

Werk

Titel: An Investigation of the Rimes and Phonology of the Middle-Scotch Romance Clariodu...

Autor: Curtis, F. J. Ort: Halle a. S.

Jahr: 1895

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?338212566_0017|log19

Kontakt/Contact

<u>Digizeitschriften e.V.</u> SUB Göttingen Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1 37073 Göttingen

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RIMES AND PHONOLOGY OF THE MIDDLE-SCOTCH ROMANCE CLARIODUS.

(continued from Anglia, vol. XVI.)

1'

§ 430. OE. $\bar{\imath}+g$ is included here, as the g became vocalised and absorbed in the $\bar{\imath}$, in the same way as in $\bar{\imath}+g$, thus producing a simple long $\bar{\imath}$. Words in which an intervocal cons. has been dropped are also included with the rest, e. g. syis (OE. $s\bar{\imath}pas$), syne $(s\bar{\imath}p/an)$.

There is no trace of any change effected upon an $\bar{\imath}$ by a preceding w. (For wyse or wayis, sb., see §§ 440, 441, and for $\bar{\imath}$ in final syllables ine-, -ite, &c., see §§ 443—6.)

§ 431. The rime-words contain

a) OE. or ON. 1. lyve, sb.: scryve (vb. OE. scrifan) 1. 236: belyve 4. 206, 1256 : fyve 3. 648. lyfe, sb. : belyve 1. 1374 (&c.) : wyfe 1. 1462 (&c.): knyfe (ON. knifr) 2. 262 (&c.): dryve 4. 2090. wyd(e): syd (sale) 1. 90 : synde (for syde) 5. 278 : abyde 4. 2026 : glyd (glīdan) 3. 1344. blyth : sweith (swipe) 1. 1154 (&c.): alswyth 2. 476: alsweith 2. 656 (&c.). wyne (win): syne $(si \not b/an)$ 4. 922, and many more. — b) OE. i + g, see §§ 411 (a), 413 (a). — c) OE. or ON. \overline{y} , see § 550 (b). — d) OE. i+h, see § 417 (plicht : quhyte). — e) OE. æ + g, see § 164. — f) OE. \overline{e} , mut. of \overline{o} , see § 185 (m). — g) Fr. i. ryde: devyde 1. 470 : cryit 3. 1854. quhy: fellonie 2. 158 : espy 3. 720. belyve, belyue : aryve, arryve 3. 34 (&c.). hy (sb. = haste, from vb. hīgian?): melancholie 3. 472: companie 2. 952 (&c.). syne (st p pan): declyne 1.320: discipleine 3.868: fyne, vb. 3.1398: defyne 3. 2316 : fyne, adj. 4. 338 : inclyne 4. 378 (&c.) : lyne 4. 2792. syse (sī þas) : compryse 4. 598 : impryse, sb. 4. 710 : pryse, sb. 4. 1988. ryce (OE. hrīs) : paradice 4. 1652. wyse, adj. : praise (read pryse as in 1. 344, cf. § 441) 5. 2158. ferlie (færlic, Angl. fērlīc): chevalrie 2. 1056. quhyt(e): indyt(e) 1. 1200 (&c.): delyt(e) 2. 368 (&c.): perfyte 3. 1300, 5. 276, and many more. - h) Fr. ei, see § 164.

§ 452. The diphthongisation of 1 began in the South soon after 1400; see Kluge, P. G. 1. 872, Sarrazin, Octav. p. 37 and Litt. Bl. 5. 270, Luick Angl. 14, pp. 280, 285, Münster p. 29. If the rime in Octav. is to be interpreted in the way Sarrazin suggests, the date of the change must be set even earlier for the N. of Engl. This would only be in accordance with

other observations that have been made with regard to the N., which in many respects went ahead of the S. in its sound-changes, so that Sarrazin's alternative suggestion, that the rime in question may be only due to the scribe, is perhaps unnecessary. In Scotl. the change may have taken place just as early or even earlier than in the N. of Engl.; but the question of date for Scotl. must yet remain open. Still we may at all events with comparative certainty consider the change complete by the time Clar. was written. Similar rimes to those on which Sarrazin bases his conclusions for the early date will be found in § 164, which we have taken as a possible indication of the diphthongal pronunc. of the $\bar{\imath}$ if we allow the author to have occasionally employed an antiquated pronunc. in such words as faire, &c. We have a similar case of the retention of an older pronunc., viz. of $\bar{\imath}$ as monophthong, in syne: greine, cf. § 187.

§ 433. But we have another indication perhaps of the diphthongal pronunc. in the orthography. As has already been mentioned in § 359, we notice that almost always y is written for OE. $\bar{\imath}$ and \bar{y} and extremely rarely to represent the short vowel. Cannot this be taken as a sign that the copyist at least felt that there was a difference in quality between the short and the long sound, and that he attempted to express this phonetic difference by the employment of different symbols? The few exceptions in which i is used for the long sound may perhaps be due to a scribe who used an older or an Engl. orthography, possibly, though not probably, even to the author himself.

§ 434. There are other works, especially Sc., which show this same difference, but it is not observed strictly till the 16th cent., although a striving after a distinction is observable before this. Skeat, in his rimeindex to Bruce, says y denotes long $\bar{\imath}$, but i is also written and there is no sharp distinction, although y may perhaps be more frequent. The same applies to K. Q. and the Sc. Leg. The following appear to make no difference, using y and i indiscriminately both for the long and the short sound: - Wall., Lanc., Rat. Rav., Dougl., Compl. Sc., Gau, Roll. C. V. In Dunb.'s poems OE. \tilde{y} and \tilde{y} are represented both by i and y, so also OE. 7, although y is preferred (Kaufmann p. 56), while OE. \bar{y} is only represented by y. In Gol. it is the same as in Dunb. In some texts the long sound is further often represented by yi, so in Roll. C. V., occasionally in Dunb., Dougl. and other Sc. poets. With regard to Lyndes. there is some variety; in the Mon. y and i are not distinguished, the suffixes -yt, -yng, &c., appear; but in the Sat. y is pretty consistently used only for the long sound, -yt, -yng, &c., are rarely or never found, for them -it, -ing, &c., are used; but still y does appear for short in some words, e.g. nycht, mys; perhaps this is the usual use of y in proximity to m, n, &c., for the sake of distinctness. Wynzet has, according to Hewitson, in his introd., p. 96, "no definite rule to guide him in spelling. The letters y and i were freely interchanged, the y apparently being also pronounced (sic) yi". This does not seem to be altogether correct; there appears to be a difference in the principles of spelling between the earlier and the latter portions of the work; at the beginning both i and y

are used for i, the latter especially with m and n, while for the long sound mostly y is used except in French words which may have been pronounced with (ii) instead of a diphthong; in the latter portions only i is written for the short vowel, even with m and n (and we then see the difference between mynd, kynd, with y, and bind, find, &c., with i). Lesl. has generally i for the short and y for the long sound, except in mycht, rycht, &c. In the Satir. P. and Montg. we find the same rule as in Clar.; y is written with great regularity for the long sound and i for the short; the end-syllables -ing and -it of the participles, which in older writers are so frequently written as -yng and -yt, are so no longer.

Of course the usual restrictions apply to the above mentioned works in which i and y vary, viz. y is preferred by many in proximity to m and n and finally. Perhaps a closer examination of some of these would show that, with these restrictions, y is more often used than i for the long sound, as in Bruce and Dunb.

§ 435. Outside of Scotl. the same attempt at a distinction is sometimes found. In many works OE. $\bar{\imath}$ and \bar{y} are represented by y consistently, while there is some variability in the representation of the short vowel. We also find ey used sometimes to express the diphthong, cf. Sarrazin, Litt. Bl. 5. 271 (feyre, meynde, feynde). In some it is noticeable that OE. \bar{y} is particularly represented by y, while OE. $\bar{\imath}$ is not so uniformly so represented, as if the unrounding of the y were not complete and there were still a difference between OE. $\bar{\imath}$ and \bar{y} , but the rimes generally show that such an interpretation is not correct; so in the York P.

§ 436. We conclude, then, that the diphthonging was of comparatively early date in Scotl. Of course the change was gradual and we cannot expect to find overwhelming evidence of the beginnings of such changes, which are probably to be dated long in advance of the time when they are regularly reflected by the orthography. We accept, therefore, a diphthong both for the time of the MS. and the date of the composition.

The mod. diall. all have a diphthong for OE. 7.

§ 437. Noltemeier, p. 22, argues from the rime wy: quently in Gol. that the pure 4-sound was preserved in contrast to NE. with its diphthong; but in this way we could prove that such words as cry, espy, sky, why, &c., had still pure 4 at the time of Spens. and Shakesp., which we know was not the case, see Ellis, pp. 869, 959, 969. We must rather argue the other way, as above in § 415, that the rime-words in -ly, (which was usually unaccented), when the final syll. was stressed in rime, could and did have a diphthongal pronunc., as distinctly recognised by Gill. Ellis proves this double pronunc., unstressed (i), stressed (ei), in the rimes of Spens. and Shakesp. and also in those of Moore and Tennyson, cf. Ellis, p. 933, Kluge, P. G. 1. 898.

§ 438. Zielke, p. 28, says that $\bar{\imath}$ has remained $\bar{\imath}$, undiphthonged, especially in the N., to the present day. He relies for this statement on Ellis 1. 291; but the examples given here are chiefly such as allow the mod. $\bar{\imath}$ to be explained in other ways, e. g. high, die, fly, &c. The $\bar{\imath}$ in the $ch\bar{\imath}ld$ of Devonshire and high = (hii) of Scotl. are of two very

different origins. In the former it is a ME. $\bar{\imath}$ which has been retained, in the latter it is a ME. $\bar{\imath}$ which has been regularly developed into $\bar{\imath}$. ME. $\bar{\imath}$ produces in NSc. always a diphthong. The word nighest has the same form nist in Sc. and in Dev.; but in Dev. it = a ME. form nist from nighest through vocalisation of the gutt., and in Sc. it is from a MSc. form n\bar{e}st = ONthmb. n\bar{e}sta, cf. Sievers, § 166, 5 and § 313, note.

 \S 439. In 5. 2712 there is an apparently false rime, due perhaps to a misunderstanding of the scribe. The passage as written in the MS. runs thus: —

The king Clariodus and his companie In schipis enterit hes and suddanlie They drew vp saillis and over the waves schare They glyd anone alse swift as onie fyre And day and night thay sojorne not nor rest

The scribe perhaps understood share, prt. of sheer, to cut, OE. sceran, scær; so apparently also Piper, who puts a full-stop at schare. But the word is really an adj. = OE. scīr, bright, shining, cf. Dougl. in the schyre air, 2. 192. 10, schire: desyre 2. 152. 8; K. Q. schire: fyre, 76. Jam. Dict. gives the word as still in use in Scotl. in sense of clear, bright, and clear, transparent, "clear liquor we call shire".

The following line above, then, contains the predicate to which the adverbial phrase over the waves belongs, so that there should be no stop at schyre, for which schare in written. The mingling of pret. and hist. pres. in one sentence need cause no offence; it is not unusual, and is, in fact, very common in Sc. poetry; the following verb, too, sojorne, is a present. Mod. rec. sp. has an adj. sheer, with (ii), which is derived from ON. skær, Sweet, p. 341; this would, on the analogy of seat, ON. sæti, give in late MSc. and NSc. an e, so that, if we can get over the difficulty of the sch for ON. sk, (perhaps there was a confusion of different forms) it is possible that the scribe understood the word correctly as an adj., but inserted another word, schare, (sheer), with the same meaning.

§ 440. wyse, wayis, &c.

- α) wayis (OE. wegas) also spelt wayes, 2. 428 (&c.), wayse 5. 26, ways 4. 2246, 2522, rimes with words containing
- a) OE. $\overline{\bf 1}$: ryse 3. 1778 (&c.) : wyse, adj. 3. 2018 : sayis (= $s\overline{1}$ pas) 3. 2314 (&c.). b) OE. $\overline{\bf i}$ + $\overline{\bf g}$: lyis (3 sg. licgan) 1. 490 (&c.) : ladies 5. 236, 2628. c) OE. $\overline{\bf a}$? : raise (OE. $r\overline{a}$ s) 4. 2478. d) Fr. $\overline{\bf i}$: cervice 3. 1498, 5. 1772, service 3. 1950 (&c.) : gyse 1. 1390 (&c.) : devyse 1. 938 (&c.) : interpryse 4. 842, 5. 948 : advyse 4. 2356, 1. 132 : parradice 5. 376 : Galice 5. 480, 2482 : dispyse 5. 1144 : Meliades 3. 418 (&c.) : gentrice 5. 224. e) Fr. ei or $\overline{\bf i}$? : praise 1. 1542 : pryse 5. 3008. f) ? : Gandaleyis 5. 2722.
 - β) wyse, once vyse (3. 2220) = OE. wise, rimes with words containing

§ 441. Here it is pretty evident that the author only used the word wyse = 0E. wise; for the one rime with \bar{a} is probably only due to the scribe who changed a historic pres. ryse into a pret. raise, and the rimes in (α, e) are also more probably evidence of previous $\bar{\imath}$ than \bar{a} , for although the meaning praise suits the passages best, the forms praise and pryse are often interchanged, in fact pryse, prize, is used in the sense of praise very frequently in ME. and MSc., it is so even as late as Shakesp. But the scribe was more familiar with the form wayis, and often put this in, in spite of the rimes and even when a singular word is necessary, e.g. on this wayis, 1.1541 (&c.), on sike ane vayes 4.2639; cf. Wall. in this wayis: dayis (= days), 8.530, (here the author uses the form wayis, and as a singular). This substitution of wayis for wyse led the scribe occasionally to alter the rime-word in the same manner, e.g. wayis: sayis 3. 2314 (&c.), the latter word being generally spelt syse or syis; and so in the rime wayis: raise, he probably found before him wyse: ryse, and first altered wyse into wayis and then for the sake of the rime ryse into raise, to which there was a special inducement in the circumstance that a pret. seemed more suitable than a pres., the surrounding verbs being preterites. He acted similarly in his substitution of praise for the author's pryse, e.g. praise: suffais for pryse: suffyse. In the rimes above in $(\alpha. e)$ the scribe in one case has left pryse, in the other has changed it to praise.

The rime in Satir. P. 35.75, gyse: alwyse (for always) shows how completely identical the two forms wyse and wayis had become.

§ 442. belyth appears twice in rime, Thay drest them to the mariag belyth: blyth 1.664, In land of Calice enterit is belyth: sweith (OE. swīpe), 1.940. In the latter, the meaning blithe might suit the passage, as a few lines further on we read, "the fresch Clariodus . . . gladlie could him speid", But to suit the metre a dissyllable is necessary and in the former passage the word requires a different meaning from blyth, with which it stands in rime. Perhaps it is written for belyve, which the author may have written, but a scribe misunderstood, or spelt differently in order to improve the rime. Such an assonance between p and v is exceptional in Clar., but we have one in kyth: belyue 5. 1248, and we have similar ones elsewhere, e.g. Sc. Leg. swith: belyfe 5/32, Freiris of B. belyve : blyth 262, Rosw. blyth: belyve 4, Am. (see Kölbing, p. 21) blibe: bryue : lyue : fyue. These rimes make it probable that we should alter in Clar. to belyve. Or was there another word belythe = altogether, in company, and connected with ME. $li\delta$, sb. = ON. $li\delta$, order, assembly? Cf. Laz. a leode, 5307 (in a body?), Langl. in oon lip, B. 16. 181. Or perhaps more probably connected with ME. $lip, (= 0N. l\bar{y} \partial r?)$, a doublet of ME. leod = OE. leod, people, race, cf. Sir Tr. lipe, (pl.): swipe: blipe : kipe, 1640, Hav. lithe, 2515, D. Arth. lithes, 994.

§ 443. Final syllables -ite, -ine, -ive, -ice, &c.

Ellis, EEP., p. 272 &c., uses the present pronunc of the majority of words containing these syllables, as he does that of those containing -ly, to prove that in Chauc.'s time a diphthongal pronunc of long $\bar{\imath}$ was impossible. In this conclusion he was probably right for Chaucer; but he goes

further and says it would be "difficult to suppose that, at a time when the (ai) or (ei) or (ei) pronunc. of long $\bar{\imath}$ was common, as at the close of the 15th and begining of the 16th cent., it should have been deliberately rejected from these words and replaced by (i) when the accent was thrown back permanently. But we know that such words had (i) in the 16th cent. and that this sound has continued to the present day. For my own part I cannot force myself to suppose that i in the last syllable of the following words ever had any other sound but (ii, i, ii, ii, ii)". Then he gives a list including such words as servyse, justise, merite, sangwyn, opposit, superlatif, ypocrite, famyne, doctrine, &c.

§ 444. But it is perhaps not quite so certain that the (9i) pronunc. could not exist as well in some words. It is true that the majority of such words have no diphthong in rec. sp. in their final syll. at the present day. But anyone familiar with the London dial. will at once acknowledge the frequent pronunc. of opposite with a diphthong (ai) or (ai); so also in favorite we sometimes hear (vi). In many similar words in which the last syll. has retained the stress, or acquired a secondary stress, or which have, in the case of dissyllables, "level-stress", mod. rec. sp. has the diphthong, e. g. appetite, satellite, paradise, porcupine, Serpentine, parasite, Palestine, mesmerise, Gentile, divine, revive, &c.; in others the pronunc. varies, e. g. several words in -ile, as futile, servile, in -ine, as iodine, columbine, in -ive as endive. How are these to be explained? At first one might be inclined to look upon the diphthong as an artificial pronunc. according to the spelling, many of the words being such as are not in popular use, and are therefore first learnt through the eye. But the word opposite, with (ei), at any rate, is found amongst such classes in London and elsewhere as render this explanation unlikely. It seems much more satisfactory to accept a possible double pronunc in popular language, from that point on when the diphthonging of ī began, according as the final syll. was stressed or not, and to look upon the usage of poets in employing both forms according to the exigencies of rime as resulting partly from this occasional twofold pronunc. of vernacular growth and not altogether as being an artificial poetical licence, as Ellis explains; the (əi) forms were distinctly admitted by Gill and used by him even in prose.

§ 445. These words are exactly similar to the words ending in -ly, -y, cf. § 415, which certainly have two pronunciations in Clar. Concerning these Ellis says, p. 281, that Gill does not represent an old pronunc. but only a poetical licence, and "there seems no reason to suppose that this termination -ly ever had, in natural speech, the sound of (lei)". But on p. 855 we find in Gill's transcription of the Psalms, i. e. in prose (tryylei, oonlei, syyrlei, ekselensei), and p. 851, Spenser, (infamei) &c., where the (ei) was not necessitated by any exigencies of rime and metre, and cannot therefore be considered a poetical licence. Gill also gives the forms (mizerei, konstansei, destinei).

§ 446. Of course we cannot explain anything like all the rimes, which prove a diphthong, from popular pronunc.; beyond the adverbs in -ly, and nouns in -y, it was only a limited number of such words that

found their way into popular speech at all, and that could therefore acquire a double pronunc. of vernacular growth; but many of those which have now the (əi) pronunc. are words which have probably long been established in the vernacular, e. g. delight, Serpentine, opposite (in dial.) appetite, &c., and to this the diphthong is probably due.

The assumption of two pronunciations of natural growth gives us an explanation not only of the use of such syllables in rime, but also of the occasional dialectal or the half obsolete pronunc. sometimes heard from the lips of aged people, of the unsettled pronunc in many words and of the undoubted diphthong in rec. sp. in many others, as appetite, &c., which do not agree in this respect with the majority. It seems difficult to have to assume so extensive a slavery to orthography as would explain all these anomalies.

§ 447. If we allow, as we almost certainly must, a general diphthongal pronunc. of long i for the time when Clar. was written, we must also allow it for the final syllables in the following words in rime, (cf. § 431) — apitite, fellonie, multiplied, matutine, melancholie, exultive, superlative, discipleine, chevalrie, paradice, exyle, delyte, inclyne, companie, or consider the rimes faulty. In many the diphthong is doubtless only artificial. Ellis's lists do not contain sufficient material to give us any exact rules about the mod. diall. We find the following words in his lists with i or i (not the diphthong) - D. 33, (cf. also DSS., p. 146) polite, oblige, type, chastise, advertise, baptise, civilise, invite, D. 38. delight, D. 39. obliged, idolised, practise, advertise, exercise, martyrising, invited, D. 41. admire. It appears, therefore, that the diphthong in these words is not so frequent in Scotl. as in Engl. and that consequently the above rimes may have been for a Sc. poet even more artificial than for an Engl. one, and are perhaps a further sign of the poet's imitation of Engl. models, or borrowing from Engl. rec. sp., if the pronunc. of the words just mentioned agrees with the dial. to which he belonged. Ellis gives no suitable words in the dial. of D. 34, which would probably be nearest to that of Clar. Many words which were used in the poetical works of the MSc. period never got a hold on the spoken language and would probably not now exist among natives speaking true dial. But the very fact of their being introduced into the language of poetry at a time when the political and literary relations between France and Scotl. were so intimate would make it a priori probable that the i should have its French pronunc., especially in D. 34, and it is noticeable that some words in the above rime-list are spelt with i and not y, e. g. paradice, exultive, superlative, &c., and occasionally ei is written, e. g. discipleine, so that the rimes are not correct for the eye. The ei is doubtless due to a Sc. scribe who pronounced with $\bar{\imath}$; the forms with i can be of similar origin, or may be merely instances of Engl. spelling. We have already seen that the author also occasionally rimed Fr. i with earlier e, so that he evidently used both pronunciations in these words, with (ii) and (oi) or (ei); but from the evidence of the rimes the latter was the usual pronunc.; whether this was altogether artificial and contrary to his native dial. or not, cannot be settled till the mod. diall. are more fully investigated.

§ 448. Note. One or two of Ellis's arguments in the passages referred to seem to rest on a faulty understanding of mod. dialectal forms. One of his chief arguments is the rime $mercy: sey \ (= saw)$, see EEP., p. 279, in connection with which he quotes the mod. dial. form (sii) in "I see him do it yesterday"; but surely this must be due to a ME. form $s\bar{e}$. ME. $s\bar{\imath}$ would give NE. (sei) or (sai), which, as he says, does not exist. We should have to look upon mercy: sey as another $\bar{\imath}:\bar{e}$ rime, if we explain by the mod. Engl dial. $s\bar{\imath}$. Similarly, on p. 284, the words with double pronunc. in the mod. diall., as $die = (d\bar{\imath})$ and $d\bar{\imath}$, must have had in ME. and MSc. the two pronunciations $d\bar{\imath}$ and $d\bar{e}$. NSc. $d\bar{\imath}$ cannot prove a MSc. $d\bar{\imath}$, but rather $d\bar{e}$, which is abundantly proved by rimes; we cannot base any argument for a ME. $d\bar{\imath}$ on a mod. form $d\bar{\imath}$.

o.

§ 449. rimes with

a) itself. befor(e): pairfor 1. 1158, thairfore 4. 1228. beforne (beforan): sworne 1. 618: borne 1. 1038. schore (OE. score = litus): whairfore 3. 1946. — b) OE. o: — borne: porne 3. 628. — c) OE. ō, see § 458 (b). — d) OE. ā, see § 56 (d). — e) Fr. o. before: restore 3. 522, 5. 1222. — f) Lat. o. before: decore 5. 968, 2966, decoire 5. 1718. — g)? before: Amandour 4. 866.

§ 450. OE. o in open syll. was lengthened in ME. and MSc. Most of the above rimes are proof of this; perhaps even those in (a) and (b) in which a vowel has fallen out between r and n, OE. beforan, boren, &c., for it is better to consider these, too, perhaps, and also the rimeword porne, as containing a long vowel, or at least half-long, since in Murray's dial., D. 33, the o in born, torn, shorn, storm, corn, horn, &c., has been treated in exactly the same way as that in hope, sole, fore, &c., viz. it appears as (u'). Ellis's material for the other diall. is too meagre and of two mixed a character to allow us to make any rules. open appears with (oo, ee, aa), hope with (oo, au, ou, au, u), foal with (o, oo, o). It is difficult to see from this what the regular development is. The rime in (g) is perhaps evidence of the commencement of a raising process towards (u).

It is noticeable that OE. beforen appears in two forms, with and without n.

O:

§ 451. 1. Before 1 + cons. — rimes with

a) OE. \overline{a} ld = WS. eald, see § 268 (b).

The o which was lengthened before ld already in the OE. period, see Kluge PG. 1. 866, remains unchanged. gold is the only word appearing in rime; this has in the mod. Sc. diall. (uu) in 33, 35, 36, (oo) in 33, (óu) in 34 and 39 with loss of l, in 39 and 41 with l retained, (áu) with l in 36, without l in 35. Thus a difference is made between this late OE. \bar{o} and early OE. \bar{o} , cf. below; it seems to go together with the newlong \bar{o} from OE. o in open syll., unless the abnormal development is due

to the following l. mould is found with (2), the correct representative of OE. \bar{o} , in D. 42, otherwise it has (\acute{u} , AA, $\acute{a}u$, $\acute{o}u$).

The rimes with $\bar{\varrho}$ from OE. \bar{a} are, as shown in § 269, not Sc., but imitations of Engl.

- § 452. 2. Before r + cons. rimes with
- a) OE. o. thorne: borne. morrow: borrow 1. 22: sorow 2. 852. b) Fr. o. horse: forse, force 1. 52 (&c.). lord: record(e) 2. 2230 (&c.). horne: vnicorne 4. 2458. lordis: accordis 5. 378. c) Fr. u. word: bourd (= jest, OFr. burde) 2. 1200.
- § 453. With the exception of morrow, borrow, sorrow and perhaps word, the vowel is probably half-long; if it were really long we should expect to find oi sometimes written. The rime in (c) is one example of the tendency, often observed, to change o to u before r + cons, and it also seems to prove the new-lengthening before rd, if the ou has any meaning.

word generally appears with (a) in almost all the mod. Sc. diall.; this correctly reflects MSc. \ddot{u} , so that if there was formerly ever a lengthening, word > word > word > word > word > word, there has been a return to vowel-shortness or half-length in NSc. as in rec. sp. We have the same rime as above, word:bourd, in Satir. P. 33. 176.

- \S 454. o + ht rimes with
- a) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{a}} + \mathbf{ht}$, see § 58. b) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{o}} + \mathbf{ht}$, see § 494 (b). For these words cf. §§ 59—71.

§ 455. Here we must include the word flaucht 3.638, "hir spirit than was all on flaucht" (: nocht), for, in spite of the spelling with au, the rime-word nocht and the spelling and rimes in other texts plainly show that the vowel must have been o. The meaning of the word is flutter, perturbation, and perhaps Jamieson's suggested derivation from OE. flogettan = fluctuare, is the most plausible one. J. quotes Dougl. Venus al on flocht: thocht, on flocht is: thochtis; Burel's Pilg. Feir pat my hairt in sic a flocht; Baillie's Lett. "all the city was in a flought. He also gives quotations for the form flaught, but none in rime. Cf. further Dunb. this fals warld is ay on flocht: thocht: socht 24.1, thair hairtis wer baith on flocht: socht: brocht (Small's note quotes from Henryson, For I am verray affeirit and on flocht" and says flocht or flicht is still in use. Jam. Diet. gives aflight or in a flight as synonymous, cf. Dunb. This warld evir dois flicht and wary, 26.6); Freiris of B. flocht: thocht 430; Roll. C. V. flocht: nocht: brocht: thocht: docht 2.611.

This word has nothing to do with fireflaught, nor with flaught in wind-flaught (= driven with the wind), e. g. Dougl. 4.133, (: ourraucht), in which the vowel was originally a.

- § 456. Before other consonants rimes with
- a) ON. o. oft : aloft 2. 1328. b) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$ (shortened), see § 458 (b), (c). c) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$, see § 43 (e).

The vowel σ remains unchanged; the mod. diall. generally show δ .

§ 457. haw: tow 3.1956, He seames to be na balleist in the haw He sall weill hald ane anker or ane tow. The former line is somewhat

obscure, but perhaps haw is for how = hollow, hold of a ship, OE. hol. Jam. Dict. gives how = hollow place, OE. hol. Cf. Bruce, howis (= holes) 17.344, Wall. in the holl, var. into the how (= hold) 9.122, Montg. how (sb. = hollow): row: mow: know (= knoll): zow (= ewe): dow (OE. dugan): pow: tow F.74, houis: bouis (= bows, arcūs) MP. 32.33.

The word tow = rope, is OE. tow, and if the above explanation of haw is correct, the rime proves the vocalisation of l in the word hol.

0'

§ 458. 1. Not followed by ht or g - rimes with

a) itself. looke (locian): tuike (prt. of taka) 1.144, luike: tuike 3. 448 (&c.), louike: tuike 4. 428. tuike: cuike $(c\bar{o}c)$ 3. 1972: quoke (strong prt. to wk. vb. OE. cwacian, cf. Plattdeutsch jog for H. G. jagte, Reuter) 5. 1534. schoke: awoke 1. 96. gud: blude 1. 1416, 2. 1188: wood 3. 390: bluid 3. 1228 : flude 3. 1334, 1962, gude : stude 1. 1392, 4. 332, guide : stude 1.568. blude: stude 3.1880: wod 1.68, wode 2.36, bluid(e): wood(e) 1. 1002, 972, bloode: woode 3. 1100, 1116. stude: fluide 1. 1402: wode 5. 2340, stuide : wode 5. 1174. fude $(f\bar{o}da)$: rude $(r\bar{o}d)$ 3. 766. soune $(s\bar{o}na)$: doune, ptc. 1.380 (&c.): noune $(n\bar{o}n)$ 4.264. schoune (= shoes) : doune (ptc. gedon) 3.878. to : adoe 1.508 (&c.) : doe 3.464 (&c.) : do 4. 2618. brother: vther 3. 1782, 1840: other 3. 1538. — b) OE. ŏ. soft: oft 2.580. behovit: hovit (= hovered; according to Skeat, ME. hoven from OE. hof, sb., Bradl. derives from MDu. and MLG. hoven) 2. 1150. schuike : smoke (smoca) 5. 2018. — e) ON. ŏ. soft : loft 2. 1420 (&c.), wnsoft (MS. wnfost): on loft 1.728. — d) OE. u. soine (sona): aboue 1.158, soune: aboue 1.506. — e) OE. \overline{eo} , see § 330 (k). — f) OE. \overline{a} , see §§ 39 (c), 43 (f). — g) OE. or ON. ă-, see § 22 (c). — h) OE. æ-, see § 77 (b). - j) OE. $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$, see § 530 (g). - k) OE. $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{g}$, see § 505 (b). - 1) Fr. eu. fure (prt. for from faran): demure (according to Skeat and Behrens from Central French demeur) 5. 212. — m) Fr. iii. rute $(r\bar{o}t)$: suite 5. 1940. n) Fr. ii. soune: disjune 2.866, 4.934: oportune 5.1720: Neptune 5. 2880. doune $(ged\bar{o}n)$: oportune 4. 1510, 2496, opportoune 4. 2378. behuifis : excuse 4. 2506, behuise, 3. sg. : excuse 4. 1356, behuise (? = sb. "say on for your behuise"; or is it the impers. vb. constructed with your? or an error for "you behuise"?): excuse 4. 2226. dois, 3. sg.: refuse 4. 1526. stude: pulcritude 4.576, 976. bluid: pulcritude 3.2436, blood: conclude 3.1750. gud: conclude 1.1202, 3.1636: denud 3.116. wod: conclude 5. 2320. leuike (= look, sb.) : duike 5. 2042. fuire ($f\bar{o}r$, prt.) : figure 5. 2948. — o) Fr. o. soune: toune (ton) 2.1520.

§ 459. OE. \bar{o} was a closed \bar{o} and remained so in ME. till it, during the course of the 16th cent., became \bar{u} , which, however, did not become fixed till the 17th cent., since which time it has remained unchanged, cf. the \bar{u} in food, soon, &c. This is the usual statement of the development of OE. \bar{o} , but it is only correct for the Engl. of rec. sp., and the mistakes sometimes made with regard to this vowel are due to an insufficient observance of the difference of diall. Hence it is sometimes asserted that

the change $\bar{o} > \bar{u}$ took place in the 15th cent. or even earlier, cf. Kluge, PG. 1. 884, Böddeker, p. 353, Hoofe, p. 27. This is not true for the S. of Engl. and requires some modification for the N., cf. Brandl, p. 61, Zielke, pp. 28, 29, Fick, pp. 29, 30, Wischmann, p. 7, &c. This theory in based on the occurrence of rimes between OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \bar{u} and the spelling with u, e. g. gud, buk, in Hamp., (there is no trace of it in Sir. Tr., \bar{o} only rimes with itself or OE. \bar{a} and is never represented by u, see Kölbing, p. 65). The more correct interpretation of this, however, is given by Brandl, Zielke, Fick, Wischmann, and Sweet § 693; but these do not all entirely agree, and perhaps we should make some difference between the N. of Engl. and Scotl., thus having at least three distinct districts.

§ 460. In rec. sp. OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \bar{u} (or $\bar{u}i$) have never coincided, except under particular circumstances, cf. food with conclude, boot with fruit, but on the other hand food with multitude, goose with use, moor with cure, &c.; i. e. there is coincidence only after r and l, and perhaps occasionally after s (cf. suit). Nor has there been any coincidence with AFr. u (= OFr. o) except in the case of words which have been re-borrowed at a later period, generally with the Parisian ou (= \bar{u}), cf. boot with devout (but route), spoon with renown, &c. In the S. W. we have a partial coincidence between OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \bar{u} and AFr. u, and, strange to say, in almost the same forms as in Scotl., $(\partial_2 \partial_2)$ and $(y_1 y_1)$, cf. Elworthy, dial. of W. Somerset, p. 51, and Ellis EEP., the lists for Devonshire, D. 11, in Vol. 5.

§ 461. In N. Engl. and Scotl. the mod. diall. are perfectly in harmony with Northern ME. and MSc. rimes, for OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \ddot{u} coincide as a rule everywhere (as far as Ellis's lists go), but the forms are very different in Yorks. and Scotl., and it is but natural to suppose that the differentiation is not of recent date and that the rimes between OE. \bar{o} and Fr. ü perhaps do not indicate the same pronunc. in Hamp. as they do in Bruce, especially as it is possible perhaps that the Fr. words with ü found their way into Central Scotch at a different date and in a different form from that in which they were received into Southern and Northern Engl.; at any rate they probably soon developed in a somewhat different direction in Sc. Ellis's lists being so meagre with regard to words of Fr. origin, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions; and the agreement between OE. o and Fr. u might be considered to be in some diall, only partial and therefore misleading; but the agreement of the few examples given and the strong evidence of all MSc. texts render this improbable. A full and careful examination of all the mod. diall. is necessary before the vexed question of the development of OE. \bar{o} and Fr. ü can be finally settled. Perhaps no other vowels show such a variety in their representation in the mod. diall. as these do.

§ 462. We will first look at Scotland. OE. \bar{o} has become (of course subject to some exceptions) (2, 22) in D. 33, (y), sometimes (2), in 34, (22) or (yy) in 35, (y) or (i) in 36, (y, yy) sometimes (i, ii) in 37, (2, y, i, 3) but chiefly (2) in 38, chiefly (ii) in 39, (i) or (yy) in 40, (22) in 41, (22) in 42. Ellis's lists leave us almost altogether in the lurch with regard to Fr \ddot{u} , except in D. 33 and 39, where, however, there is perfect agreement —

(22) in 33, except in final position and before vowels, in which cases we have (21) or (211) — (ii) in 39. From Mr. Low's kind information I find there is the same agreement in 38, in the form (2, 22). The few examples given by Ellis in the other diall. are also mostly in agreement; so that we may probably consider it as settled that OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \bar{u} have in Scotl. everywhere shared the same fortunes, and that in all MSc. diall. they must have coincided in value.

§ 463. In the N. Engl. diall. OE. \bar{o} appears in a variety of forms, (iu. iie, yu, u) in 32, (uu, iu, ie) &c. in 31, chiefly (iie) in 30, (au, œu, iu) in 26, (œu, u) in 25, (uu, ui, uui, uue) in 24, and variations of (u, uu) in 20, 21, 22, 23; i. e. we may consider the difference from rec. sp. to be confined to the counties Northumb., Dur., Cumb., Westm. and Yorks., which all show a combination with i as first element, which agrees with the (ii) of 39 (Aberd. and Banffs.) rather than with Southⁿ and Central Scotch; while the other diall. of the N. and Midl. show some variation of (uu) and thus agree with rec. sp. There is, in the Northern counties mentioned, on the whole, perfect agreement with Fr. \ddot{u} , just as in Scotl. The question is, has the (iie) of Yorks. arisen in the same way as the (ii) of Aberd.? and is the ($\partial \partial$) of the Southern Counties of Scotl. the result of the same MSc. or ME. representative of one or both of these sounds?

§ 464. One thing is certain, that neither OE. \bar{o} nor Fr. \ddot{u} ever became \bar{u} under ordinary circumstances in N. Engl. or in Sc., for there is nowhere in the mod. diall. a coincidence with OE. \bar{u} ; this latter has remained \bar{u} to the present day in the whole of Sc. and most of the N. of Engl. The rimes between Fr. \ddot{u} and OE. \bar{u} or Fr. u which are found in some MSc. and North ME. texts must find some special explanation (analogy or transference?). According to the examples given by Behrens, Frz. St. 5. 118, they seem to be chiefly peculiar to words in which the vowel is followed by r or n, and here exchange of suffix may play a large part.

§ 465. In the Sc. Leg. and Troj. W. there are also rimes between Fr. \bar{u} and OE. \bar{u} in final position, e.g. now: vertu, &c., see Buss p. 500. These are at first sight very striking, but Fr. \bar{u} in final position and before vowels seems to have had a different development from that which it had before conss., (cf. Nicol. Trans. Philol. Soc. 1877, Appendix III, vi); it has produced (au) in 33 and (iu) in the others. Can these rimes be evidence of the change $\bar{u} > i\bar{u} > i\bar{u}$ having already taken place at such an early date? This seems to be the only explanation, since OE. \bar{u} has never changed and \bar{t} \bar{u} : \bar{u} is a possible rime. Or else the \bar{u} had become here \bar{u} altogether, without any initial glide; but if so, this was not the normal development, and was perhaps limited to particular diall. Further, the (iiv) of Yorks. and the sounds in other N. Engl. and Sc. diall. admit of no satisfactory explanation from a ME. or MSc. \bar{u} , and we may safely dismiss as thoroughly impossible the $\bar{v} > \bar{u}$ theory for these districts.

§ 466. The normal value of the common Northⁿ ME. and MSc. vowel arising from OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \ddot{u} has not yet been fixed, and it is a difficult matter to do so. Possibly it was different in different diall., and the neglect of this possibility has led to the conflicting theories with regard to it. We have to account for the following modern sounds (iu, iie,

22, yy, ii). All but (22) are easily explainable in one category, and perhaps also (22) as well, though at first sight this seems doubtful.

§ 467. For the latter the explanations of Fick, Sweet, Brandl, Nicol and Murray are very plausible and probably not far from the mark. Fick's first suggestion, p. 30, is impossible; the two sounds after once coinciding cannot have separated again, and the contradiction which he notices in Ellis's statements is explained by an examination of the latter's lists in Pt V of EEP. The (yy) referred to by Ellis on p. 298 of Pt I, as given by Murray in Fr. words, is not found in Murray's own dial., as we have seen above, but is found in other diall., in which also OE. \bar{o} has become (yy). Fick then gives, p. 31, a better explanation (following Nicol and Murray), which applies for this particular dial., D. 33, viz.

```
OE. \bar{v} (mid-back-narrow-round)
Fr. \bar{u} (high-mixed-narrow-round) \} > MSc. ui (= mid-mixed-n.-r.) > NSc. (\bar{v}\bar{v}) (mid-front-narrow-round)
```

i. e. OE. $\bar{\sigma}$ was half-fronted while Fr. \ddot{u} was half-lowered, and the common resulting vowel afterwards further fronted. Brandl, p. 61, also favours a similar explanation, valuing the MSc. vowel as " α or αu " (meaning probably the latter for final, the former for medial position), and herein agrees with Sweet § 693, "in North. $\bar{\sigma}$ was fronted to mid-front-narrow-round, Fr. high-front-n.-r. being levelled under the same sound".

```
i. e. OE. \bar{o} (mid-back-n.-r.) 
Fr. \bar{u} (high-front-n.-r.) \} > MSc. and NSc. (22) (mid-front-n.-r.)
```

In this case we assume that the mod. sound was already reached in the MSc. period, through OE. \bar{o} being completely fronted, while Fr. \ddot{u} = (yy) was simply half-lowered.

§ 468. The following is also possible, viz. that OE. $\bar{\nu}$ was both fronted and raised from mid-back-n.-r. to high-front-n.-r., and so coincided with Fr. \ddot{u} , and that then this (yy) in some diall. remained, in others was unrounded and became (ii), high-front-n.-, and perhaps in others was half-lowered only to ($\partial \bar{\nu}$), mid-front-n.-r., and in others produced a diphthong, (iu), by a gliding from the i-position into the u-position, instead of forming them both simultaneonsly. (With this we might compare the pronunc. of Germ. \ddot{u} as (ii) in some diall, as ($\partial \bar{\nu}$) in others, and as (iu) in the mouth of an Englishman first learning German.) This would explain all the various mod. sounds from one uniform MSc. sound; but still it is not without its difficulties. And perhaps there may have been, as suggested already, a difference in the form in which Fr. \ddot{u} was received into the different diall.

§ 469. Fick's scheme differs from the others in that he assumes Fr. \ddot{u} to have been high-mixed instead of high-front, in which he follows Möller (Kopenhagen) and Ellis; Holthaus, p. 92, also holds the same view. Behrens does not allow this, and Sturmfels, p. 568, says that according to most scholars the sound was \ddot{u} , (yy), from the earliest times. Starting from a high-mixed instead of a high-front vowel we should not have to alter the second of the above schemes very much; it would necessitate some contradictions in the direction of change, but we seem not to

be able to avoid that in any case, and similar reversions of processes are not unknown.

§ 470. We accordingly arrive at the indefinite result that the MSc. sound may have been a high-mixed, high-front, mid-mixed, or mid-front vowel, and that it may have been more than one of these, according to dial.

Menze's and Knigge's rejection of Brandl's statement is due to their failing to take difference of dial. into consideration; what they say may be correct for the diall. they specially treat, but, because it does not suit them, it does not follow that Brandl is wrong with regard to the dial. of which he writes.

§ 471. The evidence of the 16th cent. grammarians must be considered in connection with the above, though we must still bear in mind that they may also have had different diall. in consideration, when they made their statements concerning Sc. pronunc.

Salesbury (1547): "The sound of u in French, or \ddot{u} with two pricks over the heade in Duch [i. e. German] or the Scottish pronunciation of u alludeth somewhat nere vnto the sound of it in Welshe, thoughe yet none of them all, doeth so exactly (as I thynk) expresse it, as the Hebraick Kubuts doeth. For the Welsh u is none other thing, but a meane sounde betwyxte u and y beyng Latin vowels."

§ 472. Hart (1551) in his "former treatise" (see Ellis, p. 796): "The other abuse of the u, is that we sound yt as the Skottes and French men doo, in theis wordes gud and fust: Wheras most communely we our selves (which the Grekes, Latines, the vulgar Italiens, and Germaines with others doo alwais) kepe his true sound: as in theis wordes, but, unto, and further. Yf you marke well his uzurped sound in gud and fust (and others of the Skottish and french abuse) you shal find the sound of the diphthong iu, keping both the i and u, in their proper vertu, both in sound and voel, as afore is said we ought: sounding yt in that voice wherefore we now abuse to write, you. What difference find you betwixt the sound of you, and u in gud and fust?" &c.

§ 473. Hart (in his specimen of phonetic writing as transcribed into palaeograph by Ellis, pp. 801, 802, according to the latter's interpretation of Hart's own symbols; it is possible that where Ellis reads (yy) we should understand (iu) with Holthaus, but this is also uncertain, cf. below): p. 801, "Nou third li for dhe Span iard, Hi abyyz eth dhe i, and u, in kon sonants as ui- and the Frensh du, and dhe u, oft n, in dhe Frensh and Skót ish sound." p. 802, "And nou last ov aul, dhe Frensh, uidh th- abyys ov dhe u, in dhe skót ish leik sound of dhe iu diphthoq, Huitsh, nor Ital ian nor Dutsh did ev er giv tu u, &c."

 adeo ut quod nos per V Romanum sonamus (u), illi libenter proferunt per v Graecum aut Gallicum (yy); nam et hic sonus tam Gallis est peculiaris, ut omnia fere Romane scripta per u et [probably a misprint for ut?] v proferunt, vt pro Dominus (Dominyys) et Jesvs (Jes-yys), intantum ut quae brevia sint natura, vt illud macrum v exprimant melius, sua pronunciatione longa faciunt. Hunc sonum Anglosaxones, de quibus postea mentionem faciemus, per y exprimebant, ut verus Anglosaxonice 7py. 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 robustiùs quam priores effertur, u angustiore, caetera similis $\tau \phi$ o. Sed v compressis propemodum labris, multò exilius tenuiusque resonat quam o ant u (boot) scapha, buut, (byyt) Scotica pronunciatione, ocrea". And again in his Greek Pronunciation: "v Graecum Scoti et Borei Angli tum exprimunt eum taurum sonant, & pro bul, dieunt exiliter contractioribus labiis sono suppresso & quasi præfocato inter i and u bül". [Ellis is, of course, responsible for the palaeograph in brackets].

§ 475. Hart (1569), see Ellis, p. 167: "Now to come to the u. I sayde the French, Spanish, and Brutes [i. e. Welsh], I may adde the Scottish, doe abuse it with vs in sounde, and for consonant, except the Brutes as is sayd: the French doe never sound it right, but vsurpe ou, for it, the Spanyard doth often vse it right as we doe, but often also abuse it with vs; [Holthaus somewhat alters the construction by printing a comma here instead of a semicolon] 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 togither vnder one breath, confounding the soundes of i, and u, togither: which you may perceyue 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 vpper teeth or gums, and opening your lippes somewhat, you shall perceyue the right sounde of i".

§ 476. Baret (1573), Ellis, p. 168: "And as for the sound of V consonant [a misprint for vowel] whether it be sounded more sharply as in the spelling blue or more grossly like oo, as we sound 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 perceyue in pronouncing it, our tongue at the beginning lying flat in our mouth, and at the ende rising up with the lips also therewithall somewhat more drawen togither".

§ 477. Holyband (1609), (Ellis, p. 228, note, Sweet § 870), in his "French Litleton", a handbook for learning French: "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, ioning the lips as if you would whistle; and after the manner that the Scots do sound Gud".

§ 478. Hume, a Scotchman who spent 16 years in England, (he was educated at Dunbar and St. Andrews and was afterwards Headmaster of the High School in Edinburgh, and later in similar positions at Prestonpans and Dunbar), in his treatise "of the orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue", EETS 5, ed. Wheatley, which was probably written in or soon after the year 1617, speaking of the "Latine vouales", § 18 (p. 10 Wheatley), says: "u, the south pronounces quhen the syllab beginnes or endes at it, as eu, teu for tu, and eunum meunus for unum munus, quhilk because it is a diphthong sound, and because they themselfes, quhen a consonant followes it, pronunce it other wayes, I hoep I sal not need argumentes to prove it wrang, and not a pure voual". Again, in his chap. "of the Britan vouales" § 9, (p. 11 Wheatley): "U, the last of this rank, the south, as I have said in the latin sound of it, pronounces eu, we ou, both, in my simple judgement, wrang, for these be diphthong soundes, and the sound of a voual sould be simple. If I sould judge, the frensh sound is neerest the voual sound as we pronunce it in mule and muse".

§ 479. From the above we derive at once one certain result; four of the six independent witnesses are agreed that Sc. u and Fr. u were pronounced alike, viz. Salesbury, Hart, Smith and Holyband. That they do not mean by Sc. u the same as OE. u is shown by the express mention of the word gud by Hart, Holyband and Smith; the latter of whom gives a number of other examples all containing OE. \bar{o} ; and besides, OE. u never could have been identical with Fr. \dot{u} , as it has remained \bar{u} unchanged in Scotl. from OE. down to the present day. We thus find that not only had OE. \bar{o} and OFr. \dot{u} coincided, but that in the 16th cent. the pronunc. was exactly the same as the French of that time gave to their vowel u; and from the phonetic descriptions of the sound given both by Englishmen and Frenchmen (e. g. Holyband in "Gentil-homme Bourbonnois") we are led to conclude that it was the same as that of Fr. \dot{u} of the present day, viz. high-front-narrow-round. The Scotchman Hume also identifies the Fr. pronunc. of u with that of mule and muse in Sc.

§ 480. Holthaus endeavours to use the above evidence in all cases as proof of a diphthongal pronunc. (iu), while Ellis everywhere finds support for a pronunc. as (yy). This latter must undoubtedly be right for the four mentioned, Sb., Ht., Sm. and Holyb., in their references to Sc. Hart's statements are, it is true, difficult to reconcile with each other, but, because he in one place gives a correct definition of a diphthong, there is no reason to hold with Holthaus that he never misused the word. Are any of those early orthoepists totally free from inconsistencies? And as others most certainly "abused" the term diphthong, we are not unjustified in supposing that Hart sometimes did the same. And he may have been led to it by his very explanation of the sound; he distinctly says it "commeth of i and u (or verie neare it) is made and put togither under one breath"; this must mean that it was a simple sound, but, so to speak, made of the running together of two sounds, which be therefore considers a reason for calling it a diphthong. We can quite understand an Englishman of the present day so analysing the sound of Fr. ü; in fact, many

a one, whose phonetic knowledge does not go very far, will be found to assert that the sound is a diphthong; in order to reproduce a sound foreign to him he has to think of two vowels known to him. Ellis and Sweet are therefore probably right in disregarding this little ambiguity, for, without doing so, we must find Hart's statements irreconcilable. Either it is untrue that the sounds in Sc. gud and Fr. fust are one and the same (and that they are is abundantly proved by the other authorities) or the sound in fust is a diphthong (iu), (for which there is no corroboration), or else Hart contradicts himself with regard to the use of the term diphthong (and for this confusion we have parallel instances).

§ 481. But perhaps there is another possible explanation of the inconsistency. Baret also seems to imply a diphthongal pronunc.; we might, of course, suppose this, too, to be the result of inexact appreciation, or incorrect description, as Ellis does; but can we not suppose that Baret was thinking of another dial., not that of Central Sc., but one in which (iu) was really pronounced? We find it to-day in N. Engl. and it may then have existed perhaps in some of the Sc. diall, or Baret may have confused N. Engl. with Sc. And Hart may in the same way have been at one time thinking of Central Sc. (yy), at another of the (iu) of some other dial. Hart is in any case open to the charge of inaccuracy, e.g. when he implies that the sound of u in Fr. fust is = you. Or are we to reckon with the possibility that he employed some dial. of Engl. other than that of rec. sp., in which you was pronounced with (yy), e. g. Devonshire, where it is so pronounced at the present day? It is a pity that the works of these grammarians are not published in full, and that we have not full particulars of their personal history. If our best phoneticians of today vary in their representation of the sounds of rec. sp., is it not much more likely that those of the 16th cent. should occasionally do the same, especially as the dialectal differences must have been then much more strongly marked in educated men than they are now? It is, of course, a priori probable that in speaking of Sc. pronunc. these grammarians should have had in mind Central Sc., that of the shores of the Forth, "the centre of political and ecclesiastical government, of the education as well as the commerce of the kingdom", but the differences of Sc. diall. have not as yet been sufficiently taken into consideration, and some of the authorities may have referred to other diall.

§ 482. Further, the following suggestion concerning the (yy) of Central Sc. may be allowed. It is perhaps not a perfectly regularly developed form, but due to contamination with French during the 15th and 16th centuries, the time of the "weill keipit ancient alliance, Maid betuix Scotland and the realme of france" (Lyndesay). The two vowels OE. \bar{v} and Fr. \ddot{u} were pronounced alike in Central Sc. as well as in the other diall.; but the pronunc of native development may have differed from the \ddot{u} of French as spoken in France, though not perhaps to a great extent, and then, during the time of the close intimacy with France, when there was such a large influx of Fr. words, (which, of course, would be introduced in their native form), the older vowel, whatever it may have been, was perhaps assimilated to Fr. \ddot{u} ; i. e. the vowel in the older Fr. words, which had

perhaps modified its \ddot{u} sound so as to coincide with the sound developed from OE. $\bar{\sigma}$, now returned to its original pronunc. (i. e. if we assume that Fr. \ddot{u} was always pronounced \ddot{u}) and took with it its ally, the descendant of OE. $\bar{\sigma}$. This perhaps may explain the double forms met with in the surrounding diall., (22) being the older one of native growth, and (yy) being the half-artificial one, which was distributed from the Edinburgh district and partly displaced the other. And in this way we can more easily understand the common (22) of the Southern Counties and Forfarshire. Moreover, Smith's words "Gallica lingua suam veterem quasi obliterarant", see § 474, directly imply that the Scotch had corrupted their own native pronunc. with a French pronunc.

On this theory we must reject altogether the general MSc. and N. Engl. (yy) suggested in § 468, and the mid-mixed-narrow-round vowel would then perhaps find most favour for Scotland. Still, the (y_1) of Devonshire by the side of the (2,2,2) of West Somerset shows that the (yy) of 34 may also have been of native growth. But the other suggestion is worth consideration.

§ 483. There still remain to be explained — (1) the agreement between N. Engl. and Sc. in 16th cent., if the authorities are right in stating that both have (yy), which may be open to doubt, although this sound might have been regularly developed in N. Engl. as it has been in Devonshire, while the Central Sc. (yy) was of external origin as suggested above — (2) the similar (iii) of Yorks. and (ii) of Banffs. The former, (iii), must be from 16th cent. (yy); is the latter, (ii), from a similarly developed (yy) or from the (22) of the neighbouring districts, or from the same (yy) as existed in Central Sc. of the 16th cent.? The last is improbable on account of the (22) of the intervening districts.

§ 484. The foregoing §§ give us few certain results; an attempt has merely been made to show, from the materials at hand, what varieties of forms we have to deal with, and what considerations are to be observed in order to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the various problems. One thing is certain, the pronunc. of OE. \bar{o} und Fr. \ddot{u} in Central Sc. (and that is what concerns us more particularly) in the 16th cent. was (yy). Salesbury's date, 1547, is, as we suppose, not so very much later than that of Clar., und we may therefore assume that the author's pronunc. of the vowels in question was also (yy) or something very near it.

§ 485. Now, as to the rimes themselves in Clar, although they are as varied as the orthography, still we notice that most of them fall into two classes, (a) and (n) in § 458, i. e. self-rimes and rimes with Fr. \ddot{u} , of which enough has already been said. From the rimes referred to in (f) we clearly see that the author also occasionally made use of an older pronunc. with \ddot{o} , but this can scarcely have been a known pronunc. in pure Sc., as we have to set the change from \ddot{o} to \ddot{o} at an early date; we must see here again a borrowing from Engl. The pronunc of to:so, soune: gone in pure Sc. would have been $t\ddot{u}:s\ddot{e}$, $s\ddot{u}n:g\ddot{e}n$, impossible rimes. For an exactly similar rime cf. K. Q., mone: stone, st. 72 (OE. $m\ddot{o}na:st\ddot{u}n$), also above § 22 (c).

§ 486. We notice also an \bar{o} instead of \bar{u} in the rime schuike: smoke, see (b); the ui must be due to a scribe, cf. the rime schoke: awoke in (a). Kluge, P. G. 1. 884, has called attention to the fact of this \bar{o} being found instead of u, and proved by the grammarians of the 16th cent., e. g. Bullokar and Gill, and by rimes and spelling in Spenser. It seems to occur especially when the vowel is followed by k, particularly in preterites, e. g. tooke, awooke, shooke, quooke, but also in the pres. looke. Fick, p. 14, also quotes mote (OE. mot?): fote (OE. fōt); (the form sw \bar{o} r mentioned by Kluge, is somewhat different, it corresponds to the Northⁿ form sware). Cf. Ellis pp. 863, 864, where we find the rime strooke: smooke: looke: shooke, Spens. F. Q. 5. 11. 22; this warrants us in assuming that our author borrowed his rime from an Engl. poet who rimed similarly to Spens.

§ 487. The rime behovit: hovit in (b) is also evidence of o-pronunc. in the former word, cf. the pronunc. in rec. sp. $beh\bar{o}v$ and $beh\bar{u}v$. We see the regular Sc. form of behoves in (n), \ddot{u} (with loss of f also). The rimes with soft in (b) and (c) merely show the shortening of the vowel.

§ 488. With regard to the spelling, we find o, oo, oe, u, ui and ou, and once each oui, eui and oi (louike, leuike, soine). Of these, u and ui are the most frequent, and represent genuine Sc. orthography; o, oo and oe are Engl. spellings. ou is only found before n, and that both in words of Engl. and of Fr. origin; the one case of oi, too, is in soine, OE. sona, which otherwise only appears with ou. This must mean a pronunc as (uu), (OE. \bar{u} is nearly always represented by ou), but there is no trace of this in the mod. Sc. diall. and we must ascribe this spelling to a copyist in whose dial. OE. \bar{o} and Fr. \ddot{u} became \bar{u} before n. We find the same spelling in Bruce, and also a similar spelling for OE. sona, fortoune: soyne; cf. Gol. soune: houne (= delay): broune, adj.: doune (= down) 819, Dunb. soun: toun 25.25, Rosw. soon: down 578, 644: renown 634, Hamp, fortone: sone, see Brandl p. 61 and Menze p. 68, who states that ou appears in later ME. texts of the EMidl. dial., especially before nasals. Noltemeier, p. 19, assigns one value, viz. \bar{u} , to all of the following, u, eu, ew, ou and o, even the o in broght!

§ 489. The rimes in (d), soine, soune: aboйe, at first sight seem to imply the same \bar{u} -sound, but in the mod. diall. soon always appears regularly with ($\partial \bar{\sigma}$, yy, ii, &c.) and OE. abufan has everywhere the same vowel as soon; cf. §§ 376 and 502.

§ 490. The rimes referred to in (e), with scho, pronoun, are virtually self-rimes, for in OE. $s\bar{eo}$ only the o has remained as bearer of the syll., cf. § 337. As usual, only o is written in final position, but the pronunc was the same as in medial position, for the mod. diall. show the regular forms ($t \ni o$, tyy, tii, $sh \ni o$, shyy, shii, &c.).

§ 491. For the rimes referred to in (h) cf. §§ 78, 79. Most of the mod. diall. have *ither* for rec. sp. other (the *i* is easily explained by shortening from (yy) or (ii)) but D. 33 has (a) and 36 (e), so also in mother; a further proof perhaps that the dial. of Clar. is not that of the Southern counties. Very likely the author wrote *i* in other rimes, brither: ither, &c., which the scribes altered to brother: other, &c. Cf. Satir. P. mother:

considder 5.104, brother: togidder 42.848, &c., Rosw. other: together 280, Burns, mither, ither, anither, thegither in Poor Maillie.

§ 492. If we can judge from the spelling, the rimes in (i) prove no irregularity in the development of \bar{o} , but rather in that of \bar{u} , cf. below, § 533.

The rimes in (1) and (m) belong to the same category as those in (n), as Fr. eu and $\ddot{u}i$ undergo the same development in Engl. as Fr. \ddot{u} , i. e. in medial position, see Behrens, P. G. 1.826. The rime in (o) belongs here too, for toune, rec. sp. tune, is altogether irregular; it seems to have received in Engl. the \ddot{u} -vowel instead of AFr. u = Central Fr. o; see Sturmfels, Angl. 9, p. 556.

§ 493. With regard to the mod. diall. of North Scotl., we have seen above that in D. 41 and 42 (the Orkneys and Shetlands) we have $(\partial \partial)$, while in D. 39 (Aberd., Banffs., &c.) we find (ii), and further South, in D. 38, $(\partial \partial)$ again.

Ellis EEP. V, p. 788, speaking of the language of the islands, says, "the present language is English, taught by Lowlanders chiefly from North Lowl. (i. e. D. 37. 38. 39) to Norwegians". Until the end of last cent. Norse was spoken; Ellis recounts the death in 1810 of a man who spoke "Norn", i. e. Norse. We must either suppose that the English was derived from the more southern parts of N. Lowl., D. 37 and 38, where (\mathfrak{D}) is still spoken, or, if it came from D. 39, which is more probable, the mod. (ii) of that district must be of quite recent growth, and we must understand the matter thus: OE. $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}$ became (\mathfrak{D}) in D. 39 as in the other diall. and remained so nearly up to 1800, and in this stage it got transferred to the islands, where it, as usual with transplanted languages, remained stationary in this form, while on the mainland it proceeded further and by the processes of raising and unrounding became (ii) in 39, and by raising alone (yy) in 40.

§ 494. 2. $\ddot{o} + ht$ — rimes with

a) itself. thocht (sb.): besought 1.882, brocht: besought 4.294: soght 4.468. - b) OE. ŏht. thocht, sb.: wrocht 4.1464. - c) OE. ā + ht see § 58.

These words are discussed above in §§ 59—71. The \bar{v} in $-\bar{v}ht$ was shortened already in the OE. period, cf. Kluge, PG. 1.868, and Sweet § 403, &c., and the $o\chi t$ seems to have remained in Sc. till the present day. The ou and the g of the MS. are Anglicisms.

§ 495. 3. $\overline{\mathbf{o}} + \mathbf{g}$ — rimes with

a) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$. swoun(e), (sb. from OE. $gesw\overline{o}gen$, ptc.): adoun(e) (of- $d\overline{u}ne$) 1. 504, 912, doun 3. 372, swone (vb.): toune ($t\overline{u}n$) 3. 754. — b) Fr. u. swoun, sb.: renoune 3. 2090.

The vowel in *swoun* is plainly \bar{u} (as the spelling suggests), due doubtless, like the \bar{u} of mod. Engl. woo, OE. $w\bar{v}gian$, to the influence of the preceding w.

For drew, prt., OE. drog, see §§ 349, 355.

§ 496. ho, vb. and sb., generally in the meanings stop, cease, delay, &c., only rimes in Clar. with $\bar{o} < \text{OE}$. \bar{a} , see § 39. It has been connected

with OE. hoga or hogu, and hogian, cf. Laz. prt. hozede, Rob. Glouc., howe, O. and N. hoze; cf. also ME. $h\bar{o}$ -li, adv. = ON. $h\bar{o}$ gliga (Bradl.) see Hamp., Ps. 39. 24, and $h\bar{u}lines$, sb. = tardiness, Hamp., Ps. 39. 24. But could not the verb perhaps be from OE. $h\bar{o}n$, used in a similar sense to Goth. $h\bar{a}han$, to hang, leave in doubt, which has been connected with Lat. cunctari? For this the occurrence of a form hon, &c., in MSc., apparently the same word (it has at any rate the same meaning), seems to speak; e. g. Sc. Leg. howne: alsone (sona) 7/196: done 39/590, hone: sone 32/228; Bruce, forouten hoyne: soyne 14. 182; Wynt. hwne: dwne (= done) 2880, Rat. Rav. hwn (= delay, difficulty) 1160, hwn: done 312, Dunb. hune: sone (= soon), Roll. C. V. hone: done: tone: none: throne 4. 629; Yw. Gaw. hone: undone. From the vb., of course, a sb. could easily be formed. For other instances of the form ho, cf. Bruce ho (sb.): to 20. 429, Wall. hoo (sb.): go: mo: woo: fro 2. 265, Dougl. ho (= cease, indic.): tho (pron.): tho (adv.): go: wo 1. 38. 23. Perhaps there was here a mingling and confusion of two words, OE. hogian and $h\bar{o}n$, and perhaps even a third, the interj. ho!, unless this be originally derived from one of the former (Bradl. derives it from ON. $h\bar{o}$). With Hamp.'s holi and hulines, cf. Montg. hulie (= slowly, gently) C. 396, hulv C. 1278.

ON. OE'

§ 497. 1. slægr — rimes with

Fr. e — slee: cuntrie 2. 1358. This word, like die, see § 499, falls into the same class as OE. $\bar{e}age$, $h\bar{e}\bar{a}h$, &c.; the gutt. is absorbed and a long \bar{e} , later $\bar{\imath}$, is the result in Sc., in contrast to the $\bar{\imath}$ in ME., later diphthong, mod. Engl. (ei); see Buss, p. 497 &c.

§ 498. 2. slægp — rimes with

OE. iht — slicht: knigt 3.420. This word, by the substitution of ME. \bar{v} for ON. \bar{c} (as in the adj. above) became sleg p and so was of necessity bound to follow the same fortunes as native Angl. $h\bar{v}h/u$, which in the N. soon developed $\bar{c}gp$ into $i\chi t$ and fell thus into one class with *cneht*, *cniht*, *neaht*, *niht*, &c. Cf. §§ 416 ff.

ON. **OY**

§ 499. døyja, generally spelt die — the vowel rimes with —

a) OE. $\overline{\bf e}$: me 1. 256, 3. 1748. — b) OE. $\overline{\bf eo}$: be 1. 1278: se 3. 362, 612. — c) OE. $\overline{\bf eah}$, Angl. $\overline{\bf eh}$: he $(h\overline{eah})$ 3. 1098. — d) Fr. e: prosperitie 4. 2670, 5. 2810.

The vowel is i from previous e. Cf. the preceding remarks on slee. All the mod. diall. have (dii) except D. 33 in which (ei) is always found in final position where the other diall. have (ii). (dii) is also found in Nthmbld.

TJ-

§ 500. 1. Not followed by g - rimes with

a) itself. aboue: loue 2. 238 (&c.). — b) OE. \mathbf{u} : owercum (inf.): dumb (OE. dumb) 1. 284. sone (OE. sunu): begune (ptc.) 2. 1706, 3. 266. soune (sunu): tonne (? OE. tunne) 5. 100. — c) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$. aboue (for aboune): soune ($s\overline{o}na$) 1. 506: soine 1. 158. — d) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$. owercum (ptc.): allone 3. 780. come (ptc.): home 3. 822. — e) Fr. $\mathbf{o} = \mathbf{ME}$. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$. luif(e): repruife 1. 266, reproufe 1. 296, love: remove 3. 698, louit: movit 3. 2174, luifit: movit 1. 264. — f) Fr. $\mathbf{o} = \mathbf{ME}$. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$. aboune (for aboune, OE. abufan): throne 2. 1346. — g) Fr. $\overline{\mathbf{i}}$. doure (duru): sure (OFr. $se-\ddot{u}r$) 2. 576, dore: pure 3. 764. spuris (OE. spura, spora): injuris 5. 1234. — h) Fr. e. come (pres. or prt.? the surrounding verbs are pret.): postrum (Fr. posterne) 5. 1406. — i)? aboue: rove (sb. = rest) 5. 1606. loue, vb.: vnrove (= unrest) 1. 1384.

§ 501. The question of the lengthening of OE. u- has been fully discussed above in §§ 361-385, where i and u are treated together. The rimes especially of weight in this question are those above in (c), (d), (e), (f), (g). Carstens, p. 26, derives above from an OE. form $\bar{a}b\bar{u}fan$, and then gives just the reverse interpretation to such a rime as aboue : loue, from which he argues that the long \bar{u} of $\bar{a}b\bar{u}fan$ has been shortened. We take the vowel u- to have been lengthened first to $\bar{\rho}$ and then, like original $\bar{\rho}$, to have become $\bar{\delta}$ or \bar{u} , here probably the latter, where pure Sc. is meant: but we must accept \bar{o} in some of the rimes, for the author in his Anglicising tendencies produces a mishmash neither Sc. nor English. We see, for instance, in (d), that the new-long vowel rimes with Southern Engl. $\bar{\rho}$ < OE. \bar{a} , and in (f) with $\bar{\rho}$ from Fr. o, (for the o in throne is different in character from that in move, prove, &c., which is (22) or (yy) in Sc. just the same as ME. $\bar{\rho} < 0$ E. $\bar{\rho}$, cf. the difference in pronunc. in rec. sp.). This is the result of the author's copying a standard poetical spelling which was strange to him. Pure Sc. would be (kam) or (koom, kyym): (heem): (throon). It will be noticed that one of the rimes in (d) is also inexact with regard to the conson. For similar rimes of the verb come (inf.), see § 377, where we find that the u- of cuman often rimes with ME. ō.

The author, besides the genuine Sc. and Engl. pronunciations with a long vowel, uses yet another sometimes, for the vowel is evidently short in owercum and sone, soune, in (b).

§ 502. The form abone or aboune for above was apparently unknown to the chief scribe, who wrote abone and aboune to the detriment of the rime; perhaps the latter is merely a mispelling for aboune; without the curl over the u there would be no difference between the two, but the curl is distinctly written in abone. In § 376 the forms of this word in mod. Sc. have been given. It is noticeable that the form with n is also found in the extreme S., and that the diall. of Dev. and W. Som. with their (22n) and (yyn) agree here too with those of Southern and Central Scotl.; it is remarkable how many points of coincidence there are in these two distant districts.

§ 503. The rime in (h) is probably the result of an arbitrary change of the suffix in *postrum* from OFr. *posterne*, similar to the change in *guthrone* 5.990 from *guiterne*, cf. § 43 (i).

§ 504. rove = rest, "Etheriall foullis in the air might mak na rove" and vnrove, = unrest, "That this regioun hes brocht from sik vnrove" see (h). The former word is not infrequently found, in different forms, in Sc. texts; it rimes generally with \bar{o} , or the vowel resulting from the lengthening of u-. But its etymol. has not yet been settled. Jam. Dict. (Donaldson's supplement) gives roif, rove, ruve, rufe, ruff, = break, pause, cessation, hence repose, quiet, peace, and connects with Icel. rjúfa to break, pause, interrupt; from which he derives the sb. rof, a breach, opening, interruption, and hence the meaning repose, quiet, peace. But this is open to question; the word appears in Sc. always in the latter sense; also the vb. rufe, only in the sense of to pause, cease, rest. The form unrufe, = unrest, Jam. connects with Germ. unruhe (!). Donaldson cites from Alex. Scott, rufe (vb.): lufe (sb.): mufe, vb., roif, sb.: proif, vb. : remoif, vb. : aboif : behoif. Cf. further Wall. ruff, sb. : luff, sb.: pruff, vb.: abuff, 6.60, Gol. vnrufe 499, Roll. C. V. vnrufe: abufe 2. 446, Montg. ruve, vb. : commuve : abuve : luve, sb. MP. 52. 14, rove, sb. : love MP. 6. 20, 15. 26, 20. 13.

§ 505. 2. Followed by g - rimes with

a) OE. $\overline{\bf u}$. zouth : south $(s\overline{u}p)$ 4. 750. — b) OE. $\overline{\bf v}$. zouth : suith $(s\overline{v}p)$ 4. 228.

§ 506. We must derive zouth from the Angl. form (z)iugup, cf. Sweet § 359, Sievers §§ 74, 157, t. Br. § 33, δ . The g is vocalised and absorbed in the preceding \tilde{u} , thus producing long \tilde{u} ; hence the rime in (a). That in (b) must be incorrect for Sc., probably an Engl. rime. Sweet, § 829, says the preservation of \tilde{u} in youth and uncouth in rec. sp. is anomalous; perhaps these are Sc. or N. Engl. forms which have found their way into rec. sp.?

U:

§ 507. 1. Before nn — rimes with

a) itself. sune (sunne): run (ptc.) 5.3022, sone: wine (for wune, OE. gewunnen, ptc. "to be wine") 2.970: begune (ptc.) 2.1612, soune: woune (ptc.) 5.1970. wone (ptc.): tune (OE. tunne) 5.1694. — b) OE. $\bf u$ -, see § 500 (b).

§ 508. The vowel is everywhere short; the occasional spellings with ou, e. g. soune, woune, might suggest length, but these are either scribal errors (it is true, the curve is sometimes written over the u, but we have so many other cases of faulty copying that we might well assume it here) or else the ou is to be explained, as by Morsb. p. 184, from the frequent interchange of o and ou in words both of Engl. and Romance origin (the final e is of no consequence). We take the vowel to be, as Morsb., Fick and others explain, not (u), u, but the mid-back-narrowround (o), the connecting link between (u) and the mod. (x), which latter is generally found in NSc. in sun, won, &c., just as in rec. sp.; possibly even this last stage (x), mid-back-narrow may already have been reached.

§ 509. 2. Before nd - rimes with

a) itself. wonder: asunder 3. 368, in sunder 4. 1030, wounder: sunder 5. 2310. sound, adj.: wound, sb. 3. 986, woundis (for wound) 5. 1510, wounde, sb.: stound 4. 2118. — b) Fr. u. grund: redound 1. 732 (&c.): round 5. 2284, ground: redound 5. 2030. sound, adj.: round 1. 1502. stound: abound 2. 1508. wounde, sb.: abound 2. 1870. houndis: soundis 4. 1660. asunder: founder 2. 1008.

§ 510. The above rimes, looked at from the standpoint of rec. sp., appear to imply that the vowel u in both sets of words has been lengthened before nd to \bar{u} , (which is regularly represented in Clar. by ou, as usual in MSc., cf. the lists in § 530) corresponding to ME. \bar{u} and to the (α) of rec. sp., except perhaps in the words in which -er follows, where we should generally expect to find a short vowel, although we notice that here too there is some uncertainty in the spelling, both o, u and ou being used, e. g. wonder, asunder, wounder, and this last would, of course, imply \bar{u} . In the other words the almost consistent spelling with ou shows that the vowel was long in all of them for the chief scribe. The u in grand may be an original spelling left unaltered, or merely due to careless writing.

§ 511. But the mod. diall. and comparison with other MSc. texts render it doubtful whether they were all pronounced alike by the author and whether the vowel sound in the words in (a) was not different from that of those in (b). According to Ellis's lists there is some variety in the pronunc. of words containing OE. -und in the mod. Sc. diall., but ground, sb., ground, ptc., found, ptc., wound, ptc., appear everywhere with (E), and also pound except in D. 42, which has (au); wound, sb., has always, and sound, adj. nearly always (uu) or (u), the latter has a diphthong only in D. 33; hound is more variable, it has (a) and (u) in 33, (a) also in 39, (au) in 35 and 36, and (ou) in 37. By (u) probably the halflong vowel is meant, it is not to be classed with (a) as if it were of the same origin; earlier \ddot{u} is nearly always (a) in mod. Sc. In no single dial. is there one consistent pronunc. with (a) or (uu) in all the words. We find, however, that two words are given with (uu) or (u) alone, never (a), viz. wound, sb., and sound, adj. It would therefore seem that, with these two exceptions, the regular pronunc is (a), and the (au) or (au), where found, must be borrowed from rec. sp., and not of natural growth in Scotl.

§ 512. With regard to words containing OFr. un, mod. Fr. on, followed by d, the evidence of Ellis's lists is, as far as it goes, perfectly uniform, viz. that the mod. pronunc. has only (u) or (nu). We find (un) in to bound, to found, in 33, expound in 39, sound, sb. in 42, and (u) in round in 37 and 39.

§ 513. There is, then, apparently a sharp distinction between the two sets of words; just as the words which in rec. sp. contain (gind) are divided into two sets in Sc., (ind) and (gind), cf. §§ 396 ff., so also the words which in rec. sp. contain (gund), spelt ound, are divided into two sets, (gnd) and (uund), in Sc. (It must be borne in mind that in all cases the d is liable to be dropped, cf. § 399; in some it is, in fact, unjustified in Engl., being a so-called excrescent d, e. g. sound, sb., bound = OE.

gebūn). We will call the former class, with (and), (a), and the latter, with (unnd), (b). To (a) belong all words which in OE. had -und, e. g. grund, stund, pund, fundian (= to go), the participles bunden, funden, grunden, wunden, &c., except the words wund and gesund, which belong to (b), as also all words containing OFr. un, mod. Fr. on, e. g. rec. sp. round, to found, to bound, abound, redound, sound (with excrescent d), &c., and words which earlier had an \bar{u} from other sources, e. g. bound (= OE. gebūn); also such words as crowned, drowned, &c., belong to (c). The cause of the unexpected \bar{u} in wound may lie in the preceding w, (the lengthening would be prevented in wunden, ptc., by the analogy of funden, bunden, &c., and in wundor, by the following r), but in sound, adj., the reason is less clear.

§ 514. In the Northern counties of Engl. it is very much the same. Class (β) has (uu), sometimes (ou, au), but class (α) has (u) or (u_0) , which is very different from the Sc. (u), half-shortened from (uu) and corresponds regularly to Sc. (a), e. g. N. Engl. (up) = Sc. (ap); so that the distinction between the two classes is here just as sharp. Wound and sound, adj., always have the long vowel (uu) or its local representative; otherwise class (α) has the same vowel as in under, wonder, up, &c.

§ 515. It seems, then, that, just as in the case of the words containing OE. ind, in the N., there was at first a lengthening and then a return to vowel-shortness, probably through a Norse side-influence; i.e. that in Nthmb. English a native form $gr\bar{u}nd$, on coming into contact with a Norse form $gr\bar{u}nd$, gave up its vowel-length. The observance of the same distinction between the two classes of words in N. Engl. makes it improbable that the oldest form of English in the S. of Scotl. was different from that of N. Engl. which is reflected in the Nthmb. Gospels, and these give, as in the case of ind, certain evidence of vowel-length both through accents and spelling with double u, e. g. hinduelle (centesimum) Matt. 13. S; hind (centum) Joh. 18. 12, 21. 8, pinda 19. 39, suundor 7. 18, suunder 8. 6; suundorlice, Mk. 13, 3; gründ, Luke 14. 29; also fif hūnd, with straight stroke over the u, Luke 7. 41, with which compare fif huūd, Luke 9. 14, where perhaps the stroke is meant for the u instead of the n.

§ 516. Whatever be the correct explanation of the short vowel, the mod. diall. would lead us to expect no rimes at all between words of the two classes (α) and (β) in pure Sc. We must therefore conclude that the author of Clar. did not write pure Sc. in these words, (for the rimes in § 509 (b) are too many for us to look upon them as merely careless riming); that is, his language had in respect of these words deviated further away from the vernacular and adapted itself more to Engl. forms that it had in words containing OE. ind, in which, as we have seen, it was more conservative (unless it be mere chance that he has no rimes between OE. ind and ynd).

§ 517. We find that many other MSc. texts show the same corruption, especially those which in other respects are strongly tinged by Engl. influence.

In the following, $\alpha : \beta$ rimes are given, where found, at the end of each list; — Sc. Leg. (a) bundyne: fundyne 19/288, (&c), fundyne: flungyne 19/346, hundreth (for hunder): wondyre 111/258, grownd: stovnd 139/124, stond (OE. stund): fond (fundian), grond: fond (= go) 155/1062, wondir: vndir 12/536, grond: stownd 209/434; (β) tond (= to found): ronde 111/314; $\alpha:\beta$, grownd: rond (= round) 164/264. Bruce, (α) stound : ground 10.501 (&c.); cf. pund 18.285, 521, hund 6.469, hund 6.491, grund 20. 324, grundyn 12. 520, fundyn 1. 322. Troj. W. (a) founde: grounde 1934, (β) woundede : soundede 2942, renownede : drownede 1744. Wall. (a) ground, sb.: bound, ptc. 6, 202, 11, 1112, into sowndyr: owndir (= under) 6. 578, ground: found, ptc. 8. 594, 10. 648, bwn (= bound, ptc.): fwn (= found, ptc.), var. bundin : fundin 9.664, bund : fund, var. bundin : fundin 11. 948, foun (= found, ptc.) : woun (= won, ptc.) 9. 1498, 10. 960; (\$\beta\$) wound, sb.: found, inf. 3. 204, (&c.), sound, adj.: found, inf. 5. 464, 9. 58, wnsound: abound 8. 788, sound, adj.: round 9. 1922, 10. 280, wound, sb. : abound 8. 226 : confound 8. 732; $\alpha : \beta$, stound : wound, sb. 6. 734, 9. 1306. Gol. has grund 8. 1026, fundyne 16, fundin 392 (&c.), vnbundin 1040, in which the u implies a short vowel for the scribe, but the rimes are all $\alpha:\beta$ rimes, found (fundian): vnsound: grund: stound 642, wound, sb.: found, inf.: round: ground 888, stound: found, inf. 933. Lanc. (a) founde: ybownd 502; (b) sonde, adj.: vound, sb. 106, sownis (= sounds, sb.) : clariounis 772, sown, sb.: bown (OE. gebūn) 1036; many $\alpha:\beta$ rimes, e.g. found, ptc.: wounde, sb. 272, founde, ptc.: expounde 1150, ground: wounde, sb. 1192, founde, ptc.: Iwond (= wounded) 246, &c. Dunb. (a) hunder: wnder 50. 23, vnder: in sounder 81. 114, vndir: hundir : wundir: asundir 8.39, and perhaps found, ptc.: pound: jocound (if last is derived direct from Lat.) 81.75; (β) sound, sb. : drownd 2.160, soun, sb.: toun 25. 22, woundit: refound it: soundit: confoundit 38. 31, cround : renownd 48. 154, wounde (sb.) : sounde, adj. 90. 17, soun, sb. : croun 6. 32; $\alpha:\beta$, habound: wound: stound: sound, adj. 9.159, stound: drownd: round: wound, sb. 72. 103. Dougl. is very irregular, and has mostly mixed, $\alpha:\beta$ rimes in Pal. of Hon. and King H.; in his Virg. they are also found, although the majority seem to be regular here - aboundit: roundit (= whispered): resoundit: ygroundit 1.10.14, hunder: founder : wonder: vnder: thunder 1.12.20, sound, sb.: ground: found: abound 1. 16. 6, confoundit: foundit: igroundit: resoundit 1. 21. 7, stound, sb.: ground: confound: wound, sb. 1.58.25, ground: sound, sb.: redound: wound, sb. 1.96.23, ground: sound, adj. 2.127.26, ground: rebound 2. 155. 4, wound: resound: found, ptc. 2.166.19, &c. Lyndes. (α) Mon. woundir: in schounder 3859, 5499, hounder (= 100): wounder 4027, ground : found, ptc. 4188, Sat. hunder: wonder 917, 2120; (β) Mon. sounde, sb. : redounde 187, confounde : drounde 1922, Sat. bounds, sb. : wounds, sb. 991, sound, adj.: dround 2097, found, vb.: abound 2969, abunds: founds, vb. 2971; α: β, Mon. grounde: sounde, adj. 764, grounde: founde, inf. 1700, bound, ptc.: confound 4111, wound: stound 3174, Sat. bounds, sb.: punds 2850, bounds; pounds 2959, pound: abound 3191. Roll. C. V. mostly $\alpha:\beta$ rimes, e. g. grund: found: round: sound, adj. 1. 140, stound : found, inf. : wound, sb. : ground : confound 1.648, found : ground :

abound: Mappamond 2. 126, stound: ground: abound: facound: confound 2. 415, vererund: bound, sb.: resound: redound: confound 3. 332, ground: stound: wound: confound 4. 354, &c. Satir P. (a) ground: found 35. 76, thunder: in Schunder 32. 120, hunder: vnder 43. 27, pundis (for pund): bund, ptc. 45. 803, fund him: jucundum 45. 118; (β) woundit: confoundit 17. 104, bound ($geb\bar{u}n$): toun 45. 879, boun: toun 45. 1073; $\alpha:\beta$, found, ptc.: abound 7. 196, stound: renoun: abound: resound 17. 168, fund, ptc.: wound, sb. 27. 56, wondre: fondre, vb. 29. 2, bound: redound: found, ptc.: ground 36. 148. Montg. (a) grund: fund C. 122 (&c.), thundring: wondring C. 235, thunder: vnder: wonder M. P. 40. 54; (β) round: profound C. 84, abound: sound, sb. C. 90, woundis: boundis, sb. C. 266, roundlie: soundlie C. 1441, rounds: sounds: bounds: confounds, S. 2, round: profound: abound: sound S. 56, sound: profound MP. 40. 46, &c.; $\alpha:\beta$, stound: profound MP. 40. 33, stounds (vb. = smarts, aches): wounds, sb. C. 741.

§ 518. As some of the above mentioned works were only partially examined, the α : β rimes may perhaps be somewhat more numerous than appears here. None of them appear to be free from them except Bruce and Troj. W., but it will be noticed that stound is of most frequent occurrence among the α : β rimes, so that perhaps it should like sound (OE. gesund) be reckoned to the β -class for some of the texts; as the word is not given by Ellis in his lists, we have no evidence from the mod. diall. to assist us; but if we make this allowance, then Wall., Dunb. and Montg. are also free from exceptions, which is a strong argument for placing stound in the β -class; these poets are on the whole so free from Anglicisms, that it would be astonishing if they here showed exceptions. The number of exceptions in the Satir. P. is very striking, seeing that in the treatment of OE. ind and ynd they are so consistent; we must look upon this as proof that, like the author of Clar., the authors of some of them had from some cause or other a more Anglicised pronunc. in this class of words; the mod. diall. show, too, as we have seen, less conservatism than in the case of ind, although it is uncertain how far the irregular forms are of native growth and how far due to Engl. influence. The Satir. P. require an exact examination and separation according to date and dial., for they are by different authors whose language will probably be found to vary in many respects.

§ 519. As in the Ms. of Clar., so with most of the other texts, it is very seldom that the orthography attempts to make a difference between the two classes of words, (α) and (β). This is intelligible when the rimes also show no difference, or when the texts have been copied at a later date by a scribe whose orthography was confused, as in the case of Bruce and Wall., both copied by the same scribe, John Ramsay, in 1488 and 1489. Only Dunb. and Montg. make an apparent distinction, the latter especially is very exact in using u always for the short vowel; an examination of merely the orthography of his poems would probably be very instructive.

§ 520. Other rimes, besides those given above, from Sc. and N. Engl. texts will be found given by Wackerzapp (the ptc. forms of verbs of

Class III); but his lists are often misleading, for he has included the form boun or bound (= ready, prepared, OE. $geb\bar{u}n$), which he has falsely understood to be from OE. bunden, ptc. of bindan; so that some of the apparent α : β rimes are not really so.

§ 521. It will be seen there that some of the earlier N. Engl. texts are free from $\alpha:\beta$ rimes with the ptc. forms, OE. bunden, funden, &c., e. g. Curs. M. has none; such seem to appear first in York P. But a special investigation is necessary to establish the date at which they first appear in N. Engl.

§ 522. The words of Engl. origin, in which an -er follows, only have a short vowel in the mod. diall. Ellis gives under with ($\mathfrak A$) in 33, 35 and 38, and ($\mathfrak A$) in 42, wonder with ($\mathfrak A$) in 33, (y) in 37, (i) in 41. In N. Engl. it is similar. It is uncertain whether the rime asunder: founder means that the author pronounced asunder with a long $\mathfrak A$, or founder with a short vowel, or whether it is a case of bad riming. The latter is, however, less likely, as similar rimes are found in Dougl. and Satir P., see above. If any weight can be laid upon the spelling wounder, perhaps we have to understand a long vowel in all these words as well; if so, some other explanation than Engl. influence must be found.

§ 523. 3. Before ng - rimes with

a) itself. toung : soung, ptc. 5.370. — b) Fr. u. tonge : impunge (vb. OFr. impugner) 4.2504.

§ 524. The spelling in (a) would seem to point to vowel-length, \bar{u} , for one of the scribes; whether it was so for the author cannot be decided from the rimes, but tongue appears in all the mod. Sc. diall. with short vowel (a), and in N. Engl. and N. Midl. it generally has (u) or (u), so that if ou correctly represented the pronunc of any district of that period, shortening must have taken place since then. Most probably the ou means a short \breve{u} as in young. In pure Sc. texts the vowel was altogether short; Montg. always has u, e.g. tung: sprung: sung: hung, S. 10. In Bellenden (Irving, p. 319) we find the same rime as in (b), toung: impugn.

§ 525. 4. Before mb — rimes with

a) OE. **u** - dumbe : owercum 1. 284, see § 501. — b) Fr. **u**. dumbe : Colune (? for *Columbe*) 2. 1670.

§ 526. The vowel is probably short, = (o), or (a). Montg. has u, not ou, e.g. dum: cum, C. 822, and we know that cum may have a short vowel in MSc. as it has in NSc. The b is already silent, cf. Dunb. dum: sum (= some): cum 15. 26.

§ 527. 5. Before II - rimes with

OE. y — full: dull (OE. *dyll, cf. § 549) 2. 1648, 4. 1472.

In mod. Sc. dull appears everywhere with (a), full has (a) in 33, 36, 38, 39, but also (uu) or (u) in 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, with vocalisation of the ll, 33 has also (fau) and 39 has also (fol). The author of Clar. probably pronounced (o) or (a) in both words.

§ 528. 6. Before rn — rimes with

Fr. u — murne: returne 3.658.

No evidence to show whether the vowel is long or short; the spelling suggests a short vowel for the scribe. Ellis does not give mourn, but

Murray says it and turn have (a) in his dial., cf. DSS. 148, 149, and Ellis gives turn with (a) in 35 and 39, but (oo) in 41. We shall probably be right in assigning (o) or (a) to the pronunc. of the author in both words. Montg. shows no sign of lengthening before rn, we always find u, e.g. turne: burne MP. 12. 8, murne S. 4. 11, murning: turning MP. 39. 27; cf. Dougl. Saturne: turne: soiurne: murne: spurne 1. 29. 28, Lyndes. murnit: turnit, Mon. 4005, Satir. P. murne: burne 13. 150, murne: turne 15. 32, murne: returne: burne: turne 30. 32, &c.

§ 529. 7. Before other conss. - rimes with

a) OE. \bar{u} , see § 530 (f). — b) Fr. u. thus : Clariodus 1. 208 (&c. passim) : perrellous 2. 1764 : noyous 4. 472. this (MS. for *thus*) : famous 4. 2514 : Clariodus 1. 286, 5. 238.

The vowel probably = (o) or (\mathfrak{A}) . In almost all words containing OE. u:, which have not yet been mentioned, the regular sound in NSc. is (\mathfrak{A}) , as in rec. sp.

TJ

§ 530. 1. Not followed by w - rimes with

a) itself. boun(e) (OE. (ge)- $b\bar{u}n$, see Brate, p. 37) : toun 2. 1292, 3. 1628. doun(e): toun 3. 1460 (&c.). about(e): out 3. 1548, 4. 2126: lout (OE. lūtan) 5. 2162. loud: clud 1. 726: cherude (vb. but not from OE. $scr\bar{y}dan$, but from the sb. $schr\bar{u}d = OE$. $scr\bar{u}d$) 1. 776 : schroud (sb. "syne to the scharpe assay of knightlie schroud", = OE. scrūd?) 5. 2006, cf. ischerowdit, ptc. 5. 2065. aloud : scheroud (sb. = OE. $scr\bar{u}d$) 2. 1676. clude (sb.) : scheroud, vb. 5. 3024. — b) OE. $\bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{w}$, see § 535 (a). e) OE. $\breve{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{g}$, see § 505 (a). — d) OE. $\overline{\mathbf{e}} \breve{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{w}$, see §§ 349 (b), 351. — e) OE. $\breve{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{g}$, see § 495 (a). — f) OE. $\breve{\mathbf{u}}$. ws: thus 1. 262. hous: thus 3. 782, 2388. — g) OE. ō. bruike (brūcan): forsuike, prt. 4. 2778: buike $(b\bar{o}c)$ 5. 1700. — h) Fr. u. about : stout 1. 76 : rout 1. 1388 (&c.), rowt 1. 572 : doubt 2. 1028 (&c.). out : doubt 3. 394, 4. 2094 : stout 4. 2460 : rout 5. 2194. without : dout 4. 1322 : stout(e) 5. 1964, 1992. ouris (NE. ours): valouris 4. 694. boure: houre 2. 572: honoure 5. 1714, nichbour: Amandur 2. 1036. bouris: garitouris 3. 290. hous(e): laborus 2. 720: joyous 3. 892, 2346 : pretious 5. 896. ws : chevalrus 1. 1264 : Clariodus 2. 466, 5. 794. now: wow (= vow) 2. 402: awow 3. 1706. doun(e): sermoune 2.142: renoune 2.1058 (&c.): fassioune 4.112, 2180 and many more. adoun: renoune 2.750: pardoune 4.1474 and others. toun(e): renoune 4. 1662 (&c): sojorne 3. 862 (&c.): sound 3. 354 (&c.): prissoun 4. 684, and many more. - i) Fr. ü. schoure: measoure 4. 1482, cf. Behrens PG. 1. 821 and Frz. St. V. 2. 118, and t. Br. § 75.

§ 531. OE. \bar{u} has remained the same sound unchanged in Sc. right down to the present day. All the mod. diall. of Scotl. show (uu), or occasionally (u), which may be half-long, in all regularly developed words; there are only a few, generally easily explained, forms with shortened vowel, none with the diphthong (ou) or (αu), except in D. 33, of which dial. it is characteristic that it always has (αu) for the final (αu) of the other diall., e.g. in αu , αu , &c., so that in this respect this one dial.

agrees with rec. sp.; cf. Murray, DSS., pp. 117, 148, &c. This being so we cannot well suppose that there was ever any diphthong in MSc.; the sound must have been \bar{u} all along, and the almost consistent spelling with ou in the extreme N. for pure \bar{u} is a strong argument against Holthaus and others, who argue from the orthography alone that the diphthonging of \bar{u} took place as early as the 14th cent.

§ 532. The rimes above in (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (h) are all proofs of an \bar{u} pronunc. The first in (f) shows the usual shortening of \bar{u} in OE. $\bar{u}s$, but the second, hous: thus, is somewhat striking, and most probably to be considered as a faulty rime, for there is no evidence of any shortening of the vowel in OE. $h\bar{u}s$ in any dial. Menze quotes the rime hus: us from Gen, Ex., but here the vowel in us is probably still long, as he suggests, or else the rime is like ours, faulty.

§ 533. The rimes in (g) are difficult of explanation if bruike is to be derived from OE. $br\bar{u}can$; the ui of the Ms. and the rimes seem to point to an older $\bar{\sigma}$; perhaps we have to do with another verb as suggested by Bülbring, p. 90, who calls attention to the form broke in Laz. and Sir Fer., in the latter of which it rimes with OE. \bar{a} . The weak form brukien, in Laz. explains satisfactorily according to our theory that OE. u in open syll. produces ME. $\bar{\rho}$ and MSc. \ddot{o} . We cannot explain from $br\bar{u}can$, unless we imagine that shortening took place before the c, as in $s\bar{u}can$ and other verbs, and that then the new $\breve{\nu}$ was lengthened again in the same way as OE. $\breve{\nu}$. Cf. the mod. form of rec. sp. brook, also Montg. brook: forsook: look MP. 8. 40.

§ 534. Perhaps the spelling with u in clud, rec. sp. cloud, indicates a short vowel (o) or (\mathfrak{A}) in the pronunc. of the scribe, for to-day cloud is pronounced with (\mathfrak{A}) in D. 33; cf. Murray, DSS., p. 148, col. 2.

§ 535. 2. $\overline{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{w} - \text{rimes with}$

a) OE. \overline{u} . trow $(tr\overline{u}wian)$: now 3.218.—b) OE. $\overline{eo}w$. trow: zow 2.552. As shown above in §§ 351, 352, we cannot derive the vb. trow from OE. $tr\overline{v}\overline{v}wian$, on account of these rimes, which both prove an \overline{u} -pronunc.; the bearer of the syll. in zow is only \overline{u} , $z-ow=\underline{i}\cdot\overline{u}$. The w of $tr\overline{u}wian$ has been vocalised and absorbed in the preceding \overline{u} .

§ 536. Of uncertain origin. goune, NE. gown: doun (OE. \bar{u}) 2. 1688. The vowel is, of course, \bar{u} . shout, ("Etymol. unknown", Skeat) rimes only with Fr. u,: stout 3. 400: rout(e) 3. 1064, 1072, and also contains the pure vowel \bar{u} .

\mathbf{v}

§ 537. Besides OE. cyning, for which see § 540, we only have the word OE. spyrian, to track, inquire, ask; which rimes with words containing a) Angl. $\bar{\bf e} = {\rm WS.} \ \bar{\bf e} = {\rm epeir} : {\rm feir} \ (timor) \ {\rm 5.1212.} \ - {\rm b}) \ {\rm Angl.} \ \bar{\bf e} = {\rm WS.} \ \bar{\bf e} = {\rm WS.} \ \bar{\bf e} = {\rm epeir} : {\rm heir},$ vb. 1.1248. — d) OE. $\bar{\bf e}$, mut. of $\bar{\bf o}$ — speir: in feir 5.2378. — e) OE. $\bar{\bf e}$ — speiris, 3. sg.: murthereris 4.108. — f) Fr. ie, e — speir(e): maneir(e) 3.1378 (&c.), speirit: requyrit 4.392, 5.502.

§ 538. This word is in the ME. and NE. periods peculiar to Scotl., where it was perhaps saved from extinction by the existence of the Norse vb. spurja. In Clar. it only rimes with previous \(\bar{e}, \) which has become \(\bar{t}, \) and gives us further support to our observations respecting the treatment of OE. i-, cf. above §§ 361 ff.; for the y was, as usual, unrounded to i in the N., and then underwent the usual lengthening in open syll. in the same way as i-, i. e. it became \bar{i} and \bar{e} ; for the i < y was also an i or (i), as shown by the frequent rimes with \check{e} in closed syll., of which examples will be found below, and which Brandl has shown to be found in all diall. (AnzfdA. 13. 97 ff) The form MSc. sper, late MSc. and NSc. spir, can be set by the side of rec. sp. evil = OE. yfel, ME. $\bar{e}vil$, (formerly considered to be a specially Kentish form) which shows the same lengthening in open syll. For a similar rime, cf. Montg. speirit: retyrit, C. 604, (the vowel in retyrit is the Fr. 7, undiphthonged; the rime does not prove that y has been lengthened direct to $\bar{\imath}$, but to \bar{e} and then $\bar{\imath}$, cf. reteirs: zeers S. 2); so in other MSc. texts.

§ 539. There is another verb exactly similar to this in its OE. form, viz. styrian, = rec. sp. stir, with short vowel (< ME. stir, Orm. stirenn) and mod. Sc. stir, with long vowel (< MSc. stir). Here we see the same difference between N. and S. in the treatment of i- or y- as in the two forms ME. giv, MSc. giv, giv. Stir does not occur in rime in Clar., if it did we should expect to find it riming, in the form stir, with previous \bar{e} (cf. the form steiring = stirring, 3. 717, with ei = i), as it does in other Sc. texts, e. g. Sc. Leg. stere: appere 11/476, Dougl. steiris: deiris: heiris: eiris: leiris 1. 16. 8, Roll. C. V. steird: leird 2. 157, Rob. Semple (Irving, p. 438) steir: neir: weir (= war): feir (= comrade), Francis Semple (Irving p. 580) steer: geer, sb.; also in Wynt., Lyndes, &c., and as sb., Rosw. steer: Oliver 660, on stere or asteer in Dougl., &c., see Jam. Dict. Chauc. has also $st\bar{e}ren$, with an open \bar{e} according to t. Br. § 24, β .

Ellis gives the form (stiir) in D. 39 and 41, which corresponds to (spiir) = ask, found in many, if not all, the Sc. diall.; both are common in Scott's works.

§ 540. OE. cyning. This word became cing in the OE. period, and presents in the ME. period the same form, spelt with y or i, in all diall., Engl. and Sc. The rime-words in Clar. contain

a) OE. i — king: thing 1. 106 (&c. passim): ring (OE. ring) 1. 360: sing 2. 1752. Also numerous rimes with verbal nouns and participles in -ing. — b) ONthmb. i = WS. eo —: zing 1. 804 (&c.), zeing 2. 1626 (&c.). — c) Fr. i —: bening(e) 2. 756 (&c.): resinge (= resign) 4. 2376: conding 5. 2392: ding (dignus) 5. 592 and others. — d) Fr. ei —: ringne (= reign) 1. 398.

These rimes are all perfectly regular.

§ 541. The mod. Engl. words breach and beadle have been derived from OE. bryce (Sweet, p. 327, where e in ME. is explained as being Kentish or due to the influence of brecan) and OE. bydel (= OHG. butil, see Menze, p. 46). If these derivations are correct, the two words stand parallel to the word evil in rec. sp. and to (spiir) and (stiir) in Sc. Skeat (Princ. 2. 92)

derives them from OFr. breche and bedel; but this is not necessary, for the OE. bryce and bydel would produce exactly the same forms as these in ME., at any rate in Northern ME.

\mathbf{Y} :

§ 542. 1. Before nd — rimes with

a) itself. mynd(e): unkynde 2. 284, 4. 1422: kynd 2. 398 (&c.). — b) Fr. i. myndis: declynis 4. 1118, kyndis (for kynd): ingyne 5. 790.

§ 543. These rimes have been fully discussed in §§ 396 ff. The two rimes in (b) prove the lengthening of the vowel-sound, which, as shown above, has already become (ei) or (ei) from previous (ii). The consistent spelling with y, not i, is to be noticed; also the loss of final d after n, see (b).

§ 544. 2. Before other conss. - rimes with

a) its elf. list: kist (prt. kyssan) 2. 206. — b) OE. i. fulfill: till 1. 104 (&c.): will 1. 1102 (&c.): still 4. 2264. hill: still 4. 1608, 5. 2182. thrist (by metathesis from OE. þyrst): wist 1. 1498: kist (ON. kista, = WS. ciest, cyst) 5. 1842. thine (þynne): within 2. 1484: skine (ON. skinn) 3. 728: in 4. 1048. forthinke (for-þyncan): drinke 3. 1614. kis, vb.: blise 2. 1256. wis (vb. OE. wyscan): blise 5. 2708. lift (sb. lyft): gift 4. 780. beclipis, 3. sg.: schipis 5. 2512. — c) OE. e. stint (styntan): hint (hentan) 1. 94, hinte, prt. 3. 494: vent (= went) 5. 1120. list: best 1. 640 (&c.). — d) OE u. dull (OE. *dyll, see below): full 2. 1648, 4. 1472. — e) Fr. i. list: resist 1. 866. — f) Fr. e. list: oprest 3. 1502.

§ 545. The rimes with i show the usual unrounding of OE. y. This began already in the OE. period, especially after c, (cining) and before palatals (hige) and before n, l + palatal (dincean, filizan), see Sievers § 31, note. The rimes with e are a further support of Brandl's evidence, AnzfdA. 13. 97 ff., and similar to the i: e rimes above in § 387, &c. There are only two words which in Clar. rime with e, viz. stint and list. With regard to the former we might conclude that the e of the rime-words hint and went had been raised to i rather than that the i (resulting from y) in stint had been lowered to e, as there is a tendency in many of the mod. diall. to change e + n + cons. to i + n + cons.; but there is also the opposite tendency to change i to e, as shown above in § 389, and although hint is the usual Sc. form for OE. hentan, (cf. Dunb. hynting = seizing 2. 8, hint : stynt 33. 88), we almost invariably find e and not iin went; so also in best, the rime-word of list, cf. Dunb. list: rest, 20.1. Therefore Brandl's explanation seems to be the right one, viz. that y or i is lowered to or towards e.

§ 546. This becomes more probable when we consider how many words containing OE. y are found to-day with e in the Sc. diall., e. g. Ellis gives yelt (guilt), hel (hill), ferst (first), den (din), medge (midge), breg (bridge), reg (ridge), sen (sin), pet (pit), ded (did), beznes (business), letl (little), berth (birth), felt (filled), kjest (kissed).

§ 547. This shows that in Scotl., too, y is more affected than i by this tendency to lowering, as remarked by Brandl, l.c. p. 100. The few

examples in Clar. are quite in keeping with his statement (p. 102) that the change occurs principally before s, n, r and l followed by a cons.; but the mod diall. show an extension in this respect, e. g. medge, breg, reg (OE. myeg, bryeg, hryeg). As B. further remarks we have to do with a variable pronunc., which is not consistently treated in any dial.; sometimes one form gains the upper hand, sometimes the other, so that we can make no hard and fast rule, and it is quite possible that the author of Clar. made use of double forms here again. But it would seem that in general the tendency i > e, especially y > e, is stronger than e > i, and finds its parallel in the change u > o which is also everywhere liable to take place; in fact, there is a general tendency to lower high vowels in English.

§ 548. It should be noticed that, although y rimes with e, we do not find e written for y in closed syll., but only i. The scribes, then, did not know the e-pronunc. On this y:e question cf. further Morsb, p. 41, who also remarks on the fact that in the London documents investigated by him e appears for y especially before n, ll, (l), and r, and accounts for this in the same way as Brandl, viz. by the special character of these conss., before which it was easier for i to assume a more obscure form. Cf. further Menze, p. 45 ff for the EMidl. dial.

§ 549. dull. Napier has lately, in the Academy, May 7, 1892, p. 447, suggested OE. *dyll. (= *dulja-) for the etymol. of dull, on the analogy of cluster = OE. clyster, bundle = OE. byndele, thrust = ON. þrysta, &c. This is much better than the hitherto accepted etymol. OE. dol. It remains to be seen whether the mod. Sc. diall. bear this out for the N. Generally we find $\check{\imath}$ or \check{e} for OE. \check{y} , but Ellis's lists give almost no examples of the words which have in rec. sp. an $u = (\mathfrak{A})$ for OE. y, bundle, cluster, &c., so that we cannot tell, without further evidence, whether (a), which is found in almost all Sc. diall. in dull, can be looked upon as a correct NSc. representative of OE. y. But we have some evidence which points this way, for besides e and i, we find (a) occasionally for OE. yeven where rec. sp. has another sound; this is especially the case before r, e. g. in worm, wort in 33, work, vb. in 35, 36, birth, mirth in 35, first in 34, 35, 39, 42; but also occasionally before other conss. e. g. in midge in 41, listen in 42, little in 34, 39, busy in 36, and everywhere in muckle, OE. mycel, which may, then, perhaps be explained in the same way as the Engl. (3) in bundle, &c. In agreement with rec. sp. we find (3) in comely in 33 and stump in 39. The sound (a) is in mod. Sc. generally equivalent to MSc. u, so that, if it correctly represents OE. y, this probably passed into u in MSc.; this makes the rime dull: full quite in order.

But perhaps there were sometimes parallel forms in ONthmb., with u instead of y?

Y

§ 550. rimes with

a) itself. lyte $(l\bar{y}t)$: syte (ON. $s\bar{y}ti$) 4. 1376. — b) OE. or ON. ī. kyth (OE. $c\bar{y}/an$): sweith 1. 532: alsuith 2. 990: alsweith 4. 38: belyue 5. .248. alyt(e) (OE. lyt): quhyte ($hw\bar{\imath}t$) 1. 814: myt ($m\bar{\imath}te$) 2. 1168, litt: Anglia. N. F. V.

wyt (= blame) 2.312, a lyte: tyte (ON. $t\bar{\imath}tt$) 4.1136. hyde (vb. $h\bar{\imath}_0 dan$): besyde 3.718: wyde 3.2080. pryde: ryd, inf. 5.2296. bryde: syde 5.1754. tyne (ON. $t\bar{\imath}_0 na$, = lose): myne ($m\bar{\imath}_0 na$) 3.1578. fyre: schare (for schyre = OE. $sc\bar{\imath}_1 rac{na}{na}$, see § 439) 5.2712. — c) OE. $\bar{\imath}$. thrist (vb. ON. $pr\bar{\jmath}_0 sta$, NE. thrust): wist 2.1568, thrust: wist 3.2096. — d) OE. $\bar{\imath}$. thrist: brist, ptc. 5.2026, brist, prt. 5.2336, see § 184. — e) Fr. 1. sky (ON. $sk\bar{\jmath}_0$): cry 1.738, 2.1544: harmonie 4.1610, skyis (for sky): chevalrie 5.1256. fyre: desyre 1.38 (&c.): ire 1.968 (&c.): seir (Fr. sire?) 3.1960: atyre, attyre 4.1056, 5.1724, fyrit: conspyrit 2.1808, fire: desyre 1.946. alite ($l\bar{\jmath}_0 t$): indyte 2.1872, alyte: quite 3.736: perfyte 4.2830.

§ 551. OE. \bar{y} is, as usual, like y, unrounded, and therefore rimes quite regularly with previous $\bar{\imath}$, and has with it the pronunc. (ai) or (ei). If shortened before double conss., it rimes with $\bar{\imath}$, as above in (c), or with $\bar{\imath}$, see (d) and compare §§ 545—548.

§ 552. lyte, alyt, &c., also found in Chauc., cf. Ellis, p. 276. The rimes in Clar. all prove length of vowel, (Cf. Dunb. lyte: endyte: quhite: wryte: perfyte 1. 71) and this form without final l is to be derived from OE. $l\bar{y}t$, see Sievers § 319. Sievers also gives $l\bar{y}tel$ with long vowel, BT. gives only lytel, lyt, without any mark of quantity. Ellis's lists give no trace of the monosyllabic form in the mod. diall. where we should expect to find (lait) or (lait). Ellis, 1. 290, says that in the S. of Scotl. little is often (laitl), especially as a proper name. The form (liitl), often spelt leetle, which is occasionally heard, is probably an emphatic form developed out of (litl), not a preservation of ME. litl, for leetle is not confined to the diall. which preserve ME. $\bar{\imath}$. In the regular course of development the effect of the l in the final syll. would tend to shorten the preceding vowel. In Clar. we find litill inside the verse.

§ 553. thrist = rec. sp. thrust. This is the form to be expected and generally found in the N. The Kt. form would be threst, and this is also found in Ayenb. and in Chauc.; the S. W. form would be thrüst, which produces mod. Engl. thrust, with (α) . in the same way as Southwestern ME. $m\ddot{u}che$ produces NE. much with (α) .

§ 554. List of irregular rimes.

1. 40. feild: behald, see § 173. — 1. 614. bricht: meike. Piper's emendation, eike for bricht, is probably right. — 1. 648. sende, ptc.: goŭe; the curl over the u is wrong, the scribe probably meant gone, which he wrote instead of wend. — 1.1144 chirurgiane: se, So come to him ane great chirurgiane Be the Kings ordinance his hurts for to se. Omit for and change se to saine or sane, with P. — 2.106. raid: remeid; It was me tauld or this quhair þat I raid Thairfor forzet it sen þair is no remeid. The meaning is rather obscure; raid cannot be OE. $r\bar{u}d$, prt., if the rime is pure; perhaps for reid = guess: remeid has everywhere else $\bar{\imath} < \bar{e}$, and is scarcely likely to have had its original \bar{e} -pronunc. here. — 2.164. call: deife; evidently corrupt passage. — 2.426. diamont: illuminat; The quhilke bricht was and illuminat. P. reads illuminand. — 2.1142. rap: brake; assonance? — 2.1196. prissoun: penance; P. changes prissoun to firmance. — 2.1232. anone: went, ptc.; read gone with P. — 2.1636. me-

lodie : instruments, P. reads minstrellie. — 2.1840. cheir : war, He said Madame forsuith my commoun war For scho hes oft me feistit for this. Evidently corrupt passage. — 2. 1894. glaidnes: Cousingne; P. reads glaidening for glaidnes. - 3. 278. convoyit: barrent; P. reads barrnet, but the mistake is probably rather in the other word: "baith burges and barrent" is probably correct, cf. Gol. barrentis, 5, 1274, 1335, &c. - 3, 370. bluid: bold; read wod with P. - 3.758. rebuike: fute (OE, fot); P. reads rebute for rebuike. — 3.1214. harnes (O. Fr. harneis): armis, pl.; assonance? The 2nd line is faulty in metre. — 3. 1496. dayes: perfay, P. reads day, MS. thir mony dayes. - 3.1932. lyfe, sb.: drave, As day begouth the night away drave; P. reads As day begouth and night away did drive; perhaps better, As day begouth the night away to drive. — 4.496. anone : fro; P. reads also for anone; the 1st line is too short, MS. And gart be gevine to them anone. - 4. 580. bline (OE. blinnan = cease): meine. told him all the maner and the meine. Perhaps for "all the maner maire and min(e)" (= less), cf. Gol. be mare and be myn: kyn: in: begin 1159, Sc. Leg. mare and myne: pare-In 209/416. — 4. 1500. dansit: France; read dance with P. - 4. 1540. keiping: go; P. reads ging for go, but there is no other example of ging = go, infin.; it would be better to alter kciping, for it makes the line a syll. too long; a monosyllable such as ho would put all right; or else read in 2nd line, And bad hir to hir Ladie it to bring. - 4.2086. thike (OE. picce): wicht, adj.; P. reads dicht for thike. - 4. 2140. humbillness: confidence. - 5. 176. also: went; read go with P. - 5.382. greine: cleathing; greine seems to have arisen through the two following rime-words Queine, scheine; perhaps we should read zing, tender flouris zing (: cleathing), or perhaps there is a more extensive corruption, and P.'s punctuation should be altered, viz. a full-stop at cleathing; then the following line would refer to Meliades who is frequently compared to a lily, &c. - 5.394. /yke: quhyte; the hevinlie rose with liquor new Pouderit in morrow with cristall dropis lyke The reid in equal junxit with the quhyte. lyke is unintelligible; perhaps for light if this word be allowed to rime like plicht: guhyte, 5.910 (?), see § 417. — 5. 446. dance: leising; P. changes leising to neance (?). — 5. 588. faire: cleir; read preclair for full cleir (Lat. praeclarus). - 5. 600. aray : taray; P. reads turnay for fresch taray which arose through confusion with fresch aray in the 1st line. - 5. 892. might: gift, And said thay had not seine so rich ane gift; read sight. - 5.928. age: craigis; corrupt passage. P. reads I engage in 2nd line. — 5. 1246. knight: heart; read might with P. - 5. 1532. againe: hande. Ct. 5. 2190 and 2396. - 5. 1594. snow: flew, All kynd of fleuris in the hall thay flew; P. reads flow, perhaps better throw. - 5. 1680. armes (brachia): armis (arma); A "rührender reim". - 5. 1870. veluote: bewate; Hes hir dispuilzeit of hir goune veluote And put on hir ane rosey of dew bewate. An obscure passage, but the rime may be correct, if bewate = wetted, ptc. of ME. biweten, and velvet be derived from AFr. veluet, see Skeat, Princ. 1. 296, note; Bradl. gives Ital. velluto. - 5. 1918. cumin, ptc. : windin. Perhaps only the ptc. endings rime here; but windin is suspicious. - 5. 1962. him: wine (inf. OE. winnan); assonance. — 5. 2064. seine : declyne; seine is

160 F. J. CURTIS, THE MIDDLE-SCOTCH ROMANCE CLARIODUS.

evidently a repetition of seine in the previous line; P. reads fine = cease. — 5.2190. Brisland: certaine; read Brislaine, cf. below 5.2396 and 5.1532 above. — 5.2196. knight: ring; read king for knight with P. — 5.2288. blaun: auld; P. reads bauld for blaun. — 5.2396. twa: Brisland; read twaine: Brislaine; cf. 5.2190 and 1532. — 5.2466. wayis: cheir; read maneir for wayis with P. — 5.2716. draweit: aryvit; perhaps for dryvit, a wk. prt. to dryve? or should we read dryves: aryves? — 5.2876. rehearse: mase, Blyth was the King to heir of his rehearse Vp gois the saillis preisit in the mase Of all the schipis of King Clariodus. rehearse = story, message, but what is mase? and how is the rime to be explained? Similar rimes are found in Satir. P. reheirs, vb.: grace: Hercules: allace: face: Greice 4.135, Wall. reherss: press 10.86.

Most of the above are certainly the result of careless or wilful alterations on the part of the scribes. Only a few assonances are perhaps due to the author.

Poole, Dorset, England.

F. J. Curtis.