. 18.

⁵ Gil, p. 77; Smith, fol. 17.

⁶ Ib., p. 91.

² B. Jonson, IX. 261; Mulcaster, Elem., p. 110.

⁴ Gil, p. 95.

⁵ Ib., pp. 69, 81, 90, 117, 139, etc.

⁶ Gil, pp. 149, 150; Smith, fol. 17, 18, 37.

¹⁰ Gil, p. 41.

¹² Ib., p. 17.

¹³ Ib., pp. 4, 19, 105, 111.

"But that which we call double o, (oo) I thinke in English is much mistaken, and abused. For how can oo have the name of o, when it chaungeth his sound (which is as it were his name) and doth degenerate into the nature and name of an other vowel? hop, hope, hoop. A diphthong, I thinke, it cannot be: for that no vowel can be compounded in a diphthong with itselfe. . . . Some thinke such wordes should be rather written with u."¹

As Mr. White says, the original use of a doubled vowel was the expression of the long, pure sound. This was one of the uses of the oo in 1530, for Palsgrave says of the French:—

"The soundyng of the o, which is most generall with them is lyke as we sounde o in these wordes in our tonge, a boore, a soore, a coore, and such lyke, that is to say, lyke as the Italians sounde o, or they with us that sounde the latine tong arighl."²

'Move,' 'tomb,' 'prove,' 'lose,' 'do,'³ and 'two,'⁴ were sounded as at present. And 'who' was called 'whoe'⁵ the w being sounded.

2. 'herd.' A difference seems to have existed between the sounds of 'fur' and 'fir,' for Coote tells us that 'durt,' 'gurt,' 'hur,' 'sur,' in place of 'dirt,' 'girth,' 'her,' and 'sir,' were a part of "the barbarous speech of your country-people." So with Wallis, *ter ter* is different from *turtur*, and *iter* from *itur*. This was owing to the distinctly consonantal pronunciation of the r. 'Heard' is pronounced 'hård' by Gil, but 'hård' by Baret, Coote, and others. 'Worm,' 'work,' 'word,' 'worth,' 'worse,' were pronounced 'wörm,' etc.

3. 'dauce,' 'daunt,' 'dawn.' These three vowels, which, in Mulcaster's phrase, "entermedle with each other" so much, will be conveniently considered under one head. Indeed, the three words given as their representatives all had the same vowel-sound in 1600. The sound 'daunt' did not exist unless in such words as 'car'; for *father*,⁶ *rather*,⁷ and *water*⁸ (in the last century 'wahter') took the sound of long a, while *aunt*, *daunt*, *calf*, *half*, etc. had the vowel of 'dawn.'⁹ Words now

¹ Alvearie, sub lit. O.

² p. 7.

³ Gil, pp. 50, 53; Smith, fol. 42.

⁴ Gil, pp. 13, 37, 70, 89; Smith, fol. 12, 24.

⁵ Smith, fol. 20; Gil, *passim*.

⁶ Or *räther*, Gil, pp. 121, 122.

⁷ Sometimes *wäther* and even *wahter*, Gil, 10, 23, 24, 38, 69, 81, 118.

⁸ Gil, Preface.

⁹ Gil, pp. 76, 80, 81.

sounded like 'dauce' had indifferently the a of 'fat' and 'fall'.¹

What, then, was the sound of *au* which belonged to all these words? The grammars will tell us that it was that of the French and German a. Here follow a few citations, with dates and authors prefixed.

1533. Ben Jonson. "When [a] comes before l in the end of a syllable, it obtaineth the full French sound, and is uttered with the mouth and throat wide opened and the tongue bent back from the teeth."

1653. Wallis. "Neither do the Germans alone, but the French and some other nations most commonly pronounce their a with the same sound."—p. 6.

1673. Festeau says that the French pronounce their a like the English *aw*. (p. 7.)

1698. Berault. "A se prononce encore comme en François quand il est fermé par une ou deux consônes: Example. *Fal*, gras; *mad*, enragé; *all*, tout; *call*, appelle."—p. 214.

It is established, then, that our *au* and the French a were nearly enough alike to be described as equivalent. The next step is to obtain some further information respecting the French a, and here we shall find that though the resemblance to the English *au* is still perceived, yet that, aside from that statement, the grammarians, after the year 1700, tell a very different story from those previous to that date. Thus:—

1710. "Les Anglois donnent quelquefois à oi le son de ai comme toi." De la Touche, *L'Art de bien Parler François*, (Amsterdam, 9th ed.,) Vol. I. p. 44. Here French a is made equivalent to our o short.

1745. "A is pronounced as in English in these words, War, that, tall; as academie, Academy; abattre, to pull down, &c. they must always be pronounced full and plain, as *aw*."—Taudon, *French Grammar*, 4th ed. p. 1.

1767. "a in *Water* is commonly pronounced like the French a, or English *aw*; in *Father*, and the last syllable of *Papa*, *Mamma*, it has a medium sound between *aw* and the English a."—Sharp on the English Pronunciation, p. 5.

1784. "It is the legitimate sound of the long a in the French language; but I do not know that it is to be met with at all in the Italian."—Nares on Orthöpy, p. 7.

¹ Mulcaster, pp. 128, 129, 137; Gil, Preface. The following is from Coote:—"Robert. What spelleth b, r, a, n, c, h? John. Branch. Robert. Nay, but you should put in (u). John. That skilleth not, for both ways be usuall."

We thus see that, after 1700, the French *a* was not the Italian *a*, but was the *o* in 'toil,' or *fully and plainly* aw. Now let us consult a few of the older grammarians.

1530. "The soundyng of *a* whiche is most generally used through out the frenche tonge, is lyke as the Italians sound *a*, or they with us that pronounce the latine tonge aryght.

"If *m* or *n* folowe next after *a* in a frenche worde, all in one syllable, than *a* shall be sounded lyke this diphthong *au*, and something in the noose, as these wordes *ámbre*, *chámbré*, *mandér*, *amánt*, *tant*, *parlánt*, *regardánt*, shall in redyng and spekyng be sounded *aumbre*, *chaumbre*, *maunder*, &c." — Palsgrave, p. 2.

And on the next page he lets us know what this Italian *a* is:—

"If *m* or *n* folowe next after *e* all in one syllable, than *e* shall be sounded lyke an Italian *a* and some thyng in the noose." — p. 3.

1623. "A is sounded plainly with opening the mouth, as in Latine, French, and Italian, as in English man, can, so in Spanish *manada*, *ensalada*." — Rich. Percival, Spanish Grammar affixed to the Dictionary, edited by Minsheu.

1650. "A in the *English* Tounge, and in no other, hath two differing sounds, the one open and cleer, as *Balaám*, the other pressing and as it were halfe-mouth'd and mincingly, as *Stale Ale*; In French 't is alwaies pronounced as in the first, cleer and ouvert." — Cotgrave's Dictionary, by Howell.

It is true that Strong (1698), E. Coles (1701), and Bailey (2d ed. 1733) say that *Baal* and *Bawl* are pronounced alike, but this proves but little with regard to *Balaam*; and is it probable that, with *Bawl*, &c. directly in his path, Cotgrave would have sought out an uncommon proper noun to illustrate the French sound, unless he had perceived that it answered his purpose better?

1660. "Of the Pronunciation of the Netherdutch Letters. *a* is pronounced more fully and broader than ours, as the French *a* with an open mouth, or as *ah* in English." — Hexham's Dictionary.

There are three reasons for thinking that Hexham here meant to give the French *a* nearly its present sound. The first is, that he refers to the French *a* with an open mouth as though he wished to distinguish it from some other sound of *a* in French. This can only mean the nasal sound (which is even now pronounced *aw*, though some of the modern grammars do not say so). But this would not differ from the ordinary *a* if

the latter was *aw*; therefore the orthoëpy must have been like that of Palsgrave's time. The second reason is, that this French *a* is made equivalent to our interjection *Ah*! Is it credible that this was ever *aw*? Thirdly, it is said to equal the Dutch *a*. For the sound of that see Sewel's *Wegwyzer*, 1705: "In some words, however, *a* in English is pronounced nearly as in Dutch; as, *Man*, *animal*, *bastard*, *singular*, *particular*, *mutual*, *apply*, *arrest*, *assist*, &c." (p. 8.)

1690. "A is the most open of the letters, as well as the simplest and the easiest to pronounce; whence it comes that it is with this that children begin to form sounds." — Pomey's Royal French Dictionary.

We have now collected authorities of every generation, from 1600 to 1800, and from them we conclude:—1. That in the time of Henry VIII. the French *a* was pronounced as it is now. 2. That as we advance into the seventeenth century, the statement that it is pronounced 'daunt' is less and less distinctly enunciated, and its equivalency to the English *aw* is more frequently noticed. 3. That from 1700 until after the Revolution, it was pronounced 'dawn.' But what conclusion shall we draw respecting the English *au*, which the grammarians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries alike concur in representing to be the same as the French *a*? The inference that it also changed, and that at the same time as the French *a*, would be preposterously improbable. For inferring a change at any other time sufficient reason is wanting. We must, therefore, endeavor to explain our facts on the presumption that its sound underwent no change. Now this can only be done by supposing that the French *a*, from 1620 to 1690, represented such a sound as might at once be described as 'daunt' and be made equivalent to 'dawn.' Such a sound is, perhaps, given to 'balm' in Georgia and Alabama. Soon after 1690 it took another step in the same direction as that which was taken after the wars of the Huguenots, perhaps, and now bore no resemblance to the *a* in *father*. It appears, however, that this change had not struck completely into the provinces, for, as the Revolution gradually passed off, this orthoëpy also died out, and left the pronunciation as it was during the reign of Francis I. If we accept this theory, our conclusion respecting

the English *aw* will be that it was always pronounced as at present.

The 'daunt' sound we have always had in English in a few such words as 'car' and 'star'; probably also in one mode of pronouncing *dance*, *France*, &c.; but its present use in *daunt*, *aunt*, *father*, and others arose between 1660 and 1737, when Saxon¹ first states that the *u* in *aunt* is silent. The remarkable absence of original grammars during the fourscore years before the last date renders it difficult to assign any particular period to this change,² but it is natural to think that it took place after the Revolution, when many new customs arose, and when other vowels altered their sound. Still later, and in fact very recently, the sound we give to words like *dance* branched off from that of 'daunt,' and now the prevalent vulgarism is to call *dance* like 'damsel'; in all which stages one tendency of growth is manifest, — 1. 'dawn,' 2. 'daunt,' 3. 'dance,' 4. 'damsel.'

4. 'Ale,' 'air.' A long had a sound nearly like 'ale.' A single extract will suffice to show this. It is from "An Introductory for to lerne to rede, to pronounce, and to speke the French trewly," 1532, by Giles Du Guez, the tutor of Queen Mary Tudor.

"Ye shal pronounce your *a*, as wyde open mouthed as ye can; your *e*, as ye do in Latyn, almost as brode as ye pronounce your *a* in englysshe."³

A in 'Ale,' as now sounded, ends with a very short *i* sound, as *o* in 'old' does with a *oo* sound; and it is an important but difficult question to determine whether this vanish existed or was invariably used in Shakespeare's day. Gill uses three characters in places where we sound 'ale'; they are, *ā*, *ai*, *āi*. The two latter, which are used indifferently where the *a* is followed by an *i* or *y* in common spelling, he regards as diph-

¹ English Schollar's Assistant, 2d ed., p. 10.

² Sewel (Korte Wegwyzer, p. 8) gives the sound of *particular* to *water*, *was*, and *altar*, and the sound of 'dawn' to *aunt*, *daunt*, *August*. Strong (Perfect School Master, 1698) gives the 'dawn' sound to *Draught*, *Haunt*, *Laugh*, *Taunt*, *Vaunt* (p. 35). In his table of words of like sound he has "Walter came by Water" (p. 56). But he makes *aunt* different from *ant*. These authorities are not sufficient to fix the date.

³ Same vol. as Palsgrave.

thongs. And in speaking of the peculiarities of the Lincolnshire speech he says, "*In ai, abjiciunt i, ut pro pai solvo, pā; pro sai dico, sā.*"¹ This shows that he really distinguished the sound of *pale* and *pail*, *pain* and *pane*, *gait* and *gate*. Sir Thomas Smith's remarks are even more explicit; thus: —

"The consideration of the diphthongs follows the vowels. Now a diphthong is any sound compounded of two vowels: as *AI, pai, dai, wai, mai, lai, say, esai, tail, fail, fāin, pain, disdain, claim, plai, arai*. In these both letters are short among more cultivated speakers. The country-folk produce a dense, odious, and too greasy sound, by sounding both vowels, or at least the latter one, long: *Pāi, dāi, wāi, māi, lāi*. So those who pronounce these words very delicately, young ladies especially, exhibit plainly the Roman diphthong *æ*. *Æ Latin diphthong. Pæ, dæ, wæ, mæ, læ*. Scotch and some Transtrentane English pronounce these words with the improper Greek diphthong *α*, so that neither *a* nor *e* is heard, unless very obscurely. *Α, improper Greek diphthong. Pā, dā, wā, mā, lā.*"²

There was then a decided difference between *ai* and *a*. Had, then, the latter a diphthongal termination as now? Sir Thomas Smith, speaking of the relation of *mad* and *lad* to *made* and *lade*, says: —

"It is certain that there is no difference between these words except in the length and shortness of the vowel, as any one who is willing to listen and consult his ears, unless his are more *ακούσας* than those of an ass, can readily understand."³

And Wallis, whose knowledge of phonetics is not to be questioned, says: —

"With the larger opening is formed the of the English, that is, *a* thin, such as is heard in the words, *bat, bate, pal, pall, Sam, same, lamb, lame, ban, bane*, etc. This sound differs from the German *â* thick or open; in that the English raise the middle of the tongue, and thereby compress the air in the *Palate*; while the Germans depress the middle of the tongue, and thereby compress the air in the throat. The French almost give that sound where *e* precedes the letter *n* in the same syllable, as *entendement*, &c. The Welsh are accustomed to pronounce their *a* with this sound."⁴

Now the Welsh *a* is 'cat' when short, and when long the

¹ p. 17.

² fol. 14, *et seq.*

³ fol. 10.

⁴ p. 8.

same elongated without a vanish, or nearly 'care.' There was then no vanish to the long *a*, and *ai* was a true diphthong, more resembling our *a* long than our *i* long. *Ea* had a peculiar pronunciation, which we shall presently consider.

5. 'old,' 'ore.' Having seen that *a* wanted the vanish, we are ready to believe that the same was the case with *o*, since we find the old phonotypists indicating it. There was, besides, the diphthong *ou*, formed of the long *o* and *u*, which was heard in all those words in which *ou* and *ow* are now sounded 'old,' and also wherever *o* long was followed by *l*; this sound must have been the same with which the Irish now pronounce the word 'bold.' *Court* was pronounced *cōrt*.¹ *Door*,² *quoth*,³ *shew*,⁴ *pour*,⁵ were sounded exactly as spelt, the last word differing only from 'power' in spelling.

6. 'Eve,' 'deer.' There can be no doubt that this sound was heard in almost all the words where it now occurs, including 'people'⁶ and 'shire'⁷ in combination, for Gil gives to all these words the long sound of the short *i*. The principal exceptions were words in *ea*, several in *ei*, *Cæsar*,⁸ *cedar*,⁹ *equal*,¹⁰ *fierce*,¹¹ *Grecian*,¹² *interfere*,¹³ *these*,¹⁴ etc., which had the peculiar sound of *ea*.

The sound of *ea*. It was a great puzzle to Mr. White, when considering rhymes and puns, to decide whether *ea* was sounded like long *a* or double *e*. Mr. Marsh, looking at the grammars,

¹ Gil, 22. So *courteous*, p. 67, *courtesy*, p. 82. With reference to the distinction between *o* and *ou*, Mr. White quotes Shakespeare's "Not on thy soule: but on thy soule, harsh Jew," and argues from this that the two words were pronounced alike. What does the reader say to this inference? Will some future antiquarian apply the same reasoning to Hood's lines on the learned pig?

"Of what avail that I could spell
And read just like my betters,
If I must come to this at last,
To litters, not to letters?"

² Gil, p. 95; Smith, fol. 24. But the present pronunciation also existed. Gil, pp. 118, 122.

³ Or 'koth.' Gil, p. 64.

⁴ Also like 'poor.' Gil, p. 21; Smith, fol. 43.

⁵ Gil, pp. 21, 22, 41, 78.

⁶ Or with *e* short. Gil, pp. 43, 78, 82.

⁷ Ib., 84.

⁸ Ib., 73, 74.

⁹ Ib., 13, 14, 45, and Wallis quoted below.

¹⁰ Gil, pp. 12, 98.

¹¹ Ib., 70, 81, etc.

¹² Ib., 105.

¹³ Ib., 99.

¹⁴ Ib., 33.

at once discovered that it was neither one nor the other, but an intermediate sound, like the *e* in *met*, prolonged. This view is sustained by the following extract from Wallis:—

"In the same place, also, but with a *middling* opening of the mouth, is formed the *é* masculine of the French: which sound the English, Italians, Spanish, give to this letter; a vivid and sharp sound. It is a sound intermediate between the preceding vowel and that which is to follow [*ā* in *pane* with a *greater* opening, and *ee* with a *less* opening of the mouth]. This sound the English express by *e*, and when long not infrequently by *ea*, and sometimes *ei*. As *the*, *there*, *these*, *sell*, *seal*, *tell*, *teal*, *steal*, *set*, *seat*, *best*, *beast*, *red*, *read* (*lego*), *receive*, *deceive*, &c."¹

Many words in *ea*, which now receive the short sound, in Shakespeare's day were long. Of these we have noted the following: *bread*,² *deadly*,³ *death*,⁴ *deaf*,⁵ *dread*,⁶ *heavy*,⁷ *lead* (the metal),⁸ *meant*,⁹ *pleasant*,¹⁰ *pleasure*,¹¹ *spread* (present tense),¹² *sweat* (present tense),¹³ *threat*,¹⁴ *weapon*.¹⁵ The following were pronounced both ways: *dead*,¹⁶ *health*,¹⁷ *heaven*,¹⁸ *ready*,¹⁹ *sweat* (noun),²⁰ *thread*,²¹ *tread*,²² *treasure*.²³ The following were, as now, short: *breadth*,²⁴ *breast*,²⁵ *breath*,²⁶ *cleanly*,²⁷ *cleanse*,²⁸ *endeavor*,²⁹ *feather*,³⁰ *head*,³¹ *leads* (noun

¹ p. 9.

² Gil, pp. 24, 37, 73; Smith, fol. 11, 41. So Coote also.

³ Butler's *Feminine Monarchy*, p. 20. Butler evidently distinguishes between *ea* short and *ea* long, for his spelling is uniform and consistent with Gil's.

⁴ Gil, pp. 12, 116, 118, 119, 122; Butler, pp. 13, 15, 20, 22, 24, etc.

⁵ Smith, fol. 24.

⁶ Butler, p. 129.

⁷ Gil, p. 119; Butler, p. 43.

⁸ Butler, pp. 43, 44.

⁹ Butler, p. 51.

¹⁰ Ib., pp. 27, 51, 76, 160.

¹¹ Gil, pp. 89, 144; Butler, pp. 19, 24, 46, 55, 104, etc.

¹² Butler, pp. 90, 118.

¹³ Smith, fol. 20; Gil, pp. 48, 111.

¹⁴ Gil, pp. 99.

¹⁵ Butler, pp. 8, 60.

¹⁶ So says Gil, *errata*; Smith, fol. 24, has it long; Butler, p. 50, has it long, but in pp. 3, 4, 5, 9, 24, etc. has it short.

¹⁷ Long, Gil, p. 21. Short, Butler, p. 138.

¹⁸ Long, Gil, pp. 22, 99, 118, 121. Short, ib., pp. 23, 24, 98, 110.

¹⁹ Long, Butler, p. 150. Short, Gil, pp. 84, 93; Butler, pp. 4, 15, 18, 32, 36, etc. See also White's *Shakespeare*, XII. p. 427.

²⁰ Long, Butler, p. 58. Short, Smith, fol. 20.

²¹ Long, Smith, fol. 38. Short, Butler, pp. 35, 37, 41, 91, 92, etc.

²² Long, Smith, fol. 38; Butler, pp. 81, 89. Short, Butler, pp. 117, 118, 119.

²³ Long, Gil, p. 126. Short, ib., p. 77. ²⁴ Butler, pp. 13, 18, 43, 44.

²⁵ Gil, pp. 104, 127; Butler, pp. 9, 15, 122. ²⁶ Gil, p. 125; Butler, pp. 11, 136.

²⁷ Butler, p. 64.

²⁸ Ib., pp. 53, 84.

²⁹ Ib., p. 49.

³⁰ Ib., pp. 6, 9, 154, 157.

³¹ Smith, fol. 41; Gil, pp. 27, 38, 103, 104; Butler, pp. 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 23, etc.

plural),¹ *leather*,² *read* (past),³ *Reading*,⁴ *spread* (past),⁵ *sweat* (past),⁶ *wealth*,⁷ *weather*.⁸ Several words now written *ear* had then the sound of *eer*; they were, *appear*,⁹ *clear*,¹⁰ *year*,¹¹ and sometimes *near*¹² and *rear*.¹³ Consequently these words did not rhyme with the following: *bear* (noun and verb),¹⁴ *fear*,¹⁵ *hear*,¹⁶ *tear* (verb).¹⁷ *Instead* was often called 'instead,'¹⁸ *Heard* had the sound 'hare,'¹⁹ and *heart* was pronounced as at present.²⁰ When *ea* is found rhymed with *ai*, it is owing to a common mispronunciation of the latter diphthong noticed by Gil. The *ei* in *receive*, *deceive*, etc. was a diphthong in Gil's time; it was used interchangeably with *ai*, as both Smith and Mulcaster observe. The latter says:—

"*ai*, is the man's diphthong, and soundeth full: *ei*, the woman's, and soundeth finish in the same both sense, and use; a woman is deintie, and feinteth soon; the man fainteth not, because he is nothing daintie."²¹

DIPHTHONGS. 1. '*Ice*,' '*ire*.' It is the characteristic peculiarity of English speech, that all transition from one note or tone to another is made, not by a sudden change, but by what in *pitch* is called a slide. Accordingly, none of our diphthongs are combinations of two vowels, but run from the first sound to the last through an infinite number of gradations. '*Ice*,' according to this view, instead of being *ah-ee*, is more

¹ Butler, p. 23.

² *Ib.*, p. 10.

³ Smith, fol. 11; Gil, pp. 48, 52, 117; Butler, pp. 16, 137.

⁴ Butler, p. 35.

⁵ Gil, p. 106; Butler, pp. 92, 95, 97, 109, 148.

⁶ Gil, p. 48.

⁷ Gil, pp. 39, 77, 85, 87, 89; Butler, pp. 2, 20, 138, 139, 141.

⁸ Butler, pp. 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 15, 16, etc.

⁹ Gil, pp. 87, 94; Butler, pp. 13, 15, 16, 23, 51, etc.

¹⁰ Butler, pp. 160, 161.

¹¹ *Ib.*, pp. 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, etc.

¹² *Ea* sound, Gil, pp. 34, 104. *Ee* sound, Gil, p. 84; Butler, pp. 14, 18, 28, 30, 34, etc.

¹³ *Ea* sound, Smith, fol. 30; Butler, pp. 29, 42, 47, 86, 97. *Ee* sound, Butler, p. 87.

¹⁴ Gil, p. 50; Butler, pp. 54, 139.

¹⁵ Gil, pp. 20, 22, 98, 99, 109, etc.; Butler, pp. 15, 29, 48, 65, 84, etc.

¹⁶ Gil, p. 27; Butler, pp. 14, 15, 114.

¹⁷ Smith, fol. 30; Gil, p. 107; Butler, p. 119.

¹⁸ Butler, pp. 5, 8, 18, 144. Gil, however, gives it the long sound of *ea*, p. 103.

¹⁹ Gil, pp. 21, 23, 80; Butler, p. 150; White's Shakespeare, XII. 427.

²⁰ Gil, pp. 21, 23, 24, 79, 99, 119; Butler, pp. 15, 25, 33, 150.

²¹ p. 119.

nearly *ah*, *up*, *err*, *end*, *in*, *eve*.¹ But it is not to be supposed that any abrupt change was made from the Saxon *i* long to this very complex combination. It is more rational to suppose that the sound grew up by insensible gradations somewhat in this way:—

1. *eve*;
2. *in-eve*;
3. *end-in-eve*;
4. *err-end-in-eve*;
5. *up-err-end-in-eve*;
6. *ah-up-err-end-in-eve*.

The grammars do not afford us that full and exact information which we should desire upon so interesting a subject; but it would seem that in the time of Palsgrave the change from *eve* to *ice* was but half completed.

"*I*, in the frenche tong," says this author, "hath II dyverse maners of soundynges": (1.) "Like as the Italians sounde *i*, whiche is almost as we sound *e* in these wordes: 'a bee, a flie; a beere, for a deed corps; a peere, a felowe; a fee, a rewarde'; a litell more soundynge towardes *i*, as we sounde *i* with us." (2.) "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 wordes with us, 'by and by, a spye, a flye, awry,' and suche other, as in *ymage*, *converyt*, *ydole*, *estourdy*, in whiche the *y* hath suche sounde as we wolde gyve hym in our tonge."

"I reken *ui* also among the diphthonges in the frenche tong, whiche, whan they come to gether, shalle 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, *aguyser*, *aguyllon*, *conduyre*, *deduyre*, *aujourd'hui*, *meshuy*, and all suche lyke shall unde theyr *u* and *i* shortly together, as we do in our tong in the wordes I have gyven example of, and nat esche of them distinctly by hymselfe."²

The unmistakable drift of these citations is to the effect that '*ice*' was pronounced like *i* in '*wind*,' or perhaps '*end-in-eve*.' During the next half-century the pronunciation underwent a further change, as is evident from Mulcaster's '*remarks upon* '*wind*' and '*kind*' quoted below.

¹ Mr. J. Jennison in Hillard's Reader

² Palsgrave, pp. xviii, 6, and 16.

Some phonotypists in the time of Baret thought that *ei* should take the place of long *i*; but Gil says that *i* long differed slightly from *ei* (that is, probably, 'err-in'); and because *i* long had a sharper sound than this combination, he adopted into his system the character *j* as its representative.¹ Wallis regards 'ice' as compounded of French *e* feminine, that is, *e* in 'stranger,' and *i* short, pronounced like the Greek *ei*, and almost like *ai* in the French words 'main' and 'pain.'² This description may not appear strange when the process by which 'point' came to be pronounced 'pint' is explained. The analysis of 'ice' by Wallis may be thought to be that of numbers four or five in our table, but it is not to be asserted that this is or is not the case. It may be doubted whether Shakespeare pronounced this *so* like ourselves; but, until stronger evidence is produced than that of Gil and Wallis, we should hardly be justified in believing that its pronunciation has become essentially changed since 1600. Even at this day so excellent an orthoëpist as Smart is confident that 'ur-i' is the true analysis of *i* long. This resolution differs but little from that of Wallis.

'Mice,' 'lice,' and 'kinde' were pronounced as now; but Jonson informs us that the old sounds 'meece,' &c., were also allowable.³ The Palsgravian pronunciation of 'ice,' in words where the *i* is now sounded long, appears to have been confined, with Mulcaster, to a few words ending in *nd*. "Wind, frind, bind," he laconically remarks, "and with the qualifying *e*, kinde, finde, &c."⁴ So Coote, who, however, like Gil, preferred the longer pronunciation in all words of this class, not excepting 'wind.' "And some pronounce these words, blind, find, behind, short: others blinde, finde, behinde, with *e*, long."⁵

'Height' and 'sleight' were pronounced 'hate' and 'slate' by Mulcaster, but by Gil as they are now. 'Eye' was also sounded like *I* by Gil, who, however, refers to Mulcaster's pronunciation, which was nearly that of *a* long.

2. 'oil.' There were two different sounds of this diphthong

¹ Logonomia, pp. 7 and 16.

² Wallis, pp. 38 and 60.

³ Elementarie, p. 133.

⁴ B. Jonson, p. 301.

⁵ Coote, p. 19.

in Shakespeare's day; the present sound and that of 'oail.' This duplicity of sound is thus referred to by Mulcaster:—

"Thirdlie, *oi*, the diphthong sounding upon the *o*, for difference sake, from the other, which soundeth upon the *u*, wold be written with a *y*, as *joy*, *anoy*, *toy*, *boy*, whereas *anoint*, *appoint*, *foil*, and such seme to have an *u*. And yet when, *i*, goeth before the diphthong, tho it sound upon the *u*, it were better *oy*, then *oi*, as *joynt*, *joyn*, which theie shall soon perceive, when theie mark the spede of thei pen: likewise if *oi* with *i*, sound upon the *o*, it maie be noted for difference from the other sound, with the streight accent."¹

Mulcaster, therefore, in the system of orthography in which his work is written, the most marked characteristic of which is the employment of *e* in place of *ee*, places a straight or acute accent upon *oi*, or rather *oy*, sounded upon the *o* in this position. While treating of the proper diphthongs, Gil, in confirmation of Mulcaster, remarks: "Sometimes we indifferently foist *ū* in the place of *o* before *i*. For we say *toil* or *tūil*, *broil* or *brūil*, *soil* or *sūil*."²

During the thirty-four years which intervened between the publication of Gil's and Wallis's Grammars, the 'ooze' sound in 'oil' shortened into 'up'; and we are instructed by the latter author, that in *oi*, sometimes *o* short, as in 'boy,' and sometimes *o* or *u* obscure, as in 'oil' or 'ūyl,' 'toil' or 'tūyl,' is the first part of the combination.³ This pronunciation soon degenerated into that of *i* long, the almost universal orthoëpy for nearly a century. Even as late as 1784 Nares says: "The Englished diphthong seems at length to be upon its return; for there are many who are now hardy enough to pronounce *boil* exactly as they do *toil*, and *join* like *voil*."⁴

3. 'out.' The combination *ou*, is said by the old grammars to have had two sounds. One might, perhaps, be so hasty as to make the same remark now, though in fact it has seven,—'touch,' 'trough,' 'ought,' 'group,' 'should,' 'mould,' and 'thou.' The sounds it most frequently had are spoken of in the following quotations from Palsgrave and Mulcaster:—

"*Ou* in the frenche tong shalbe sounded lyke as the Italians sounde this vowel *u*, or they with us that sounde the latine tong aright, that is

¹ Elementarie, pp. 117, 118.

² Wallis, pp. 37, 63.

³ Logonomia, p. 15.

⁴ Elements of Orthoëpy, p. 74.

to say, almost as we sound hym in these words, 'a cove, a mowe, a sowe,' as *oultre, soundayn, oublier*: and so of suche other."¹

"O is a letter of as great uncertaintie in our tung, as e, is of direction both alone in vowel, and combined in diphthong. The cause is, for that in vowel it soundeth as much upon the *o*, which is his cosin, as upon the *ó*, which is his naturall, as in *cósen, hósen, móther*, which *o*, is still naturallie short, and, *hósen, frósen, móther*, which *o*, is naturallie long. In the diphthong it soundeth more upon the *u*, then upon the *o*, as in *found, wound, cow, sow, bow; how, now*, and *bów, sów, wróught, óught, mów, tróugh*."²

An acute accent placed upon the last six words indicates that they were sounded on the *o*. Sounding upon the *u* in all cases in Mulcaster means sounding *oo*, whether long or short. In another passage he says, "*Hoop, coop*. If custom had not won this, why not *ou*? *Houl, coul, skoul*. Why not as well with *oo*?"³ It would appear from these quotations, that in 1582 *ow* was pronounced like *oo*. There are several puns in Shakespeare, as that of 'fowl' and 'fool,' which depend upon this identity in sound.

Jonson copies Mulcaster; Gil says:—

"We place before the vowel, either *o* short as in *bound, sound, or*; or *ó* long, as in *blóun, thróun*. So a *bou bough* differs from a *bóu bowe*, and a *boul* from a *bóul bowle*."

That this language can only be construed as teaching a pronunciation different from that of Mulcaster is made still more evident by Gil's mode of spelling certain words regarded by Wallis as exceptions to the general sound of *ou*, as *yū* for *you*, *yūr* for *your*, *wūnd* for *wound*, *cūrt* for *court*, *cūld* for *could*, &c.

Wallis seems to contradict both Mulcaster and Gil; he says:—

"*Ou* and *ow* are pronounced with an obscure sound; to wit, a sound composed of *o* or *u* obscure and *w*. As *house, mouse*."

This is not an accurate description of the present sound, but what is intended must be left to others to determine.

4. 'use, ure.' The pronunciation of 'use' is described with some unanimity, as that of the French *u*, as indeed it may well

¹ Palsgrave, p. 15.

² Ibid., p. 136.

³ Elementarie, p. 115.

have been once; but that certainly was not its sound in Shakespeare's day, for Baret describes it in terms of more than ordinary clearness as being a diphthong compounded of *e* and *u*. Palsgrave mentions two sounds of *eu*, one occurring in "adewe, ashewe, afewe," the other in "trewe, glew, rewe, amewe." Most of the latter words afterwards changed their spelling. Gil has *eu* with short *e*, and *ēu* with long *e*. The latter occurs infrequently, as in *few, ewe, ewer, sewer*. The former *eu* differed from *u* in 'use,' apparently in beginning with the vowel 'end' instead of the consonant *y*. Wallis says:—

"*Eu, ew, eau* are sounded by *e* clear and *w*. As in *newer, few, beauty*. Still some pronounce them a little more sharply, as if written *niewter, flew, bieuty*, or *niwty, fiw, biwty*, especially in the words *new, knew, snew*. But the first pronunciation is more correct."¹

The old pronunciation of the terminations 'rue' and 'ure' in unaccented syllables has been mooted by verbal critics. Gil is not uniform. He spells 'scripture' and 'venture' respectively 'scriptur' and 'venter,' but to 'creature,' 'measure,' 'nature,' and 'treasure' he assigns their present sound, representing their *u* by *v*, the character in his alphabet which stands for *u* in 'use.' Mulcaster, on the other hand, classes 'future' with such words as 'writer' and spells it 'futer.' He also writes 'conjectur,' 'conjur,' 'creatur,' 'figur,' 'measur,' 'misconster,' 'natur,' 'nurtur,' 'pastur,' 'pictur,' 'scriptur,' 'statur,' 'treasur,' and 'ventur.' With this catalogue, flattering to Yankee lips, we end our account of the olden orthoëpy.

¹ Wallis, p. 63.