Review

Author(s): Allen Mawer

Review by: Allen Mawer

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Jan., 1918), pp. 109-111

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3714316>

Accessed: 18-11-2015 22:48 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

wise general principles of policy and of their corollaries in action. Wordsworth bases his argument on the right of an organized national state to genuine independence. He claims it as a necessity for the healthy development of the race. He hopes for the union of conscious nations then in fragments, Germany and Italy, and maintains that by their union a stable balance of power, the object of statesmen then and now, may be attained. But he recognizes the difficulties then extant in Spain, and the dangers in his own ideal for Europe. Unreal or rose-coloured pleas, here as elsewhere, he disregards; he painfully, too painfully, grapples his argument to undeniable facts. For all his fervour he is a temperate and wary crusader. A nation needs internal freedom to obtain the main value of its independence, he says in effect, but national independence is indispensable to the existence of civil liberty. So, too, with the example of France before him, he dreads the irresistible power of one nation, even his own, and urges the voluntary equal union of the smaller states. Thus a stable balance of power may be maintained.

It is not surprising that the great *Tract* has never been a popular work. Its fire is not a light-giving flame, but a white-hot glow. This is not merely an effect of long-winded sentences. The principles on which the thesis is founded emerge slowly and partially late in the argument. They receive their completion in a subsequent *Vindication*, which was not published till 1876. This is, so to say, true to life, but, in consequence, we struggle through corollaries before we reach the proposition. Some obscurity and clumsiness were all the more natural owing to the originality of the *Tract*. Wordsworth seems to have had no English precursors in his conception of Nationalism. Mr Dicey is at pains to show that Mazzini belonged to a later generation and was uninfluenced by his English predecessor. It is possible, however, that Wordsworth received some clue from Mazzini's forerunner Alfieri. Wordsworth may well have read and admired some works of Alfieri during his stay in France or even later, and more especially the *Del Principe e delle Lettere* published in 1789 where the ideal of the union and freedom of Italy finds its first expression in modern times. It is not easy to say what Wordsworth did or did not read during his residence in France, but fresh light might be obtained could we recover the original text of the *Prelude* as it left the poet's hands in the years 1799–1805.

C. W. PREVITÉ-ORTON.

CAMBRIDGE.

Pronunciation of English Vowels, 1400—1700. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. (Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-samhälles Handlingar. Fjärde Följden. xiv:2). Göteborg. 1913. xiv + 232 pp.

The centre of interest in English linguistic studies both at home and abroad has, during the last twenty years, shifted from Old English to Middle English and now the best work both in Germany and in Scandinavia is being done on the later period of Middle English and,

more especially, on the transition from Middle to Modern English. The names chiefly associated with these developments are those of Jespersen, Luick and Horn. Now there must be added the name of R. E. Zachrisson who by the book at present under review has shown himself worthy of holding a position side by side with these distinguished scholars. Dr Zachrisson's name is already familiar to a small number of students from his place-name studies. His present book should make a much wider appeal.

The main problem at issue is 'which were the N. E. correspondents to the M. E. vowels during the period 1400—1700, and when did the so-called Continental pronunciation of the English vowels cease to exist?' Dr Zachrisson first examines the 'Orthographical' evidence, to be found in letters of the fifteenth century, more especially in the Paston Letters and the Cely Papers. Here he is careful to reject all tainted or uncertain evidence, e.g. possible dialect forms, and ultimately arrives at certain conclusions the most important of which are that already by 1500 *ā* was pronounced as (æ·) or (ɛ·), *ai*, *ei* as (æⁱ) or (ɛⁱ) perhaps even (æ·) or (ɛ·), *ē* as (i·), *ē* as (ɛ·) or (e·), *ī* as (ei), *ō* as (u·), *ū* as (əu) or (au), *u* sometimes as *Λ*.

Next he deals with the 'Orthoepistical' evidence, first of English and French Grammars written by Frenchmen, then of French Grammars written by Englishmen. Here Zachrisson prints in full much evidence from books hitherto unknown or ones which have not received their proper meed of consideration, while his thorough knowledge of historical French phonology stands him in good stead. From this evidence he confirms the conclusions formed on the orthographical evidence, namely that as early as the 16th century 'all the great changes characteristic of the English pronunciation as opposed to the Continental had then commenced.' The evidence of English Grammars by Englishmen has already received a good deal of attention from Jespersen and others, but Zachrisson subjects it all to a fresh and careful study in the light of the evidence already adduced in the earlier part of the volume. Here more clearly than any previous writer he shows how important it is to find out the real pronunciation behind the one that was considered to be correct. He quotes an interesting passage in illustration from Miège's *English Grammar* (1691) which distinguishes four sorts of pronunciation, viz. national, provincial, grave and familiar. 'The grave is properly used in grave and serious Discourses, and comes nearest the regular Way of Spelling.' Unluckily most of the grammarians like many 'teachers of elocution' were grave and serious men and their pronunciations are often pedantic and unnatural. At times acute analysis alone will reveal the natural or familiar pronunciation of a word, generally when the grammarian fails to be consistent with himself. Further there is the trouble that the grammarians were not trained phoneticians, being often quite unable to distinguish between diphthongs and digraphs (not 'diagraphs' as Dr Zachrisson so unfortunately writes it) or between sounds and symbols. Fortunately the other kinds of evidence are not tainted quite to the same degree. Many people were still quite ready,

at least in private correspondence, to spell as they spoke, while the foreign language teachers were eager to get their pupils forward and so made rapid, if rather rough and ready, comparisons of the sounds of the two languages. Finally the author concludes that:

(1) The sound-changes to which our Present Standard pronunciation owes its characteristic features had commenced to operate as early as the 15th century.

(2) The pronunciation of Elizabethan English must have borne a strong resemblance to that of to-day.

(3) The present pronunciation was established towards the end of the 17th century.

(4) The theories (of Luick and others) as to two-fold developments of M. E. sounds in N. E. are largely untenable.

Dr Zachrisson must be congratulated on the excellence of his English, and his printers on the rarity of the misprints in a work crowded with detail of every kind. So far as it has proved possible to the reviewer under stress of present circumstances to examine the evidence adduced, only very rarely does the author make any mistake. On p. 80 *sonds* in *sonds of Dover* (Paston Letter 93) is clearly for *sands* and not for *sounds*. On p. 82 there is no need to query Richard Cely's *auffer* = offer, for that is certainly the word.

The book marks a real and definite advance in the study of the development of Standard English and it is to be hoped that Dr Zachrisson will continue to work on lines which have already proved so fruitful in his hands.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Notice du Manuscrit Français 12483 de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Par M. ARTHUR LÂNGFORS. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1916. 167 pp.

In this publication (printed as a separate volume from *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits, etc., Tome xxxix, 2^e partie*), M. Långfors has given us in an accessible form a detailed analysis of a manuscript which has been frequently described and the greater part of which has already been published¹. The manuscript is a notable one. It forms, as M. Paul Meyer has said, 'une espèce de poème moral' in honour of the Virgin Mary, and its component parts furnish an extraordinary variety and wealth of material for a collection of this kind. The author, or rather the compiler, was a man of extensive reading and the analysis of M. Långfors enables us to pass in review the numerous sources which he has laid under contribution in the course of his work and also to detect the hand of the author when he ceases to quote from others and contributes something of his own. The composition of the manuscript has been described more than once (cf. Raynaud, Naetebus, etc.); it consists

¹ See Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil de contes, dits et fabliaux* t. II, p. 413 f.; Raynaud, *Romania* xiv, 442 f.; Naetebus, *Die nicht-lyrischen Strophenformen*, Einl. p. vi.