

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LONG *U* IN ACCENTED SYLLABLES IN MODERN ENGLISH.

That the quality of long *u* in modern English is different from the quality of long *u* in A.-S. times is doubtless well known to all who have interested themselves in English philology. Equally well known is the fact that this vowel cannot be traced back to Anglo-Saxon. Its origin is not English: it is French.

The A. S. long *u*, or more strictly speaking the W. S. *ū*, which was probably a high-back-narrow-round vowel, was preserved in M. E., and about the middle of the fifteenth century developed into the diphthong *ou*, as in the words *cow*, *thou*, *house*, *mouse*, *loud*, *how*, *brow*, etc. This diphthongic sound has persisted, with but slight change, down to the present century. The writing varies between *ou* and *ow*, the latter being restricted, for the most part, to the final position, while the former spelling prevails initially and medially. In such words as *rust*, *dust*, *udder*, *Suffolk*, *Sussex*, etc., where the original A. S. *ū* was shortened through the influence of following consonants the simple *u* is preserved. In some words, such as *brook* (A. S. *brūcan*) *room* (A. S. *rūm*), the spelling is of course *oo*, and the sound is that of a short mid-back-narrow vowel. In cases where the A. S. *ū* was followed by *h*, as in A. S. *rūh*, *rough*, *slough*, etc., the vocalic sound is the same, though the symbol *ou* is employed to represent it. In *stoop* (A. S. *stūpian*) as well as in *uncouth* (A. S. *uncūth*), the original A. S. high-back-narrow-round vowel is preserved, but with a change in spelling. In such words as *our* (A. S. *ūr*),

bower (A. S. *būr*), *shower* (A. S. *scūr*), the vowel in question has not only developed into the regular diphthong, heard in *cow*, *how*, etc., but, through the influence of the following *r*, there has developed along with the diphthong an indistinct vocalic glide.

The normal development of the A. S. *ū*, as noted above, is the diphthong, the first element of which is a low-mixed-wide vowel, and the second a mid-mixed-wide-round vowel, such as is heard in the words *thou*, *owl*, *fowl*, *south*, *bow*, *loud*, *shroud*, *cloud*, etc. The writing of course is *ow* and *ou*.

In order, therefore, to investigate the origin of the so-called long *u* in modern English, we must go to an entirely different source. For the original A. S. long *u*, as we have just stated, did not persist down to modern English, but developed into other sounds.

The chief sources of long *u* in modern English are as follows:

1. Certain A. S. diphthongs.
2. Certain French *u*'s, which were introduced into English chiefly from the Anglo-Norman dialect.
3. Late M. E. close *ō*, which in the seventeenth century developed into long *u*. (But since I have discussed the development of this last vowel elsewhere, I will not repeat it here.

Now, as to the first source, the original A. S. diphthongs which gave rise to long *u* in early modern English. In M. E., as is well known, there were two distinct *eu*-diphthongs, the one an open *ēu*, the other a close *eu*. In the seventeenth century these were both leveled under a common diphthong *iu*, after the passage of the open *ē* into close *ē*, and the subsequent development of this close *ē* into *i*. The source of one of these two M. E. diphthongs is the A. S. *eo* followed by *g* or *w*, which combination developed into the M. E. close *ēu*, as in M. E. *nēwe* (A. S. *nēowe*), *trēw* (A. S. *trēow*), *brēwe* (A. S. *brēowan*), and the preterites *knēw* (A. S. *cnēow*), *blēw* (A. S. *blēow*), *crēw*, *flēw*, *grēw*, *thrēw*, etc.

The source of the other diphthong is the A. S. *ēaw*, which developed into the M. E. open *ēu*-diphthong, as in M. E. *fēwe*

(A. S. *fēawe*), *shēwe* (A. S. *scēawian*), *shrēwe* (A. S. *scrēawa*), *glēw*, *sēw*, *hēw*, *strēw*, *dēw*, etc.

In regard to the second source of long *u* in modern English, it is well known that there was introduced into M. E. from the French, particularly the Norman dialect, a certain *u*-sound, as in the words *mue* (*mew*), *due*, *rue*, *virtue*, *value*, *statue*, *rude*, *use*, *refuse*, *cure*, *pure*, *nature*, *verdure*, *muse*, *accuse*, *excuse*, *censure*, etc.

Now, although all these examples are from the French, they are not to be confused, as if the *ū*-sound common to them were all the same or sprang from the same source. We must classify and examine more closely into the nature of this imported vowel.

Ten Brink in his *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, in the chapter on Romanische Vocale, has shown that a distinction must be made between *u* and *ū*, both imported into M. E. from the French. In this chapter he shows that the *ū* corresponds to the old French closed *o* (*ô*), Anglo Norman *u*, (< Latin *ō* and *ū*, *au* and *ø*), and that this sound is represented in Chaucer by the writing *ou* and *ow*, as in *avow*, *prow*, *houre*, *doute*, *resoun*, *colour*, *honour*, etc. This early M. E. *ū* was identified with the M. E. *ū* from A. S. *ū*, and sharing the fortune of this latter long *ū* of A. S. origin, it subsequently developed into the late M. E. diphthong *ou*. Thus this early M. E. long *u* from the French passed out of the category of the *ū*-sound altogether, and is, therefore, more properly discussed under the head of long *o* and its allied diphthongs. We shall, therefore, not pursue further the history of this particular sound here, as it does not properly fall within the scope of the present paper.

The other M. E. *ü* from the French is a far more common vowel. Ten Brink, in the passage cited above, shows that this M. E. *ü* has at least three distinct sources and corresponds to the following O. Fr. sounds:

1. O. Fr. *ü* (Lat. *ū*, occasionally *ü*), as in M. E. *vertue*, *muwe*, *crude*, *fortune*, *cure*, *nature*, *duc*, *pur*, *rude*, *excuse*, etc.
2. O. Fr. *iu*, *iv*, as in M. E. *eschu*, *sewe*, etc. And here he remarks that the spelling, as well as the origin of

eschuw, *sew* seem to indicate that the M. E. \bar{u} was not far removed in quality from a modified \bar{o} , or the Alsatian pronunciation of the German \bar{u} , or the French *ou*.

3. O. Fr. *ui* = *üi*, as in M. E. *suit*, *bruit*, *fruit*, etc.

Now, Chaucer in his rimes kept these two *u*-sounds (\bar{u} and *ü*) distinct and apart, and rarely confused them. This fact is of itself presumptive evidence that the two sounds in question, far from being identical, were of an entirely different quality. The French \bar{u} (Lat. \bar{o} and \bar{u}), represented graphically by *ou* and *ow*, Chaucer rimes with the *ou* from A. S. \bar{u} . But the Fr. *ü* he does not rime with this English sound.

Behrens, in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Französischen Sprache in England*, p. 118, has shown that the M. E. authors in the Southern and West Midland dialects rarely make the *ü* (Fr. *ü*) rime with *o* or *ou*; but almost without exception make it rime with itself. For example, we find here Wm. de Shoreham and Dan Michel riming *mesure* : *sure* : *endure* : *pure* : *figure* : *cure* : *nature* etc. But in the Northern dialect and in the East-Midland this distinction is not strictly observed; and consequently we find here the Fr. *ü* and the Eng. \bar{u} and the Fr. \bar{u} (< Lat. \bar{o} and \bar{u}), occasionally all riming together indifferently.

It is interesting to note in passing that the Fr. \bar{u} (< Lat. \bar{o} and \bar{u}) is generally represented by *ou* and *ow*, whereas the Fr. *ü* (< Lat. \bar{u} and \bar{u}) is usually written \bar{u} simply, sometimes *ui* and *uy*, as in *puire*, *duyk*, *enduir*, *suir*, etc.

In connection with the introduction of this Norman Fr. *ü* into M. E., an important question suggests itself, viz., What was the phonetic character of this vowel when introduced into English? We have seen that in the South at least, it seems to have been clearly distinguished both from the other Fr. \bar{u} as well as from the native English \bar{u} . It must, therefore, have been more of the quality of the modern French representative of this sound.

Payne, in his article on the *Norman Element in the Spoken and Written English of the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries* (*Trans. of the Philological Soc.*, 1868—9.), says: "There appears no place for the modern French *u* in Norman and, therefore, not in English of the 13th and 14th centuries." "There

is every reason to believe that *nature* in Chaucer was (*naetuur*) and generally that *u* long was (*uu*).” That is to say, there was but one \bar{u} -sound in Chaucer, and that was a high-back-narrow-round vowel, such as the A. S. \bar{u} . This view is of course quite untenable and does not quadrate with the facts in the case.

Now, as to the quality of this M. E. \bar{u} -sound introduced from the Fr. Was it a high-back-narrow-round vowel, like the A. S. \bar{u} and the Latin \bar{u} , or was it a high-front-narrow-round vowel, like the modern French \bar{u} ? As Fick has observed (cfr. his dissertation, *Gedicht von der Perle*, p. 30), this sound cannot have been the former, that is, a high-back-narrow-round vowel, since it was not combined in rime by the M. E. poets with the original A. S. \bar{u} , which was of this quality. Moreover, if it had been of this value, it would have shared the subsequent development of the M. E. representative of the A. S. \bar{u} , just as the other Fr. \bar{u} has done, as in *hour*, *doubt*, *avow*, etc. On the other hand, it cannot well have been of the same quality as the modern Fr. \bar{u} , viz., a high-front-narrow-round vowel. In that event, it would probably have been unrounded and then have developed into long \bar{i} , like the M. E. *fire*; and if the \bar{u} in question had followed that line of development, it is probable that we should have in modern English “*pire*”, “*dike*”, “*sire*”, “*ride*”, “*cride*”, “*nature*”, etc., instead of *pure*, *duke*, *sure*, *rude*, *crude*, *nature*, etc. This, however, is not absolutely known, for some preventing cause might have arrested the normal development. Fick’s theory, therefore, may be true that the M. E. value of this imported Fr. \bar{u} was an intermediate sound to the A. S. \bar{u} and the modern Fr. \bar{u} ; that is to say, it was closely allied to a high-mixed-narrow-round vowel. The following fact tends to corroborate this view. In the Northern dialect, as I have shown elsewhere (see my ‘*o-Vowel in English*’, p. 52), M. E. close \bar{o} became \bar{u} . Now, this M. E. \bar{u} in the North rimes with the Fr. \bar{u} . Since then the A. S. close \bar{o} became in standard English a high-back vowel and in the northern English or Scotch a mid-front vowel, this same vowel must at one time have passed through a common stage, viz., that of a mid-mixed-round position. Inasmuch as in the North this M. E. close \bar{o} rimes with the French \bar{u} in question, the latter may in all probability

have been a mid-mixed vowel. It seems almost impossible to determine accurately the exact phonetic value of this sound.

Whether this Fr. *ü* developed in M. E. into a diphthong *iu* with the stress on the second element, as some think, is not so clear. It is hardly necessary to have recourse to this theory to explain the few sporadic occurrences of the sound riming with the M. E. *ū* from other sources, such as *dute* : *abute*, *aventure* : *bure* (King Horn, p. 10). Behrens, who dissents from this view, pertinently remarks that if that were the case, then the writing *iu* and *eu* would be of frequent occurrence. As a matter of fact this spelling is very rare.

The case seems to me to be this. The distinction between *ü* and *ū* in M. E. texts is closely observed, especially in the Southern and West-midland dialects. But exceptions do occasionally occur. In the Northern dialect this distinction was by no means closely observed, since there was a tendency to level out both these *ū*-sounds under the common M. E. representative in that dialect of the A. S. *ū*. A parallel case to this tendency to confuse Fr. *ü* (< Lat. *ū* & *ũ*) and Fr. *ū* (< L. *ō* & *ũ*) is furnished by the history of the M. E. *ō* vowel in the South. It is of course a well established fact that open and close *ō* were carefully differentiated in M. E. texts, and that no author was more careful in the observance of this distinction than Chaucer. Yet even in Chaucer there exists a slight tendency to confusion of these sounds, as I have elsewhere shown (see *Englische Studien*, XX, p. 341). So it seems a warranted assumption that while the M. E. texts, especially in the Southern and West-midland dialects, generally discriminate between *ü* and *ū*, there was yet a slight tendency to confuse these sounds.

Nothing conclusive can be deduced from the spelling. The usual writing for the Fr. *ü* is *u* simply. But occasionally we find *ui* and *uy*, as in *puire* for pure, *duyk*, *dispuite*, *swir*, *enduir*, in which cases the glide occurs after and not before the *ū*. It is, to be sure, possible that this writing may be interpreted as lending color to the diphthongal theory, and that the writing is in the nature of an attempt to represent graphically this diphthong. But it seems also possible to regard this writing simply as an occasional attempt to represent phonetically the sound in question the *i* or *y* being a slight glide

that was developed in the pronunciation of some. Since, however, the glide, if it means anything, must certainly be regarded as indicating an incipient diphthongal pronunciation, we seem warranted in interpreting this phenomenon as showing that, sporadically at least, long *ū* tended to become diphthonged in late M. E.

In regard to the third class of M. E. long *u* from the French source, viz., O. Fr. *ūi* (< Lat. *u, i*), as in *suit, fruit*, etc., it may be remarked that this class needs no special discussion, since the original diphthong became a monophthong and shared the fate of the Fr. *ū*. It is occasionally written *u* simply, as in *frute, sute*, even in Chaucer, though the prevailing writing is *ui*.

To return to the first principal source of M. E. long *u*, viz., certain original diphthongs. The writing of the M. E. open *ēu*-diphthong, as is well known, is *ew*, as in *few, lewd*, etc. Of the M. E. close *eu*-diphthong the writing is likewise *ew*, as in *new, knew*; but it is also *ue* and *u*, as in *chue, true, truth, clue, brue, grue*, etc. It is worthy of note that this latter writing recurs repeatedly in late M. E. and early modern English in certain words, such as *slue, drue*, where subsequently *ew* became stereotyped as the conventional spelling. On the other hand, we occasionally find such a word as *true* written *trewe* during this period. All of which indicates a tendency to confusion, in early modern English, of close *ew* and *ū*. Sweet thinks this confusion is the result of the late M. E. change of final Fr. *ū* into *eu*, the confusion between the traditional spelling *vertue* and the phonetic *vertew* leading to a similar fluctuation between *trewe* and *true*, and that the spelling *true* prevailed. Chaucer, for example, sometimes writes *crewel, vertew* instead of *cruel, vertue*; and even the Fr. *ū* he sometimes writes *ue* and *ew*, as *eschue, eschew*.

An early modern English document which throws some light on the problem before us is the Welsh transcription of the Hymn to the Virgin. In this text close *ew* is transcribed *uw*, as in "*truwth*", "*Dsiuws*" for *truth, Jews*. So likewise the Fr. *ū* is transcribed *uw*, as in "*uws*", "*fruwt*" for *use, fruit*.

Salesbury, one of the earliest orthographists, writing in 1547, says: "The *u* vowels answers to the power of the two Welsh letters *u, w*, and its usual power is *uw*, as shewn in

the following words, true *truw* verus, vertue *vertuow* probitas. And sometimes they give it its own proper sound and pronounce it like the Latin or like our own *w* (*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 busy *busi*, occupatus aut se immiscens.

He says further in his pronunciation of Welsh: "*u* written after this manner *u*", that is, not as *v*, which, as Ellis adds, was at that time interchangeable with *u* in English and French, but not in Welsh, "is a vowel and soundeth as the vulgar English *trust*, *bury*, *busy*, *Huberden*. But know well that it is never sounded in Welsh, as it is done in any of these two Englyshe wordes (notwithstanding the diversity of their sound) *sure*, *lucke*. Also the sound of *u* in French, or *ü* with two pricks over the head in Duch, or the Scottish pronunciation of *u* alludeth somewhat near unto the sound of it in Welshe, though yet none of them all, doeth so exactly (as I think) expresse it, as the Hebraick Kubuts doeth. For the Welsh *u* is none other thing, but a meane sounde betwyxte *u* and *y* being Latin vowels."

It appears, therefore, from the above that *u* was in early modern English a diphthong at least in the pronunciation of some, since the Welsh *uw* which is used to transcribe it must have been a diphthong. For, as Sweet well observes, if the *u* in *duke* had been a pure monophthong still, it would have been transcribed in the Hymn to the Virgin and by Salesbury *duk* simply, just like *busi*. And, further, since *true* was transcribed *truw*, we infer that it, too, must have contained a diphthong. It is not, however, quite clear what the character of this diphthong was. Whether the transcriptions employed represent it accurately or only approximately is questionable. The English equivalent of the Welsh *u*, according to Ellis, is a high-front-narrow-round vowel, which he transcribes in his paleotype *y*. He says in this connection: "If then Salesbury had to represent the sound (*yy*), that is, the vocalic sound in the Fr. *flûte* or the Ger. *gemüth* he could not have selected any more suggestive Welsh combination than *uw*. To have written *uu* would have been to give too much of the (*i*) or (*é*) character, for when *u* was short, he did not distinguish from (*i*),

as shewn by *busy*, which he writes *busi*, meaning (*bizi*). If he had written *uw*, he would have conveyed a completely false notion, and *iw* would have led to the diphthong (*iu*) which he wished to distinguish from *uw*."

If, then, the diphthong was accurately described, it appears that in the first modern English period the M. E. close diphthong *eu* and *u* had both become identical, having developed into a diphthong, the first element of which was a high-front-narrow-round vowel and the second a high-back-narrow-round vowel. Ellis, however, does not accept this view, but maintains that long *u* in the first modern period was still a monophthong. The following is his conclusion (E. E. P., p. 171): "At any rate it is clear that quite to the close of the 16th century, (*yy*) was the universal pronunciation of long *u* in the best circles of English life, and that it remained into the 17th century we shall shortly have further evidence."

Sweet, on the other hand, thinks that the long *u* had been diphthonged already during the early modern period, and that this diphthong was the one described above. He offers the following explanation of the change, which seems quite probable (H. E. S., p. 862): "close *eu* became (*iiu*) by the regular change of close *e* into (*ii*), and the (*ii*) was rounded by the following *u*, the resulting (*yyu*) or (*yu*) afterwards supplanting the non-final as well as the final *ü*."

Since then the authorities differ in regard to this point, one holding to the view of the diphthongic, the other to that of the monophthongic character of long *u* in the first modern English period, let us review the evidence and examine for ourselves the testimony furnished by the contemporary phoneticians, in order to arrive at an independent judgment.

Turning now to the phoneticians of that period, we find Palsgrave, who wrote under date of 1530, saying: "U in the frenche tong, wheresoever he is a vowel by hymselfe, shall be sownded like as we sownde *ew* in these words in our tong, *rewe* an herb, a *mew* for a hauke, a *clew* of threde, and such lyke resting upon the pronousyng of hym: as for these wordes *plus*, *nul*, *fus*, *user*, *humble*, *vertu*, they sound *plevus*, *nevul*, *fevus*, *evuser*, *hevumble*, *vertevu*, and so in all other wordes, where *u* is a vowel by hymselfe alone; so that in the soundyng of this vowel, they differe both from the Latin

tong and from us." Again in his discussion of *eu* he says: "*Eu* in the frenche tong hath two dyverse soundynges, for sometye they sound hym lyke as we do in our tonge, in these wordes a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe, and sometye like as we do in these wordes, *trewe*, *glewe*, *rewe*, a *mewe*. The soundyng of *eu*, whiche is most general in the frenche tong, is such as I have showed by example in these wordes, a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe, that is to saye, lyke as the Italians sounde *eu*, or they with us, that pronounce the latine tonge aryght, as *cvreux*, *ireux*, *lieu*, *dieu*."

It appears from the above that Palsgrave did not recognize the diphthongal quality of long *u*.

Salesbury, who wrote under date of 1547, seems to indicate by his Welsh transcriptions (using *uw*, as we have noted above, to represent long *u*) that long *u* was, at least according to his ear und judgment, a diphthong. Else why should he have employed two different Welsh characters to represent this sound?

Cheke, writing in 1555, leaves no doubt as to his interpretation of the sound in question as a pure monophthong. He says: "Cum *duke*, *tuke*, *lute*, *rebuke*, *δυκ*, *τυκ*, *λυτ*, *ρεβυκ* dicimus, Graecum *υ* sonaremus." And of the Greek *υ* he says: "simplex est, nihil admixtum, nihil adjunctum habet."

Smith in 1568 says pedantically: "Y vel *υ* Graecum aut Gallicum, quod per se apud nos taxum arborem significat, taxus *υ*", meaning, says Ellis that yew-sound of Greek *υ*; that is, as he immediately proceeds to shew, and as I shall assume in transcribing his characters, yew = (yy). The following are his examples: "(snyy) ningeat, (slyy) occidit, (tryy) verum, (tyyn) tonus, (kyy) q. littera, (ryy) ruta, (myy) cavea in qua tenentur accipitres, (nyy) novum, (tyyli) valetudinarium, (dyyk) dux, (myyl) mula, (flyyt) tibia Germanorum, (dyy) debitum, (luut) testudo, (bryy) cervisia facere, (myylet) mulus, (blyy) caeruleum, (akkyyz) accusare". Again, he says: "Quod genus pronuntiationis nos à Gallis accepisse arguit, quod rarius quidem nos Angli in pronuntiando hac utimur litera. Scoti autem qui Gallica lingua suam veterem quasi obliterarant, et qui trans Trentam fluvium habitant, vicinioresque sunt Scotis, frequentissimè, adeo ut quod nos per *V* Romanum sonamus (*u*), illi libenter proferunt per *υ* Graecum

aut Gallicum (yy); nam et hic sonus tam Gallis est peculiaris, ut omnia fere Romane scripta per *u* et *v* proferunt, ut pro Dominus (Dominyys) et Iesus (Jesyys), intantum ut quae brevia sint natura, ut illud macrum *v* exprimant melius, sua pronuntiatione longa faciunt. Hunc sonum Anglosaxones, de quibus postea mentionem faciemus, per *y* exprimebant, ut verus Anglosaxonice *try*. Angli (huur) meretrix, (kuuk) coquus, (guud) bonum, (bluud) sanguis, (huud) cucullus, (fluud) fluvius, (buuk) liber, (tuuk) cepit; Scoti (hyyr, kyyk, gyyd, blyyd, hyyd, flyyd, byyk, tyyk)". And again "O rotundo ore et robustius quam priores effertur, *u* angustiore, caetera similis *τφ* *o*. Sed *v* (yy) compressis propemodum labris, multo exilius teniusque resonat quam *o* aut *u*, (boot) scapha, (buut) ocrea, (byyt) Scotia pronuntiatione, ocrea" "*v* Graecum Scoti & Borei Angli tum exprimunt cum taurum sonant, & pro *bul*, dicunt exiliter contractionibus labiis sono suppresso & quasi praefocato inter *i* & *u* *bul* (byl)."

Smith, it is evident, recognized no diphthong in long *u* in his time.

Hart writing in 1569, about the same time as Smith, says explicitly that long *u* was a diphthong; and he wrote it *iu*. But since he also calls the French *ū* a diphthongh, with which he identifies his English *iu*, we are inclined to discredit his testimony. By diphthong, as Sweet and Ellis suggest, he probably means only compound. He says: "Now to come to *u*. I sayde the French, Spanish, and Brutes [Welsh], I may adde the Scottish, doe abuse it with us in sounde and for consonant, except the Brutes as is sayd: the French doe never sound it right, but usurpe ou, for it, the Spanyard doth often use it right as we doe, but often also abuse it with us; the French and the Scottish in the sounde of a Diphthong: which keeping the vowels in their due sounds, commeth of *i* and *u*, (or verie neare it) is made and put together under one breath, confounding the soundes of *i*, and *u*, together: which you may perceyve in shaping thereof, if you take away the inner part of the tongue, from the upper teeth or Gummes, then shall you sound the *u* right, or in sounding the French and Scottish *u*, holding still your tongue to the upper teeth or gums, and opening your lippes somewhat, you shall perceyve the right sounde of *i*."

Baret also in 1573 seems to speak for the diphthongal quality of long *u* though his meaning is not entirely clear. He says: "And as for the sound of V consonant [he doubtles means vowel] whether it is to be sounded more sharply as in spelling *blue* or more grosly like *oo*, as we sounde *Booke*, it were long here to discusse. Some therefore think that this sharpe Scottish V is rather a diphthong than a vowell, being compounded of our English *e* and *u*, as indeed we may partly perceyve in pronouncing it, our tounge at the beginning lying flat in our mouth, and at the end rising up with the lips also therewithall somewhat more drawen together."

Now, here the diphthongal quality of long *u* is clearly attested. But the exact character of this sound is not distinctly expressed. What does Baret mean by his description of 'the tongue as lying flat in our mouth' at the beginning of the pronunciation of long *u*? Perhaps Ellis's interpretation of these words is the most satisfactory, viz., that Baret was thinking of the neutral position of the tongue before beginning to utter any sound. But whatever the interpretation, it is evident from the above that this phonetician heard the diphthongic pronunciation of long *u* in the mouths of some of his contemporaries.

Bullokar (1580), on the other hand, recognized in this vowel only a pure monophthong, and this was (*yy*). He says: "U also hath three soundes: The one of them a meere consonant, the other two soundes, are both vowels: the one of these vowels hath a sharpe sound, agreeing to his old and continued name: the other is of flat sound, agreeing to the olde and continued sound of the diphthong: *ou*: but alwayes of short sounde. . . . And for our three sounds used in, *u*, 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, *u*." He adds further: "U. sharpe, agreeing to the sound of his olde and continued name, is so sounded when it is a syllable by itself, or when it is the last letter in a syllable, or when it commeth before one consonant, and: *e*: ending next after the consonant, in one syllable thus: *unity*, universally procureth use to be occupied, and leisure allureth the unruly to the lute: which I write thus: (*yyniti yyniversaulli prokyyreth yys tuu bii okkyypied and leizyyr*

allyyreth the unryyli tuu dhe lyyt)." The transcription is that of Ellis.

Erondell in 1605 seems to indicate by his pronunciation a diphthongal sound for long *u*, though he is not so distinct as might be desired. His pronunciation too is not the conventional *iu*, which, as Sweet observes, he would have expressed by (*iu*). Perhaps it was (*yu*). He says: "*u* is sounded without any help of the tongue but joyning of the lips as if you would whistle, say *u*, which *u*, maketh a sillable by it-selfe, as *unir*, *uniquement*, as if it were written *u-neer*, pronounce then *musique*, *punir*, *subvenir*, not after the English pronunciation, not as if it were written *muesique*, *puenir*, *suevenir*, but rather as the *u* in this word, *murtherer*, not making the *u* too long."

Holabrand in 1609 offers evidence that is corroborative of Erondell's and unquestionably points to the diphthongic pronunciation of long *u* as (*iu*). He describes it as follows: "Where you must take paine to pronounce our *v*, otherwise then in English: for we do thinke that when Englishmen do profer, *v*, they say, *you*: and for, *q*, we suppose they say, *kiou*: but we sound, *v*, without any helpe of the tongue, joyning the lips as if you would whistle; and after the manner that the Scots do sound *Gud*."

Cotgrave in 1611 simply says: "*V* is sounded as if you whistle it out, as in the word *a lute*."

Gill, writing in 1621, indicates only the monophthongic character of long *u*, remarking briefly: "*V est tenuis, aut crassa: tenuis u, est in Verbo tu vz vse utor; crassa brevis est u. ut in pronomine us nos; aut longa ü: ut in verbo tu üz oose scaturio, aut sensum exeo mori aquae vi expressae.*"

The next and last phonetician whose evidence we shall cite to establish the pronunciation of long *u* in the 16th century is Butler, who, though he wrote in 1633, yet probably acquired his pronunciation in the last quarter of the the 16th century. He seems to support the diphthongic quality of long *u*, but it must be confessed his meaning is far from clear. He says: "*I* and *u* short have a manifest difference from the same long; as in *ride rid*, *rude rud*, *dine din*, *dune dun*, *tine 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 *w* have the

very sound of *u* long: as in *hiw*, *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 why are some of these written with the diphthong *ew*? whose sound is manifestly different, as in *dew*, *ewe*, *few*, *hew*, *chew*, *rew*, *sew*, *strew*, *shew*, *shrew*, *pewter*."

As Sweet has noted, we learn here incidentally that open *ew* in *dew*, in Butler's pronunciation was distinct from close *ew* and long *u*.

Now to sum up. It will be observed that the bulk of the evidence tends to establish the proposition that long *u*, during the 16th century, was a monophthong, viz., a high-front-narrow-round vowel. But it is a significant fact that the evidence of some of the contemporary phoneticians is in favor of the diphthongal pronunciation of long *u* during this period. Since there was developed even in late M. E. a tendency of long *u* toward diphthongization, it is but reasonable to infer that this nascent change still continued in the first modern English period, and was gradually extending and perfecting itself. It is well established that this process was completed in the following century. In view of this fact we seem warranted in the inference that the prevailing pronunciation of long *u* during the 16th century was monophthongic, but in the mouths of some there was a growing tendency toward the diphthongization of this vowel a process which was completed in the following century.

Having then shown that long *u* during the first modern English period was a monophthong, with a growing tendency toward diphthongization, let us now trace the subsequent development of this sound in the 17th century. The first phonetician of this period to be cited is "rare Ben Jonson". He says under date of 1640: "V is sounded with a narrower, and meane compasse, some depression of the middle of the tongue, and is, like our letter *i* a letter of double power." This does not help us much.

Wallis, who wrote in 1653, is fuller and more distinct. He says: "Ibidem etiam", that is, *in labiis*, "sed Minori adhuc apertura" than (uu), "formatur *ú* exile; Anglis simul et Gallis notissimum. Hoc sono Angli suum *u* longum ubique proferunt (nonumquam etiam *eu* et *ew* quae tamen rectius pronunciantur

retento etiam sono *e* masculi): Ut *muse*, musa; *tune*, modulatio; *lute*, barbitum; *dure*, duro; *mute*, mutus; *new*, novus; *brew*, misceo (cerevisiam coquo); *knew*, novi; *view*, aspicio; *licu*, vice, etc. Hunc somum extranei fere assequeuntur, si diphthongum *iu* conentur pronunciare nempe *ĩ* exile litterae *u* vel *w* praeponentes, (ut in Hispanorum *ciudad* civitas), non tamen idem est omninò sonus, quamvis ad illum proximè accedat; est enim *iu* sonus compositus, at Anglorum et Gallorum *ù* sonus simplex. Cambro-Britani hunc fere sonum utcumque per *iw*, *yw*, *uw* describunt, ut in *lliw* color; *llyw* gubernaculum navis; *Duw* Deus, aliisque innumeris. "*U* longum effertur ut Gallorum *ú* exile. Ut in *lúte* barbitum, *múte* mutus, *múse* musa, *cúre* cura, etc. Sono nempe quasi composito ex *ĩ* et *w*."

Here, as Sweet observes, Wallis, while pointing out the resemblance between the Spanish *iu* and the Welsh *iw*, *yw*, *uw*, on the one hand, and the French (*yy*) on the other, expressly states that Spanish *iu*, is a diphthong and that the French (*yy*) is a simple sound; and with this latter he identifies the English long *u* and *ew*. But he says the English *u* and the French *u* approach nearly to the diphthong *iu*. Unlike Salesbury, Wallis heard the Welsh *uw* as a diphthong, the first element of which was a high-front-narrow and the second a high-back-narrow-round vowel. This according to Sweet is the present sound of this diphthong in South Wales.

The evidence of Wilkins, who wrote in 1668, is almost diametrically opposed to that of Wallis just adduced. Wallis, as we have just observed, did not admit the diphthongic pronunciation of long *u*, but identified it with the French *u* and affirmed that this pronunciation was common to all Englishmen, Wilkins, on the contrary, can scarcely pronounce the French *ū* (*yy*) at all, and denies that the English use it. Moreover, he affirms that every long *u* in English is diphthonged into *iu*. (Yet, as Mr. Ellis has noted, both Wallis and Wilkins were contemporaries and lived as fellow collegians for some time at Oxford and mingled in the same society.) Wilkins's words are: "As for the *u Gallicum* or *whistling u*, 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 Diph-

thongs, 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, he says: "*u* is I think proper to the French and used by none else." For example, *communion* he transliterates *kommiunnion*.

Holder in 1669 differs from Wilkins in his description of long *u*, which he expresses very accurately as *yy*, stating that it follows *ae* and *e* in diphthongs. But when he speaks of diphthongs he is not perfectly clear. It is interesting to note in passing, as Mr. Ellis has remarked, that Holder has "very acutely anticipated Mr. M. Bell's separation of the labial and lingual 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 rounder, 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 the 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 *8*; *u* with the tongue in the posture of *i* 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."

"*8* is made by the throat and tongue and lip; in *8* the tongue being in the posture, which makes *oo*; and in *u* in the same posture, which makes *i*, and in this *8* 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 *eu*, *pla* etc. Yet for this reason they seem not to be absolutely so simple words as the rest, because the voice passeth successively from the throat to the lips in *8* and from the palate to the lips in *u*, being there first moulded into the figures of *oo* and *i*, before it be fully articulated by the lips. And yet either

these two, *ɔ* and *u*, 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 *i*, and the other most open and backward; there being reason to allow a vowel of like sound in the throat with *ɔ*, 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 *u* will be only *i* labial, and *ɔ* will be *oo* labial, that is, by adding that motion of the under-lip, *i* will become *u*, and *oo* will become *ɔ*." He proceeds to use his *i*, *u*, *ɔ* in the formation of diphthongs and concludes thus: "Concerning *ɔ* and *u*, this may be observed, that in subjoining them to another vowel, *ɔ* is apter to follow *a* and *o*, because of their resemblance in the posture of the tongue, as hath been said; and for the like reason *u* is apter to follow *a* and *e*. as 8a8l *wawl*; euge etc. But generally if the vowel follows, then it is *ɔ* precedes and not *u*".

Cooper in 1685 recognizes the diphthong *iu* in the pronunciation of long *u*, and expresses difficulty in understanding *yy*, the French *û*, thus aligning himself with Wilkins, who could scarcely understand this latter sound. He says: "*E* in *will, weal*, cum *u* coalescens nobis familiarissimus est, quem vocamus *u* longum; ut *funeral* funus, *huge* inus [sic]; *juice* succus, sc[r?]ibimus per *ew*; ut *chew* mastico, *knew* cognovi; aliisque temporibus verborum praeteritis; quando syllabum finalem claudit, additur *e*, *true* verus; raro per *eu*, *rheum* rheuma; sic semper pronunciamus *eu* latinum, and *eu* Graecum: et Galli plerumque illorum *u*, quandoque autem subtilius quasi sonus esset simplex, sed haec difficilis & *Gallis* propria."

Miege who wrote in 1688 speaks for the old monophthongic quality of long *u*, but because of his inaccuracy of ear in distinguishing various other English sounds then current, we must discredit his evidence. He says: "U vowel, by itself is pronounced in French according to the sound it has in the word *abuse* in English." It is interesting to note in passing that he transliterates *nature*, *picture* and *fracture* "naiter", "picter", "frecter", which pronunciations persist to this day among the illiterate.

To sum up. The change from the monophthongic to the diphthongic pronunciation of long *u*, which, as we saw, was in process of development during the 16th century, toward the end of the 17th century won general currency and became fully established. But the old monophthongic pronunciation of this vowel as the French *ü* still survived as an antiquated pronunciation.

Let us now turn aside from the history of long *u* for a while in order to examine the development of a related sound, viz., the M. E. diphthong *ew* (*eu*). When long *u* became diphthonged into *iu*, the old open *ew* (*eu*) likewise underwent a change passing first into close *ew* and subsequently developed into *iu*. It will prove of interest to trace the history of this sound as recorded by the contemporary orthoepists.

Palsgrave (1530) says: "*Eu* in the frenche tong hath two diverse soundynges, for sometime they sound hym lyke as we do in our tong, in these wordes a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe, and sometyme like as we do in thes wordes, *trewe*, *glewe*, *rewe*, a *mewe*. The soundyng of *eu*, whiche is most general in the frenche tong, is such as I have showed by example in these wordes, a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe, that is to saye, like as the Italians sound *eu*, or they with us, that pronounce the latine tonge aryght, as *evreux*, *ireux*, *lieu*, *dicu*."

The word *beauty* Palsgrave wrote *beautie* and Levins (1570) *bewtye*, and in the Promptorium it is written *bewte* and *beawtye*.

Smith (1568) says of this diphthong: "Et *Eu* diphthongum Graecum habent Angli, sed rarius, quae tamen apud Gallos est frequens: (feu) pauci, (deu) ros, (meu) vox catorum, (sheu) monstrare, (streu) spargere." And in his Greek pronunciation he adds: "εὔ, ut eu, εὔρε, euge. Angli pauci *few*, φεῦ, ros,

dew, δεῦ. ην sonamus apertius, ut illud Gallicum *beau*, quod multi Angli *beu*: sonum etiam felium quidam *mew*, alii *meau*, quasi μῆν, μῆν exprimunt."

Hart (1569) shows the beginning of the development of an i-glide before the diphthong, for he writes *mew* *miew*. But Bullokar in 1580 gives no indication of such a development. He recognised only the pure diphthong *eu*, writing, for example, *hew* thus: he, u, the comma, which he wrote under the *u*, meaning that it had the sound of *u*.

Gill likewise in 1621 recognised only the simple diphthong and nothing more. He says: "*E*, saepius praecedit *u*, ut, in (eeu) eawe ovicula, (feeu) fewe pauci, (seeuer) sewer dapifer."

So Butler in 1633 distinctly recognised the true *eu*-diphthong in *dew*, *ewc*, *few*, *hew*, *shew*, *rew*, *sew*, *strew*, *shew*, *shrew*, *pewter*.

It is noteworthy that during the 16th century the writing with *ew* was employed in many words in which the conventional spelling today is with *u* simply; as in Levins' list: *dew* (due), *clew* (clue), *glew* (glue), *rew* (rue), *blewe*, *trewe*, *issew*, *seskew*, *renew*, *valew*, *endew*, *condinew*, *pursew*, *slewce*, *trewce*, *hewge*, *rewle*, *trewth*, etc.

In the 17th century we observe a change taking place. This was duly chronicled by the orthoepists. The old open *e* of the *eu*-diphthong began now to advance to a high position approaching *i*, so that *eu* was pronounced somewhat like *iu*. We saw that Hart in the preceding cent. had indicated the presence of a glide in the pronunciation of this diphthong in the word *mew*, which he transcribed *miew*.

The first to draw attention to this new development especially is Wallis in 1653: He says: "*Eu*, *ew*, *eau* sonantur per *e* clarum et *w*. Ut in *neuter* neutralis, *few* pauci, *beauty* pulchritudo. Quidam tamen paulo acutius efferunt acsi scriberentur, *niewter*, *fiew*, *biewty*, vel *niwter*, *fiw*, *biwty*; praesertim in vocibus *new* novus, *knew* sciebam, *snew* nungebat. At prior pronunciatio rector est."

As Sweet has pointed out (cf. H. E. S., p. 254), Wallis is not consistent. For he here says that the *iw*-pronunciation is quite frequent in *new*, and some other words with *ew* (from M. E. *ew*). And yet in his description of long *u* he includes

new in a list of words with the long French *u*, which he then pronounced (yy). In this same discussion he distinguishes (yy) very carefully from the *iu*-diphthong. In view of this fact, Sweet's conjecture is perhaps not far wrong, viz., that Wallis himself pronounced *muse* and *new*, for example, *myyz* and *nyy*, but was at the same time familiar with the diphthongic pronunciation *miuz*, *niu*, and that he intentionally ignored the latter pronunciation, while unconsciously admitting its existence by identifying the vowel of *new* with the diphthongic (eu) in the modified form of (iu).

We infer from Wallis's statement that (iu) was fast becoming the received pronunciation of the old *eu*-diphthong at this time, and that it was especially noticeable in such words as *new*, *knew*, *snew*. Otherwise, so conservative an orthoepist as he was would scarcely have recognised this new development.

Price in 1688, while he admits that the old *eu*-pronunciation is usual in "*brew-ess*, *few*, *lewd*, *ewe*, *feud*, *neuter*, *pleurisie*", still adds, "*ew* hath now obtained the sound of *iu*" in *blew*, *brew*, *chew*, *crew*, *drew*, *hew*, *embrew*, *eschew*, *gewgaws*, *knew*, *sewer*, *slew*, *stew*, *steward*, *vinew*, *monsieur*, *adieu*, *lieu*.

Cooper in 1685 recognised only the *iu*-pronunciation of the diphthong *eu*, with very little emphasis on the first element. In other words, in his pronunciation (iu) was almost equivalent to long *u*. The explanation of this change in the quality of the diphthong is that the stress was shifted from the first to the second element, and the *i* was reduced to a mere glide, so that only the *u* was heard. This pronunciation still lingers among the illiterate as in *nooz* (for *news*).

Jones in 1701 seems to indicate an existing difference between (eu) and the newer pronunciation of this diphthong as (iu). But whether he really felt any such distinction, it were hard from his confused account to ascertain with satisfaction. In his youth he was doubtless more familiar with the old *eu*-pronunciation, and would fain maintain that this was the proper pronunciation, but at the time that he wrote the new *iu*-pronunciation was probably far more common, and was fast extending itself and supplanting the former.

The conclusion then from the evidence thus far reviewed is that the old *eu*-diphthong had, during the 17th century,

advanced to a high position and at the close of the century, was quite generally, pronounced (iu). And in the mouths of some the stress was shifted from the first to the second element so that this diphthong was reduced almost to a monophthong, viz., long *u*. Probably this change of the *eu* to *iu* is to be regarded as a result of the influence of the passage of the old close long *e* to the high position, becoming long *i*. For it was during the early part of the 17th century that this latter change took place.

It is worthy of note that the change of the diphthong *eu* into *iu* is practically synchronous with the diphthonging of long *u* into *iu*. It appears, therefore, that at the beginning of the 18th century M. E. close *eu* and open *eu* as well, had, together with the M. E. long *u* from the French, all been leveled under the one common diphthong *iu*.

In consequence of the leveling out of the diphthong *eu* and the long *u* under one common sound, as shown above, the problem of tracing the history of these sounds in the 18th century is much simplified. The stress on the diphthong *iu*, developed from the old *eu*, tended to shift during the 17th century, to the *u*, the second element of the diphthong as we have seen, thus almost reducing *iu* to a monophthong. Perhaps in the pronunciation of many, the first element still survived as a slight *i*-glide. This slight glide seems to have proved the entering wedge to the development of a new diphthong *iu*. We have, then, the singular circumstance of the diphthong *iu* (from *eu*) being reduced almost to a monophthong *u* and again becoming diphthonged into *iu*, so that it returned again to its former value.

The Expert Orthographist in 1704 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 *rheubarb* 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 pedantick."

The anonymous instructor of the Palatines in 1710 says that *u* at the beginning is like the German *ju*, by which he probably means, as Ellis suggests, that long *u* is equivalent to *iu*, that is, a diphthong.

Buchanan in 1766 generally makes *eu*, *ew* equivalent to

long *u* or *iu*, as in *monsieur* (monsiur), *lieutenant* (liutenant), *cwe* (iu), *beauty* (biuty), *chew* (tshuu), *true* (triu), *furious* (fiurias), *lute* (liut), *muse* (miuz), etc.

Franklin, likewise, two years later writes, *furious* (fiurias), *usage* (iusedzh), *used* (iuzed). But unlike Buchanan, he writes *true* (truu), *rules* (ruulz), and *new* (nuu). His practice was not, therefore, far removed from present usage except in his pronunciation of *new* as *nuu*, now regarded as a vulgarism.

Lediard, in his account of English Pronunciation (written in 1725), says: "Rule (a) Long *u* is pronounced *iu* (iú) after *b, c, f, g, h, j, m, p, s*, but *su* may sometimes be *suh*."

"Rule (b) Long *u* is a long German *u* or *uh* (uu) after *d, l, r, n, t*. In *gradual, valuable, annual, mutual*, *u* may be either *iu* or *uh*."

I. Long English *u* is pronounced as *iu*, *u*, or *uh*, more or less rapidly according to accent. 1. according to rule (a) as *iu* in *abuse* abjuhs, *huge* hiudsch, *June* Dschiuhn, as *uh* in *seduce* seduhs, *exclude*, *minute* minuht, *rude*, *Brute*, *conclude*, *obtrude*. 2. as *iu* or rather *juh* (juu) in the beginning of words, as *union* juhniun. 3. except *ducat*, *punish*, *pumice*, *study*, *tuly*, short and like obscure *o* (o) in *busy* bissi, *bury* berri."

Ellis's comment on Lediard's pronunciation in general is so suggestive that I here subjoin it as throwing some light on the problem we are considering. The comment reads as follows: "After thus going through the vowels by the spelling, he proceeds to describe their formation, but as he has scarcely done more than translate Wallis, apparently ignorant that Wallis's pronunciation was a century older, I feel it useless to cite more than the following remark in an abbreviated form. "According to Mr. Brightland and others, the English express the sound of French *u* by their long *u* and sometimes by *eu* and *ew*. I cannot agree with this opinion, for although the English perhaps do not give the full sound of German *u* to their long *u* after *d, l, n, r, t*, yet their sound certainly approaches to this more closely than to the French *u*, which has induced me to give the German *u* as its sound, contrary to the opinion of some writers. After other consonants English long *u* is *iu*, and has nothing in common with French *u*."

The diphthongal quality of long *u* has continued to the present time, but perhaps with some modifications. This diph-

thong today has for its first element a very brief and evanescent vowel and for its second element, which receives the chief stress, the pure \bar{u} -sound. The first element is a sound very closely allied to the i -sound in the word *ill*, which is technically termed a high-mixed vowel. This same vowel rounded is the French *u* and the German modified *u*. The second element is a high-back-narrow vowel rounded, such as is heard in *food*. But this is not a pure diphthong, for in most cases there is heard, in addition to the diphthongal sound described above, a connecting glide, more or less full, which seems very like the sound of the consonant *y*. In many cases this *y*-glide encroaches upon and almost supplants the i -sound which constitutes the first element of the diphthong. When preceded by certain consonants, the glide tends to become fused with the consonant and palatalization of the consonant is the result; as in *sure*, *sugar*, etc. But this glide is not equally noticeable in all words where the long *u* occurs. After gutturals, such as *k* and *g*, or after labials, such as *p*, *b*, *m*, *f*, and *v*, the *y*-glide is very patent, as in *pure*, *mute*, *cube*, *beauty*, *fume*, *view*, etc. So, initially, the *y*-glide is very clear and distinct; as in *use*, *unit*, etc. But, on the other hand, after the tongue-tip consonants *t*, *th*, *d*, *n*, *r*, *l*, *s* and *z*, the *y*-glide is by no means so distinctly pronounced, owing to the mere physiological difficulty of utterance. Consequently, in this latter position the *y*-element of the diphthong in question is much reduced, and in the pronunciation of some it is scarcely appreciable, as in *lurid*, *lute*, *assume*, *suit*, *tune*, *new*, *due*, *duke*, etc., which many pronounce as if written 'loorid', 'loote', 'as-soome', 'soote', 'toone', 'noo', 'doo', etc. It may be remarked that according as the *y*-element is reduced, so does the sound of long *u* in these and other like words approximate that of a pure diphthong.

It is to be observed that this peculiar diphthong is produced by a rounding of the lips so that it is a kind of labialized diphthong, and the labialization is most complete in those words where the *y*-element is most pronounced, as in *pure*, *mute*, etc.

The omission of the *y*-element is not generally sanctioned by best usage, but is stigmatized as provincial or vulgar. It is regarded as more pardonable after *l*, for example, than after *d*, or *n*, or *t*, etc. Indeed, some standard authorities omit the glide

after *l*, and accordingly pronounce 'loorid', 'loote', etc. The Century dictionary omits the *y*-element in cases where the *l* is preceded by another consonant, as in *fluid*. Webster's International remarks upon this matter: "After *s*, *l*, *j*, *th*, the *y*-sound comes in with difficulty, as in *suit*, *assume*, *lute*, *jury*, *thew*, *enthusiasm*; and after *t* or *d*, the *u* may better be given without the *y*; as in *tune*, *tutor*, *due*, *duke*, *duty*. In all these cases of *y* omitted, the initial vowel element is retained: it would be quite wrong to give an ordinary *oo* (as in *food*) for the entire sound in such words. The *y* if attempted, is apt to degenerate into a sibilant, and produce, with the consonant, a decided *tsh* or *dsh* sound, thus making *due* the same as *Jew*. The *y* sound after *d* or *n* is common in England, as in *due*, *new*, etc., but not in America."

After *r* there is practically perfect unanimity of authority in favor of the omission of the *y*-element. No one pronounces the *y*-glide in this position, as such a pronunciation would be regarded as archaic or pedantic.

In the light of these facts an additional interest attaches to the words of Ellis, when he says: "For the polite sounds of a past generation are the *betes noires* of the present. Who at present with any claim to 'edification' would 'jine' in praising the 'pints' of a 'pictur'? But certainly there was a time when 'education', 'join', 'points' and 'picture' would have sounded equally strange."

In the same line Lowell, in his admirable essay on the Yankee dialect, which he gives in his introduction to the Biglow Papers, remarks: "The *u* in the ending 'ture' is always shortened making 'ventur', 'natur', 'pictur', and so on. This was common also among the educated of the last generation. I am inclined to think it may have been once universal, and I certainly think it more elegant than the vile 'vencher', 'naycher', and 'pickcher' that have taken its place, sounding like the invention of a lexicographer to mitigate a sneeze." This pronunciation was, as we have already seen, universal, viz. in the age of Dryden and Pope, as well as in the great Elizabethan age.

ASHLAND, SA. .

EDWIN W. BOWEN.