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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Language—speech—is an individual matter, and if students of language have discovered anything in the past few decades, it is that this individual matter is also involved with human emotions. It is natural for anyone to defend the way in which he speaks just because it is the way in which he speaks and to look down upon any other way of speaking as inferior to his own. A Northerner cannot understand why a Southerner objects to his abrupt, energetic speech, and a Southerner cannot understand what it is about his relaxed drawl that irritates a Northern ear. The same emotional prejudices are also expressed toward differences in written language. Anyone who has had a friend or teacher or editor find fault with his writing, or has done the faultfinding, knows that emotions are almost always involved.

Even in the area of spelling, emotions and prejudices seem to rule; Americans may be just as irritated with a British novel which spells honor with a u and defense with a c as with a British actor who accents the second syllable of laboratory instead of the first. The English people's attachment to their own spelling has been at least partially responsible for bringing about an unusual situation in English; Stuart
Robertson points out in his chapter on spelling in *The Development of Modern English* that the spoken form of the English language has come to be so far removed from the written form that the only way a lexicographer can indicate pronunciation is to use a sort of synthetic language, a phonetic respelling of the written word to make it correspond directly to the spoken word.\(^1\) Surely this situation seems strange when one considers the original purpose for writing: to record the oral utterances of a language in some semi-permanent form. One can hardly disbelieve that this was and still must be the primary purpose of written language in spite of some who, ever since such revisions were proposed, have protested against phonetic revisions in our spelling with such comments as those made by Jonathan Swift in the early eighteenth century: "Another cause . . . which hath contributed not a little to the maiming of our language, is a foolish opinion . . . that we ought to spell exactly as we speak." This practice, says Swift, would destroy the traceable etymology of a word,\(^2\) would interfere with communication by admitting different spellings for each different dialect, and would be troublesome for those who learned traditional

---


\(^2\)Showing etymology, however, is "an office for which it [spelling] was never designed." Thomas R. Lounsbury, *English Spelling and Spelling Reform* (New York, 1909), p. 182.
spelling. It remains, however, as Thomas R. Lounsbury pointed out, that English orthography "defies the main object for which orthography was created."

The primary purpose of writing, then, is to record speech. Of course, since the two media, writing and speaking, are inherently different, it is really too much to expect of any written language that it should record perfectly its corresponding spoken form. It is almost impossible to put into written form all the elements of speech. In written Chinese, pitch, though it plays an important role in the spoken language, is not now indicated. In our own English, it is almost impossible to indicate without a very cumbersome set of apostrophes and accents and marks of other sorts the pitch and stress patterns which are essential to interpreting the language. H. A. Gleason, Jr., explains in An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics that written forms of sentences which would be perfectly clear in oral forms can be ambiguous in print; as he was proofreading an early form of his book, he came across the phrase "What thinking Americans do about language is . . . ." The phrase made no sense until


4Lounsbury, p. xiv.

upon re-reading, the author recalled what he had meant:
"What thinking about language is done by Americans is . . . ."
On first reading, one usually interprets the words as "What is done about language by thinking Americans is . . . ." 6

No written language can perfectly represent speech, but most others are better than English, whose sound-spelling correlation is at best "very complex and difficult to describe." 7 The languages of Italy and Hungary, for example, are much more nearly phonetic than is English, and children of those countries have little difficulty in learning to spell their native languages. 8 Clarence L. Barnhart writes of a correspondence with Ladislas Országh, who is compiling a Hungarian-English dictionary in Budapest; he quotes from a letter which Országh wrote:

We are not harried by problems which face the compiler of every English dictionary: we have no need to indicate pronunciation, for our language is written with an orthography that is remarkably phonetic, just like Turkish or German or Finnish. In English-speaking countries people need dictionaries to tell them how a word is pronounced. Such problems do not exist here. 9

7Ives, p. 167.
English is considered by almost any authority one of the least phonetic languages in existence and therefore one with the poorest orthography. Such has not always been the case. Early in the history of the language, English orthography could be considered reasonably phonetic, showing almost a one to one correspondence between the symbols used and the sounds for which those symbols stood.\textsuperscript{10} Since then, certain known influences and certain unaccountable whims have caused our spelling to develop into the abomination which it is today, in which exist some fourteen, or at least twelve, spellings for the sound $[	ext{j}]$, as found in shoe, sugar, issue, mansion, mission, nation, suspicion, ocean, nauseous, conscious, chaperon, schist, fuchsia, and pshaw.\textsuperscript{11}

The first form of a language which could be called Old English survives in the runic alphabet, which all Germanic languages once used, but by about 600 (Baugh says 597),\textsuperscript{12} when the Anglo-Saxons became Christianized, the language was written primarily in the Latin alphabet. Only a few of the runic letters were kept; Robertson lists $\text{þ}$ and $\text{þ}$ as the two most important.\textsuperscript{13} These letters were retained to represent the sounds $[\text{θ}]$ and $[\text{ð}]$. It would have been logical for $\text{þ}$ to have been adopted to represent $[\text{θ}]$ and $\text{þ}$ to represent $[\text{ð}]$ or even


\textsuperscript{11}Lounsberry, p. 180.

\textsuperscript{12}Baugh, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{13}Robertson, p. 88.
verse versa, but instead the two symbols were used interchangeably for the two sounds, and the spelling difficulties of modern English were officially begun. Old English also retained .Params for [w], which was later written w, and the symbols æ for [æ] and œ for the German ö sound, which were later written, respectively, a and e. The letters j, q, v, and z did not exist in English before 1200, and k was rarely used. On the whole, the symbols used for writing Old English were the same as those which are used for writing modern English, but the orthography was much more nearly phonetic than is ours. It was also more stable than it was to become a few centuries later.¹⁴

The first major influence on English orthography after it was established with the Latin alphabet was the Norman invasion. Ever since, the Norman French and their ancestors have been cursed by linguists and spelling reformers for the complex and unphonetic spellings which they brought into English, for example honour, colour, and similarly spelled words which British spelling reformers are still struggling with. These spellings often came in when Norman scribes, dealing with a tongue foreign to them, consciously or unconsciously carried over into English the conventions of their native tongue.¹⁵ The Normans also contributed four

¹⁴Ibid., p. 331. ¹⁵Baugh, p. 250.
letters, \( j, q, v, \) and \( z \), which English did not have before; since it had the sounds \([v]\) and \([z]\), these last two letters were needed. The \( q \), on the other hand, was not; it merely took over part of the duties formerly assigned to the \( k \) or the \( c \). It is now used before \( u \) to represent \([kw]\).

When, after two centuries of suppression under the Norman domination, English again emerged as the dominant language even in literary circles, the invention of the printing press, along with the continuing influence of the Great Vowel Shift, was the next event important to the history of English spelling. Printing brought with it two tendencies, one beneficial and the other detrimental to English spelling. The tendency to stabilize an orthography which had up until that time been almost an individual matter would probably be considered beneficial; it remedies half of the objections which Baugh stated to sixteenth-century spelling, that it was "neither phonetic nor fixed."\(^{16}\) It was no doubt detrimental that the spellings which were consistently used were generally unphonetic spellings which entered English during the sixteenth century and which occasionally varied from printer to printer or publishing house to publishing house in almost the same way they varied from individual to individual. Many of these spellings can be attributed to the same lack of familiarity with the English language which characterized attempts of the

\(^{16}\text{Ibid.}\)
Norman scribes to write English, for many of the early printers came, not from England, but from Holland. They introduced the spelling gh for [ŋ], which we retain today in such words as ghost. They also apparently took advantage of the still unstable spelling system to "justify" lines of print. Baugh cites as an example of this practice Greene's "Notable Discovery of Coosenage" (1591), in which coney is spelled cony, conny, conye, conie, connie, coni, cuny, cunny, and cunnie. But even with the variations which they introduced, the printers tended to stabilize the accepted spellings eventually, and at just the time when English pronunciation was changing about as rapidly as it ever would again. The pronunciation of each tense vowel, in general, became that of the vowel immediately above it on a vowel chart. Spelling was not changed to conform to the new pronunciations, and written English became less and less phonetic, though more and more stable.

The final major orthographic problem which affected English spelling resulted from a desire to improve the language and its orthography. Since the thirteenth century or earlier, spelling reformers had been in existence. The works of John Hart (The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our English Young, 1551; An Orthography, 1569; and A Methode or Comfortable Beginning for All Unlearned Whereby They May Be Taught

17 Robertson, p. 231.
18 Baugh, p. 252.
to Read English, in a Very Short Time, 1570) and that of G. W. (Magazine, or Animadversions on the English Spelling, 1703) represent attempts to reform the language in accord with phonetic principles. But there were others who used other reforming principles in revising English spelling, and many of these are now considered detrimental to English orthography.

By the sixteenth century, the humanistic influence of the Renaissance was a pervading force among English-speaking people. It brought about a great interest in and respect for all things classical, including the classical languages. Besides adopting almost intact the grammar of Latin and a host of Latin words, English linguists of this period adapted the spellings of some English words to show supposed derivation from Latin words. For example, scholars, seeing a kinship of some sort between the English word det or dette and the Latin word debitus, respelled the English word, and we still have debt in our language. Instead of revealing the actual etymology of the word, however, the new spelling disguises it, for Old English never had the b in spelling any more than in pronunciation in even the earliest appearance of the word, and the term probably entered our language, not directly from Latin, but through French. Many much more serious etymological confusions resulted in unphonetic spellings for such words as island, foreign, and sovereign. 20

20Robertson, p. 334.
And, obviously, the unetymological and unphonetic spellings have remained, frozen into the language by custom.

The influence of humanism and the desire to reform English spelling lasted at least throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By the end of this period, the spellings of most words came to be fairly well established; one has no real difficulty in reading the English of the late sixteenth century. The Restoration was a conservative period, and its practices became so entrenched in the English language that most of them survive today.²¹ The reasons for this conservatism and the tendency toward consolidation in spelling which accompanied it are of course complex, but Baugh believes that they were brought about at least partly by two factors: the growth of a prosperous merchant class and the development of class consciousness.²² The prosperity naturally brought with it conservatism. Class-consciousness and a basically flexible class structure caused groups to identify with those slightly above them in class and to attempt to imitate their ways, even their speech. This practice naturally brought with it a tendency toward unity and stability in language which has continued to the twentieth century.

The seventeenth century, then, represents a period in which spelling was not materially different from our own. Upon examining writing from that period closely, however, one

is surprised at the number of words whose spelling differs from that which is now used. Some of the differences are significant in determining pronunciation of that period; some help establish etymology. This paper is a study of the differences in orthography which are found in contrasting late seventeenth-century written English with that of today. An edition of the comedies of William Congreve, edited by Bonamy Dobree, was chosen for this study because it is accessible and because the original spellings and even capitalization have apparently been preserved; Dobree has the reputation of an accurate scholar. The plays contained in the collection are The Old Batchelor (first published in 1693), The Double Dealer (1694), Love for Love (1695), and The Way of the World (1700). This edition was published from the 1710 version of Congreve's comedies, which was printed before Congreve died.²³ It is possible that Congreve himself was responsible for the spellings used in this edition of his plays; it is also possible that an editor is at least partly responsible. In either case, the spelling is that of some person of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It is also possible, of course, that printing errors have been preserved in this edition of Congreve's works and that a few of the most interesting spellings are nothing more than mistakes. For

this reason, the frequency of occurrence of any spelling is significant; a printing error in one word might easily occur once in a text, and perhaps that same error could be made twice, but probably not three times. For each example cited, then, at least three occurrences are given when that many are found. In cases in which more seem significant, more are listed.
CHAPTER TWO

CHANGES IN HYPHENATED WORDS SINCE CONGREVE'S TIME

The spelling differences noted between Congreve's and modern writing may be classified roughly and unevenly into three groups: differences which deal with compounded or hyphenated words, those which deal with contractions or with other uses of the apostrophe, and those which involve the omission or addition of letters or the substitution of one letter for another. The first, encompassing about ninety words, is the smallest of these groups.

This group contains a number of expressions which were written as two words in the seventeenth century but which have become single words, or compounds, today. It seems significant that in no instance did Congreve write a word as a solid compound which now exists only as two separate words; the nearest approach to a breaking down of elements which were closely related in Congreve's writing occurs with a few hyphenated forms which now exist as two words.¹ The language

¹As no adequate terminology exists, two-word form has been used to designate what has been termed a "two-word compound"--two words often used together with a special meaning (as in "the White House," as opposed to "a white house") but written with space between them. Compound has been used to designate two such words written with no space between them, and hyphenated form to designate two such words written with a hyphen between them.
shows a tendency toward agglutination rather than toward isolating elements in the area of compound words, although in other areas it shows a tendency toward isolating elements; for example, Robertson points out that English tends to lose inflection by isolating and simplifying elements. 2

The largest group of words which have been compounded since Congreve's time is composed of the compound personal pronouns her self (28, 126, 261, +) 3, it self (319, 330, 345), thy self (54, 127, 350, +), your self (32, 127, 233, +), your selves (102, 138, 359, +), my self (34, 126, 260, +), and our selves (53, 308, 425). These forms were used as they are today both as reflexives ("You suffer your self to deceive your self," 278) and as intensives ("You intend to marry your daughter your self," 177). None of these forms is hyphenated or compounded in the plays. On the other hand, the fact that himself (53, 149, 354, +) occurs only as a compound gives evidence of the beginning of the formation of the compound personal pronouns. Himself came from the Old English dative or accusative form him and the adjective self, used

2Robertson, p. 111.

3Numbers given in parentheses refer to page numbers in Comedies by William Congreve, edited by Bonamy Dobrée (London, 1926). A maximum of three numbers is given; the + indicates that there are more. Capital letters have been ignored to avoid listing separately such forms as her self and Her self. Where possible, each citation refers to a different comedy to show continued use. The plays are The Old Batchelor, pp. 1-109, The Double Dealer, pp. 110-112, Love for Love, pp. 213-332, and The Way of the World, pp. 314-442.
like the Latin *ipse*, in the nominative form. Frequent juxtaposition of the two words brought about eventual connection. The *Oxford English Dictionary* shows a reflexive form, *himself*, which has a hyphen as early as 1250. By 1388 a reflexive *himself* occurs, but separated forms appear until 1513. All subsequent entries listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, both reflexive and intensive, are compounded, and one can assume that by the early sixteenth century, *himself* was regularly written as a compound.

The feminine counterpart *herself* appears in hyphenated form, *herself*, as early as the thirteenth century and in compounded forms in adverbial phrases or after a form of *to be* as early as 1430. Isolated cases of the compound in other uses are shown in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but the compound form does not prevail until after 1796. The neuter *itself* followed about the same pattern, with scattered compound occurrences before Burns' 1793 *itself* marked the general shift to the compound form. *Myself*, the first person singular compound, would ordinarily have evolved as *meself*, compounding the dative and accusative form of the personal pronoun with *self*, but apparently either because *her* in *herself* was felt to be a possessive form or because as *me* lost emphasis when it occurred with *self*, the final vowel of *me* went from [i] to [ɪ], often spelled *ye*, we have the form *myself*. This form went through a hyphenated stage during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries,
and myself predominated by the middle of the eighteenth century. The plural our selves followed about the same pattern. Your self, like my self, was changed to a genitive form from the older ye selfe and you self, earlier dative and accusative forms of the pronoun in Old English. Hyphenated forms appear in the fourteenth century, as does the two-word form. The compound appears in the sixteenth century and predominates by the eighteenth.\(^4\)

All of the forms discussed are ordinarily written in their compound forms in modern English. It has lost thy self, the compound form of the once-distinct second person singular pronoun thee, which was being replaced rapidly during the seventeenth century by the second person plural you. The old second singular form once held about the same position as does the French tu; it was used only in speaking to those with whom one was quite familiar, to children, or to those whom one insultingly treated as children. This distinction between you and thee is observed in some scenes in Congreve's comedies: When Sir Sampson Legend, in Love for Love, is conversing with the son who he thinks has lost his wits, he consistently uses the familiar form. On entering, he says, "Val, Val, do'st thou\(^5\) not know me, boy? . . . / How dost thou

\(^4\)Information on word histories is taken from the Oxford English Dictionary, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1961) and further material can be found under the word being discussed unless otherwise noted.

\(^5\)Italics have been added.
do, boy . . . come, thou shalt sit down by me. . . . come, sit thee down . . . I'm glad thou art better. . . ./ Let me feel thy hand. . . . I believe thou canst write" (291-293).

In speaking to his lawyer in the same scene, Sir Sampson uses the more formal plural: "Don't you go yet" (292). Congreve is consistent in making the familiar-formal distinction in the scene in which Mrs. Frail, hardly acquainted with Ben, uses the familiar--here, condescending--thou in berating him: "Thou wert born amongst rocks, suckl'd by whales . . . and thou art come forth with fires and scales" (299). But in the next speech given her, Mrs. Frail inconsistently changes to the plural form: "I am wise enough to find you out," then immediately goes back to the familiar singular: "Hadst thou the impudence to aspire at being a husband . . . ?" (299).

The compound personal pronouns are probably the most important group of newly-formed compounds in the English language, but there are other important groups. One is composed of those words which end with -body: any body (3, 113, 232, +), no body (28, 124, 214, +), every body (33, 113, 232, +), and some body (146, 316, 392, +) occur only in their two-word forms, and no compound with -body appears. The Oxford English Dictionary shows a first appearance of the compounded form of any body in the mid-nineteenth century; the two-word form itself did not appear until the late fifteenth century. No hyphenated intermediate forms are listed, though they may have existed. Nobody appeared in the fourteenth century and
was written as two words from the time of its appearance to the eighteenth century, when it was written as a compound. A hyphenated form was also used during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. **Every body** was even later in appearing: Lord Berner's *everye bodye* in 1530 is the first instance recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. **Everybody** appeared early in the eighteenth century, but the last recorded example, Tyndall's usage in 1860, is the two-word form. **Somebody** first occurred in its two-word form during the fourteenth century and was compounded as early as 1526 (Tindale's *someboody*); in 1623 *someboddie* occurs. Then, after 1724, the compound form seems to have prevailed.

Three later compounds with -thing form another group not written as compounds in Congreve's comedies: **any thing** (43, 114, 223, +), **every thing** (80, 150, 236, +), and **some thing** (202, 232). **Anything** and **everything** do not appear, although the first use of the two-word **any thing** and **every thing** occurred as early as the eleventh century. **Anything** was not commonly used until the middle of the nineteenth century. **Everything** came into common use about then too, with Dryden in 1681 and Macaulay in 1855 showing the first compounded forms listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. **Something** appears only twice in Congreve's comedies; once the word is hyphenated in the Dobrée edition (232) because it is divided at the end of a line. This occurrence could represent either a hyphenated or a compound form. The second
occurrence (202) is the compound form; since the Oxford English Dictionary comments that the divided spelling was frequent down to the end of the sixteenth century, one might expect both hyphenated and compound forms to exist during the seventeenth century.

Any where (114, 367), every where (262), and every one (212) all appear exclusively as uncompounded forms in Congreve's comedies. Anywhere originated as a compound (aniquar, about 1300), but vacillated between the compound and two-word forms until the middle of the nineteenth century. No form of the word occurs often before 1450; until then owhere, oughwhere, and aywhere were used. These forms were single words throughout their histories; perhaps by analogy anywhere originated as one word. Everywhere also first appeared as a compound. The first use the Oxford English Dictionary records for it occurred during the thirteenth century. By the fourteenth it was written as two words occasionally, however, and during the eighteenth century it was sometimes written with a hyphen. It acquired its stable compound form about the middle of the nineteenth century. Everyone went through about the same pattern, originating as eurichon about the thirteenth century, being written as two words during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth, and reverting to a compound in the nineteenth century.

The last group of related compounds formed since Congreve's time is composed of those words which deal with time and
involve the prefix to-. Although yesterday (389) appears only in its compound form in the comedies, all of the words beginning with to-, to day (30, 125, 286, +), to morrow (97, 125, 224, +), and to night (246, 253, 276) appear only in the two-word forms given. The Oxford English Dictionary comments that to-morrow (the dictionary lists all of the words under discussion in their hyphenated forms, not in the compound forms we commonly use) was written as two words always until 1500 and usually until 1750. Late eighteenth-century examples of all three words show that a hyphenated form was most common by then. Both compounded and hyphenated forms are listed by Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1961 edition, the Winston Collegiate Dictionary, 1946 edition, and Thorndike-Barnhart's Complete Desk Dictionary, 1958 edition. Since Thorndike-Barnhart comments that "Today (like tonight and tomorrow) is hyphenated now only by formal writers and by conservative publishers, or by people who learned to spell when the hyphen was generally used," it is apparent that American English has dropped the hyphen within the last sixty or seventy years.

Several other words which are not easily categorized have been compounded since 1700. When ever (written when e'er, 334) was originally two words and was so written during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; it was occasionally

---

written as one word during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Skeat’s *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, published in 1882, shows the hyphenated form of the word as the accepted spelling, although current American dictionaries give only the compound. *May be* (60, 99, 175) occurs in Congreve’s comedies and was compounded by the middle of the nineteenth century. The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives both *maybe* and *may-be*, the more popular spelling during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as acceptable, although modern American dictionaries give only *maybe*. *Hey day* (60) exists in modern American English in both compounded and hyphenated forms, but seldom as two words. *For ever* (193) appears in Congreve’s comedies but was generally compounded during the late seventeenth century. Strangely enough, the compounded *forever* has been retained in American English, but *for ever* is now generally used in Great Britain. Congreve uses the phrase "wind me like a larum" (134); *larum here represents a shortened form of *alarum*, itself an alternate form of *alarm*. The added *u* probably resulted from a pronunciation spelling of a heavy rolling of the *r*. The initial *a* was unstressed and simply dropped to give *larum*, a form found from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

---


In 1586 Bright wrote of "clocks, watches, and larums," and Lytton used the same form in 1846 in "a larum loud enough to startle the whole court from its stillness." The spelling was apparently merely fashionable for a time, however; only the original alarm survives. The seventeenth century produced the variant all arm, also, although Congreve does not use it. This spelling assumed a false derivation for the word, for it came into English from the Old French alarme, "To arms," not as a combination of the English words all arm. The regular alarm was never lost, and Congreve uses it (175) as well as larum.

Two forms, stander by (45) and in her stead (206) would not regularly be written now as Congreve wrote them, but probably would appear as bystander and instead of her. The compounds bystander and instead have come into general use since 1700.

Congreve employs the two-word good bu'ly (245) or the single word b'w'ly (376), whereas a modern writer would use good-by, good-bye, or goodbye—the spelling is obviously still not stabilized. By Congreve's time good had already taken the place of God in the contracted form of "God be with ye," probably by analogy with such constructions as "Good day" and "Good night."

Common place (350), used as a noun, is written as two words by Congreve; generally by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the form was hyphenated. By the nineteenth century,
the compounded form which is retained in modern English had
developed.

Congreve wrote *shall I, shall I* (396) for *shilly-shally*;
Congreve's form clearly shows the derivation from a repe-
tition of *shall I*.*⁹* The vowel contrast which developed is
similar to ablaut¹⁰ and appears also in such words as *wishly-
washy* and *dilly-dally*.

Besides the two-word forms which have become compounds
since the seventeenth century, there are many forms which
were going through a hyphenated stage at that time and which
have since become compounds. As these are numerous, they are
listed in Table I. One form listed, *coach-man*, appeared also
as *coachman* (165), both forms appearing within two pages and
possibly indicating divided usage. Besides dropping the
hyphen, *oil'd-skins* has also dropped the 'd, probably because
it is difficult to pronounce the four-consonant cluster,
and has become *oilskin* in much the same way that *waxed paper*
is becoming *wax paper* in pronunciation if not always in spell-
ing. *Short-hand* was used as a figure of speech to denote
only succinct English, for it occurs when Witwoud says of Petu-
lant in *The Way of the World*, "Thou art a retailer of phrases;
and dost deal in remnants of remnants, like a maker of

---


¹⁰Robertson, p. 188.
pincushions--thou art in truth (metaphorically speaking) a speaker of short-hand" (411). The word apparently had then about the same meaning it has now in general use. The form of writing which we now consider short hand was created in England about 1600, and the Oxford English Dictionary lists the word shorthand from the 1630's.

TABLE I

HYPHENATED FORMS USED BY CONGREVE WHICH HAVE BECOME COMPOUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-bed</td>
<td>406*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-drift</td>
<td>299, 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-foot</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-kin</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-new</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare-faced</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bed-chamber</td>
<td>187, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before-hand</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth-day</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-guard</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broom-stick</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach-man</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coffee-house</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down-hill</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head-quarters</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hen-peck'd</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot-headed</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human-kind</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journey-work</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knight-hood</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master-piece</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new-born</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night-gown</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o'er-match'd</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off-spring</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil'd-skin</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-landish</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-live</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-side</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-act</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-hear</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-heard</td>
<td>95, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-joy'd</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-reach'd</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-spreads</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play-house</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short-hand</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small-pox</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snuff-box</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet-heart</td>
<td>226, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406, +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather-cock</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when-e'er</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where-ever</td>
<td>223, 407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers listed in all tables refer to pages in Dobrée's edition of Congreve's comedies. Only three page numbers are given except where contrasting forms appear, in which case all occurrences of both forms are listed; + indicates that more examples occur than are listed.

In general, the words in Table I have moved in an orderly fashion from an original two-word form to the hyphenated form Congreve used and on to a compound state by the twentieth century. Another much smaller group of words seems to have reached stage two, the hyphenated stage, during Congreve's time, but subsequently to have lost the hyphen. The words listed in Table II are of this kind; they are now occasionally used as two-word forms, but are not spelled with a hyphen.

**TABLE II**

**HYPHENATED FORMS USED BY CONGREVE**  
**WHICH ARE NOW TWO WORDS**

| boils-over 89         | gall'd-beast 104 |
| cherry-brandy 377, 378| lap-dog 33      |
| closet-door 109       | morning-sun 108 |
| corner-house 99, 100  | side-boxes 130  |
| dairy-maid 165        | twin-stars 267  |
| fellow-travellers 108 | wedding-night 158|

Several other hyphenated forms which Congreve used are simply not in use now. **Rent-charge** (120) is not listed in most American dictionaries; **Webster's International** (second edition) lists it with the comment that it is now used in Britain. The word is not simply an older form of rent, but designates a special rent contract with an arrears clause. **Town-talk** (153) is not generally used now; one says "the talk of the town" instead. **Plain-dealing** (88, 374) and **plain-dealers** (217) are seldom spoken of. The remainder of the compounded forms which Congreve used are of the temporary type; a single writer or speaker may invent a hyphenated modern counterpart.
of Moor-husband (14), snow-house (143), or mouth-glew (433) today, but the words are not a part of standard English. In hyphenating adjective forms, Congreve’s English seems to have been about as indefinite as our own; Congreve did not make a distinction between use before the word modified and use as a predicate adjective. Ill-natured provides a good example of seventeenth-century usage; the hyphenated form occurs five times, three as a subjective complement (4, 94, 107) and twice in the attributive position (54, 268). It is once written illnatured (72), and this form occurs before the word it modifies. Good natur’d (125), never hyphenated, appears in the same position, however. A few adjectives which modern English would probably hyphenate, ill humored (64), fifty five (345), and long liv’d (312), appear without the hyphen in Congreve’s comedies.

The English language seems to show a tendency to move toward compounding two-word forms since the seventeenth century. Some words used by Congreve are now compounded, generally after progressing through a hyphenated stage. Some words Congreve used are now in that hyphenated stage. A few words have moved in the opposite direction, but the number is small and therefore insignificant.
CHAPTER III

CHANGES IN THE USE OF APOSTROPHE S SINCE CONGREVE'S TIME

In 1712, Jonathan Swift wrote "A Proposal for Correcting the English Language," in which he displayed great distress at the condition of early eighteenth-century spelling. He particularly condemned the tendency to contract words and form harsh combinations of consonants; this tendency, he said, showed the English people more nearly akin to rude Northerners than to gentle Southerners. Germans, Dutch, Swedes, and Danes, he pointed out, had little difficulty in learning English, whereas Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Italians learned it only with great difficulty.1 Swift's criticism could apply to the comedies of William Congreve; he is guilty of using a great number of contractions. Many of these contractions are not any shorter, if one counts the letters and apostrophes involved, than the complete form of the word or words for which they stand. They do, however, usually indicate the loss of a sound, generally a syllable, in pronunciation.

Most of the contractions commonly used today--don't (30, 31, 147, +), can't (30, 41, 44, +), and those containing forms of be, such as there's (26), you're (132), and the scores

---

of others—are all to be found in Congreve's comedies. There are also many which have not survived to the twentieth century. Of course, all those which involve the now-obsolete second person singular form of verbs—can' st (26), would' st (55), could' st (148), and know' st (205), for example—and those which involve the distinct second person singular pronouns—d' ye (139), thou' rt (55), th' hast (69), and thou' lt (101)—were lost when we lost these verb and pronoun forms. Others may have been lost because they were written to indicate a particular pronunciation when two possibilities for one word existed; after one pronunciation became established, a tendency to conform to a regular pattern may have caused the original spelling to be resumed. This is perhaps what happened to the largest group of contractions found in seventeenth-century literature—those which substitute _'d, or sometimes _'-t or _'-t, for the regular _'-ed ending of the preterit or past participial form of a verb. All of the preterit or past participial forms found in Congreve's comedies are listed in Appendix A,² divided into groups according to their endings. A glance at the list is enough to show that the _'d ending predominates by about three to one over the _'-ed ending. The _'-t ending is relatively insignificant; there are only twenty-six verbs which end with _'-t, but there are about four hundred and fifty which end with _'d.

²See below, p. 70.
The -'d spelling indicates a change which was taking place in the seventeenth century in the pronunciation of the past-tense inflectional ending. Formerly the -ed had been pronounced as a syllable; abandoned had four syllables, abused had three, accomplished had four. Because the -ed was never heavily stressed, it gradually lost force until it was no longer a syllable. As the new, shorter, pronunciation came into use, spelling began to change to indicate this new pronunciation: Congreve wrote abandon'd, abus'd, and accomplish'd. Swift considered this contracting a "barbarous" habit. In his comment that the custom of abbreviation made "harsh and unharmonious sounds" in such words as fledg'd, disturb'd, drudg'd, and rebuk'd, he implies that such abbreviations indicated pronunciation. That the result was the loss of a syllable is indicated in his comment that "by leaving out a vowel to save a syllable," a "jarring" sound, "difficult to utter," is formed. In spite of Swift's opinion, -ed is no longer pronounced as a syllable in most verbs. The primary exceptions to this convention are verbs whose stems end in -t or -d, as in abate, acquaint, act, admit, confound, delude, and descend. In order to pronounce a distinct -ed ending on such verbs and thus distinguish present from preterit form, a speaker must add a complete syllable. In all such words, Congreve spells the inflectional ending -ed, but in about sixty cases, he uses the -ed where modern English

---

\(^3\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 11.} \quad ^4\text{Ibid.}\)
does not pronounce the ending as a syllable. In all but fifteen cases—contained, controlled, cradled, desired, discharged, indisposed, pillaged, pratled, raved, repulsed, spared, stitched, stumbled, supposed, and threatened—the word also appears with the -'d ending. Most of the words show many more occurrences of the -'d ending than of the -ed; amazed, for example, appears only three times, but amaz'd appears nine; concerned appears three times, concern'd, twelve times; convinced appears once, convinc'd, seven times. A few words show the -ed ending more frequently than the -'d when both forms occur: assured appears two times and assur'd, one; dissembled, two and dissembl'd, one; hinder'd, two and hinder'd, one; named, two and nam'd, one; promised, four and promis'd, three; settled, two and settl'd, one. Obviously, the proportion of -ed over -'d endings even in these six cases is not great. None of the verbs which Congreve spells exclusively with an -ed ending but which we now pronounce with only a [d] or a [t] occurs more than once. Many of the -ed endings could be attributed to habit.

Congreve does not seem to employ the -'d or -ed spelling to distinguish between different individuals or social classes with any consistency. Laetitia, for example, in The Old Batchelor, fearing her husband suspects her of infidelity, says aside, "I'm amazed.\(^5\) Sure he has discovered nothing" (69).

\(^5\) Italics have been added.
A few scenes later in the same act, speaking to her husband after he has found a lewd book left by her lover, she says, "Dear Husband, I'm amaz'd: Sure it is a good book, and only tends to the speculation of sin" (36). Waitwell, a servant in The Way of the World, exclaims that he has been "marry'd, knighted and attended, all in one day!" (377), but later swears "Married we will be in spight of treachery" (420). Named is used by Careless in The Double Dealer and nam'd by Scandal in Love for Love, although the two characters are similar in social position and manners. Characters of high social classes use both forms: Mellefont in The Double Dealer, only a step below nobility, attempts to persuade Cynthia "to run . . . away . . . and be married" (170), though earlier he speaks of Sir Paul Flyant as one "like a gull'd Bassa that has marry'd a relation of the Grand Signior" (158). Perhaps since marry'd and married are in the small group of words which might indicate no variation in pronunciation, no correlation between either form and an individual or a class could be expected, but if correlation existed, one might find it in such words as amazed and named.

Some forms not listed in the Appendix show a close relation to those which are included; fallen, a past participial form which does not end in d, appears with a variation analogous to those listed. Fallen occurs once (36), fallin, three times (30, 100, 274). A number of adjectives which are not simply the -ed form of verbs are definitely analogous to the
verb forms in the appendix also. They are given in Table III. Forms which are merely past participles with the prefix un- added are listed in the appendix.

TABLE III

ADJECTIVES USED BY CONGREVE ENDING IN -'d OR -'ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-'d</th>
<th>-'ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big-belly'd</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cherry-cheek'd</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chitty-fac'd</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horn'd</td>
<td>244, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill-natur'd</td>
<td>4, 54, 268, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natur'd</td>
<td>59, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-ey'd</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-fac'd</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-matrimony'd</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shame-fac'd</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thick-skull'd</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two-legg'd</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-dress'd</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same generalizations can be made about these words as were made about the words in Appendix A: The -'d form predominates; both forms for one word occasionally occur. One, two-legg'd, is now generally pronounced as three syllables instead of the two which Congreve's spelling suggests. One spelled with the -'ed ending, bare-faced, is pronounced with only two syllables. The fac'd spelling is more common, however, as shown in chitty-fac'd, out-fac'd, and shame-fac'd from Table III, so bare-faced, occurring only once, may
represent a slip. Only one adjective occurs in which the -ed is regularly pronounced as a syllable—wretched. Other words which end in [tʃ], as wretch does, regularly contract the -ed syllable: Only two syllables are pronounced in approached, bewitched, and debauched, for example, and Congreve spells all three, as the Appendix shows, with the -d inflection. Perhaps the syllable is kept in wretched to distinguish it from retched.

One group of verbs from the Appendix list seems to represent an unusual phenomenon. The group is composed of dwindled, entred, frightned, happened, hindered, pratled, raffled, settled, stifled, stumbled, swaddled, threatened, tickled, troubled, undessembled, and whistled. Most of these verbs have infinitives which end in -le; two end in -en, and one ends in -er. All of these endings would probably be transcribed in phonetics as syllabics rather than vowel and consonant combinations. Apparently the syllabics which are used today were not commonly used in the seventeenth century: -ed was the most frequent ending for the past tense and past participle of these words in contrast to the preponderance of the -d ending for the entire appendix list. Only dwindled, hindered, raffled, settled, and tickled show -d, as well as -ed, endings. Entred, frightned, happened, and threatened indicate a tendency to omit the e in the final syllable

6See below, pp. 70-84.
of the verb stem when the -ed ending is added. This may have been brought about by a practice of stressing the -ed inflection more than the preceding syllable, since it is this preceding syllable which has been lost; [ˈθrɛt ən ɪd] might have become [ˈθrɛt ɪd], but [ˈθrɛt ən ɪd] would probably have become [ˈθrɛt ənd] or [ˈθrɛt ɪd].

The -t endings listed in the Appendix\(^7\) represent phonetic spellings of the regular -ed ending. Most represent modern pronunciations: -ed is pronounced [t] after [k], [p], [s], and [ʃ]. Only dreamt and learnt do not represent modern pronunciations, but even these are still heard occasionally and were probably in frequent use during the seventeenth century.

In addition to the large group of words in which he used -d or -t for the regular -ed ending, Congreve contracted many other words which are not usually contracted today. Phrases involving it were often contracted and written as one word; those which involve it- and a form of be such as 'tis (145, 263, 351, +), 'twas (40, 134, 217, +), and 'twere (34, 213, 375, +) or it and another auxiliary verb such as t'had (18), t'has (138), 'twill (157), and 'twould (109) are found occasionally in modern writing to which the author wishes to lend an archaic flavor or in which a dialect is being portrayed. It's is much more common than 'tis today.

\(^7\)See below, pp. 71-84.
of course; it now almost never contracts and combines with another word, although is regularly contracts and combines. It was has no contracted form in modern English. It were is almost never used now; it is a subjunctive form and survives almost exclusively in formal English or in set expressions—for example, "as it were." The contracted form is no longer used in standard English. Contractions of it would and it will are now it'd and it'll, with it preserved as in it's. Congreve also contracted it in such phrases as deny't (234), do't (207, 403, 407, +), hang't (60, 140), for't (42, 104, 418, +), if't (52), in't (25, 130, 256, +), into't (124), is't (124), on't (31, 143, 418, +), say't (396), to't (222 244, 414), upon't (412, 128), and was't (207). The phrases are all composed of a preposition or a verb and it; as long as the combination produced can be pronounced, it makes little difference whether the first word ends in a consonant or a vowel. In modern English all of the combinations except on't are replaced with their two-word counterparts; even on't stands for on it in some cases (54, 131, 314, +), but it more often stands for what we would write in modern idiom as of it.

The, unlike it, is contracted only before words which begin with vowels, as in "castles ith' air"8 (26), "abandoning th' ungrateful stage" (120), and "let not th' insulting

---

8 Italics have been added.
foe my fame pursue" (120). The contraction th' is written as a part of the following word occasionally, but generally stands as a word itself. Congreve uses t'other (56, 131, 214, +), still heard in some dialects, as a contraction for the other in most cases. The word was originally formed when the open juncture between the two words in the phrase that other moved to make the phrase the tother in pronunciation and then in spelling. Thet, modern English that, was originally the neuter form of the definite article the. The origin of the word is reflected when Angelica in Love for Love tells Sir Sampson, "Leave the t'other to me."

In often becomes 1 before th', as in the phrase "castles ith' air" mentioned above, "not 1' th' humour" (59), and "1' th' good man's arms" (121). Of often becomes o', as it is seen in poetry and heard in colloquial English today, before a consonant, as in "out o'sight out o'mind" (38). Of contracts in the same way that in does before th': "Think o'th' sting" (109), "Get out o' th' way" (158), "Think o' th' sad condition" (141). 'Em (26, 119, 370, +) is often used for them, as it frequently is today in representations of speech. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary does not list the form, however, and it is never written in formal English. He is contracted to a (416, 382, 403) or 'a (41, 392) where one might expect e. The 'e was already employed as a contraction for ye (59); a was possibly introduced to avoid confusion.
Three contractions which Congreve used throughout his comedies are now in dubious standing but are used in informal writing: 'till (193, 236, 346, +), tho (32, 125, 215, +), and thro' (243, 302, 344, +). Till is now regularly written without the apostrophe. The word was till when it originated in about eight hundred; the compound until, which now usually replaces till in formal writing, was not formed until about twelve hundred. Tho and thro', as well as till, are listed in modern dictionaries, but are not generally considered standard English in spite of the attempts of spelling reformers. Three other contractions Congreve used show pronunciations used today but have returned to their original spellings: wou'd (89, 114, 240, +), shou'd (91, 119, 214, +), and cou'd (101, 119, 225, +). All three of these words appear also with their present spellings, but the form with the apostrophe predominates by about eight to one. The l was no doubt silent by the seventeenth century.

The omission of y was rather common in Congreve's comedies. Ha'nt (39, 168) is seldom seen today except in representations of certain dialects, but the other words of this type--o'er (206, 340) and its compounds (o'ertake, 141), e'er (205, 321, 331, +) and its compounds (whene'er, 141), ne'er (38, 147, 239, +), and e'en (285)--are poetic forms today. The y is generally pronounced in standard English, however. One of these forms appears as a contraction in another spelling, also; e'en is written ev'n (189). All of
the forms are also spelled occasionally as we spell them today.

Congreve often substitutes an apostrophe for e, probably again to indicate pronunciation. The apostrophe is used where the e would add a syllable. In about half of the words in which Congreve used the apostrophe, speakers of modern American English pronounce the e: diff'reng (119), ev'n (189), gen'rous (335), gen'rously (334), heav'n (34, 145, 296, +), heav'ns (120, 263, 419, +), pow'r (19, 192, 368, +), pow'rs (178), 'scape (130), 'scap'd (121), sput't'ring (411), and stoll'n (26). Gen'rous and gen'rously, pow'r, and 'scap'd each occur once in verse sections of the plays--songs, prologues, and epilogues--and may have been written as they are to fit the meter. The other examples given, however, are found in regular dialogue. Two of the words in which Congreve substitutes an apostrophe for e are now regularly pronounced as his spelling would suggest: ev'ry (28, 145, 346, +) and diff'rence (212). In one, conqu'ring (118), the e might make no difference in pronunciation unless gu represents only [k]; then the word would be reduced to two syllables. One form, untord'ist (76), is no longer used. In the remainder of such words--diff'rent (340), ev'ning (154, 185, 186), list'ning (190), off'ring (284, 306), red'ning (364), and wand'ring (189)--current usage is divided, although modern dictionaries do not always reflect this fact. Webster's New Collegiate, for example, lists two pronunciations for list'ning:
it allows the shorter form for *evening*, but not for *different*, *offering*, or *reddening*.

In addition to its use in contractions, modern English uses an apostrophe in all possessive forms except the possessive pronouns. Congreve generally follows this practice, but in about three cases out of ten, he omits the apostrophe. This practice is much more prevalent in the earliest of the plays; *The Old Batchelor* shows possessive forms without apostrophes twenty-one times and forms with the apostrophe only seventeen. The other plays show no definite progression, but the form we use today predominates in each; *The Double Dealer* contains eight possessive forms written without the apostrophe and forty-five with, *Love for Love* contains one without and thirty-two with, and *The Way of the World* contains eight without and sixty-three with the apostrophe.

Though Congreve employed the apostrophe for the same purposes for which we use it today, he did so much more often than we would. His pages are all fashionably scattered with apostrophes in spite of Swift's condemnation of the "barbarous habit" of contracting words.
CHAPTER FOUR

CHANGES IN THE USE OF SPECIFIC LETTERS
SINCE CONGREVE'S TIME

The first group of words studied in this paper is comprised of those involving compounding or hyphenation; it is a small group of less than one hundred words. The second group dealt with is limited to contracted or possessive forms, words which contain an apostrophe. This group is the largest of the three, with about six hundred and fifty words; almost five hundred of these, however, are of one type—those which contract the weak inflectional ending of the preterit or past participle of verbs. The third group to be discussed contains fewer words than the second—about four hundred—but the words fall into much smaller subgroups and therefore involve a greater variety of orthographic phenomena than are encountered in either of the other two classes. This group encompasses words in which spelling changes other than those involving an apostrophe or a hyphen have occurred since seventeen hundred. The letters composing these words have undergone a variety of alterations: some which were doubled in the seventeenth century have subsequently lost one of the double letters; some have become doubled since that time; some letters have been dropped from words, some added, some
replaced by others. Words in the first subgroup mentioned are listed in Table IV; each contained a doubled letter in the seventeenth century, but does not in modern English.

**TABLE IV**

**WORDS IN WHICH CONGREVE USED DOUBLE LETTERS WHICH ARE NOT NOW DOUBLED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allarm'd</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barr</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curr</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eccho</td>
<td>372, 373, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excell</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linnen</td>
<td>161, 222, 257, 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melancholly</td>
<td>268, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mellon</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallat</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perruke</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rivetted</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settelmentts</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solliccit</td>
<td>405, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoll'n</td>
<td>212, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarr</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unparallell'd</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagg</td>
<td>270, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiggs</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One might expect English spelling to have lost many double letters since its earliest forms; duration, or quantity, of sound as well as stress was important in Old English, and one way to indicate a lengthened sound was to double the letter which represented it. Today duration of vowels and consonants is not phonemic in English as it formerly was; doubled letters are quantitatively no longer than single letters, as one can see by comparing the pronunciations of butter, batter, and button with cater, outward, and debtor. Modern English vowels depend on phonetic context for any variation in length; the vowel of gnawed, for example, is of slightly longer duration than is that of naught.1 Consonants are

---

lengthened only in such compound words as pen-knife, bookcase, and grab-bag, as compared with penny, beckon, and grabbing. The double letters in Old English winnan, bucca, and webba, on the other hand, indicated longer duration than the consonants involved would receive if they were not doubled. Apparently English has not been consistently moving away from the now-almost-meaningless doubled letters since seventeen hundred, however, for there are more words (twenty; see Table V) which have doubled letters since seventeen hundred than have lost a doubled letter (eighteen).

All of the words in Table IV show doubled consonants. Eight of the list of eighteen words show the doubling of one letter, \_\_. Since the letter is a continuant and could easily be lengthened in speech, it may have been still so lengthened in the seventeenth century. One of the words listed, stoll'n, appears also without the doubled letter as stol'n (282); wigg appears in beperribig'd (394) without its final doubled letter also. Wiggs represents the final category of words in Table IV, those with doubled final consonants. Three words which double final consonants have endings added: rivetted, settlementts, and unparallell'd. The Oxford English Dictionary shows that rivet was the regular spelling for the word without its ending; the t was never doubled even before a suffix except during the seventeenth century, and then only on

\[2\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 13.}\] \[3\text{Ibid.}\]
occassion. Parallel occurs with several spellings during the seventeenth century; the twentieth-century spelling parallel predominated then as it had earlier, but the forms parallell, parallell, and paralel also occurred. Here there seems to be no obvious connection between the use of double letters and duration of sound. Parallel is the only common form by the early eighteenth century.

The inflectional ending of settlementts probably does not affect the spelling of the base word; it would not in modern English. Since the Oxford English Dictionary shows no spelling with a double final consonant, the word probably represents either a misprint or Congreve's personal spelling. The other words in Table IV were probably written with the doubled final letters in the seventeenth century. This group, if one omits the two preterit forms rivetted and un-parallell'd, corresponds closely in number to the group of words in Table V which are now written with a doubled final consonant—befal, buz, coquet, and farewell. No general trend, then, toward or away from doubling final consonants is evident since seventeen hundred. For only one of these words, coquet, does there seem to be a reason other than convention for doubling the final consonant. Coquet came into English from French; the original form meant one who was cocklike and applied only to men. The word referred to women also,

---

4See below, p. 44.
if not exclusively, in the seventeenth century: Congreve designates Lady Froth in the list of characters for The Double Dealer as "a great coquet" (122). The feminine spelling coquette came into use during the eighteenth century.

Linnen and perruke also represent words in which continuants, in these cases n and r, are doubled, and again doubling them could indicate a slightly longer duration of the sound involved than is found in words spelled with a single letter. Because perruke came into English from the French perruque, the doubled consonant can be justified by etymology. Linnen, however, came from the Anglo-Saxon linen, and the doubled n is not etymological. The doubling of the c in echo is likewise unetymological; it may have been done to make the word look, if not sound, onomatopoetic. The doubling was done before the thirteenth century.

Table V lists the words in which letters have been doubled since the seventeenth century. These words do not fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORDS CONGREVE USED WHICH NOW CONTAIN DOUBLE LETTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>araignment 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>befal 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buz 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cinamon 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coquet 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulness 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desarts 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farewell 66, 67, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guzling 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugler 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into categories quite so readily as do those listed in Table IV. Besides the words discussed above which now have a double final consonant,\(^5\) there is one other group of six words—pratled, strugled, guzling, jugler, squabling, and scribling—which seem to have something in common. All of these words are verbs with suffixes added, and all of the verbs end in a syllabic \(\ell\). Two, pratled and strugled, were discussed in Chapter Three with the group of verbs which ended in syllabics.\(^6\)

The list just presented seems to follow about the same principle as did the verb list; when a word ends in a syllabic, the final syllable of the stem is lost when a suffix is added. The former syllabic is incorporated into the last syllable. In the case of the verbs, modern English has regained the syllabic pronunciation, as in \(\text{[præ\ell \ld]}\) and \(\text{[str\ell \ld]}\) rather than \(\text{[præ\ell \ld]}\) and \(\text{[str\ell \ld]}\). For jugler, squabling, and scribling, the pronunciation indicated by the seventeenth-century spelling, \(\text{[dʒyl \ld]}\), \(\text{[skw\ld \in]}\), and \(\text{[skr\ld \in]}\), are the pronunciations listed in current dictionaries. One also hears pronunciations with a syllable added, or regained, however. The lengthened pronunciation may result from a tendency to pronounce juggle, squabble, and scribble and merely add \(\text{[\in]}\), giving each word three syllables.

There remain ten words in Table V; several may represent etymological spellings from which we have since departed.

\(^5\)See above, p. 43. \(^6\)See above, p. 33.
Araignment, for example, probably had one r in the seventeenth century because it came into English from the French araignier. The g spelling, etymological but unphonetic, was not originally adopted, but was added during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Cinamon was an occasionally used spelling during the seventeenth century; the orthography of the word was not even relatively settled until then. Many variants appear during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, synamom, sinamon, and cynamum, among others. Cinnamon was the established spelling during the eighteenth century, and Congreve uses it once (354). The seventeenth-century cinamon, which Congreve also uses, may have been influenced by the French spelling cinamonde, which came into prominence during the sixteenth century. The French word came from the Latin cinnamom, which came in turn from an older Greek form. Another Greek spelling of the same word, however, produced a later Latin form cinnamn, which the Oxford English Dictionary states is "at least in part" responsible for the modern English form.

Congreve's spelling of desert as desart represents an unetymological form prevalent during the eighteenth century. The word originated from the Latin dēsertāre, which developed into the French désérerter. The spelling desart was also occasionally used during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries for the word dessert. Perhaps the -ar- spellings represented a pronunciation such as those found in
the American pronunciation of **sergeant** and in the British pronunciation of **clerk**.

The **Oxford English Dictionary** lists **dulness**, as well as **dullness**, as an acceptable spelling and comments that **dulness** was the prevalent spelling until the eighteenth century. The second *l* was added by analogy with such words as **smallness**, **illness**, and **stillness**. **Odlly** was the common spelling for the adverb form of **odd** during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and still predominated during the sixteenth. Even the form **od** for **odd** was frequently used in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. **Possest** and **possessed** are listed in the **Oxford English Dictionary**. The **t** no doubt represents a phonetic spelling of the **-ed** inflection, and the **ss** immediately preceding the ending may also have been reduced to **s** by the tendency to spell phonetically. Perhaps Congreve reduced **reddened** to **reden’d** for the same reason; though he uses the word with only one **d** twice, this spelling is not listed in the **Oxford English Dictionary** and may have been a personal preference of Congreve’s. **Stroling** occurs occasionally as a variant of **strolling**, especially during the eighteenth century. The form **strole**, the verb stem which one might expect from the form **stroling**, occurs as well as **stroll**; although the form is rather rare, perhaps Congreve would have used **strole**. Both **strole** and **stroling** represent modern pronunciation better than **stroll** and **strolling**, since doubled final letters ordinarily indicate a preceding vowel of [a];
perhaps Congreve's spelling indicates that the o was pronounced [ɔ] in these forms during the seventeenth century as now.

Besides those in which double letters are involved, there are many other words which have lost or gained letters since the seventeenth century. The only letter which has been added, generally restored, to a large number of words in modern English is e. The words in Table VI show the absence, in Congreve's spelling, of an e which appears in modern English.

**TABLE VI**

**WORDS CONGREVE USED TO WHICH AN E HAS BEEN ADDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Which Have Gained A Final E</th>
<th>Words Which Have Gained An Internal E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bath (verb) 89</td>
<td>buffoonry 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breath (verb) 26</td>
<td>changling 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigat 300</td>
<td>christnings 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulsom 31</td>
<td>falsely 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handsom 27, 412; handsome 30, 68, 74, 128, 259, 266, 270, 282, 313, 316, 335, 359, 382, 383</td>
<td>gally-slave 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loath (verb) 45, 360, 404, +</td>
<td>generous 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallat 41</td>
<td>listening 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare 119</td>
<td>mony 30, 40, 49, 59, 60, 64, 93, 99, 170, 220, 227, 229, 249, 285, 287, 303, 314, 352, money 40, 59, 60, motley 308, oftner 364, wholsom 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wholsom 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the words which have gained a final e since Congreve's time, bath, breath, and loath, exist in modern English with the spelling Congreve used, but that spelling is not used for the words in the sense in which Congreve employed them. The verb bath is listed as a word distinct from
bathe in the Oxford English Dictionary; it developed in the fifteenth century and occurred frequently through the nineteenth. It differs from bathe in that it is always transitive, it generally refers to a baptismal bath, and the bath is always literal. Bath as a transitive verb is still listed in modern international dictionaries. Merriam-Webster's second edition lists it also as an intransitive verb. Bath has never, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, existed in standard English as a verb. Breath, a sixteenth-century spelling, is the only form of breathe which does not have a final vowel, usually e. Congreve's use of breath as a verb was probably just a slip. That both the noun breath and the verb breathe existed in the seventeenth century and that the difference in pronunciation was then just what it is today is substantiated by Dobson in his English Pronunciation 1500-1700. Dobson mentions that Richard Hodges, whom he calls the author of "in some sense ... the only lists" indicating pronunciation in the seventeenth century, pairs breath and breathe in a group of words which show contrasting voiced-unvoiced consonant sounds. Loath is a spelling of loathe found from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, and,


9Ibid., p. 398.
like breath, is merely a variant spelling for the modern verb form. It never existed as an independent verb, as did bath.

In frigat, fulsom, pallat, and wholsom, the e was regularly dropped during the seventeenth century, although earlier forms show a final e. Handsome, unknown before the fifteenth century, was written at that time without the final e; the e was added during the sixteenth century and was, as Congreve's usage shows, predominant by the seventeenth century. Shakespeare was an acceptable form during the seventeenth century as it is now, though Shakespeare predominates today, of course.

In six of the ten words which Congreve wrote without an internal e that is present in modern English, the e is silent--challenging-kind, falsly, gally-slave, mony, motly, and wholsom. The habit of omitting unpronounced letters, such as the e in the -ed inflection when it was pronounced [d] or [t], may have carried over into other words containing silent e's to bring about this phenomenon. In challenging, the e would ordinarily affect the pronunciation, and one might expect it to be left in, but the analogy of other words with omitted silent letters was apparently stronger than the habit of pronouncing ng as [ŋ] unless an e followed it.

In the remainder of the words in which Congreve dropped internal e's, a syllable is lost in the pronunciation indicated. Each word existed before the seventeenth century with the e spelling, but some (christnings, genrous, listning) are pronounced occasionally as Congreve's spelling indicates they
were in the seventeenth century. *Oftner* may represent a pronunciation of the *t* which is usually silent in the modern English *oftener*; one does hear the *t* pronounced today, however, and since *often* developed from Middle English *oft*, the *t* is not unetymological in either orthography or pronunciation. In all of the comedies only four words appear to which Congreve added an *e* that is not now used; *Jesuite* (199), *oafe* (61), *haule* (272), and *sate* (for *sat*, 428) appear only once each. *Oaf* (96) also appears, and the *Oxford English Dictionary* does not list either *oafe* or *haule* as regular spellings; these two forms and perhaps *Jesuite* may represent Congreve's personal preference or slips in writing or printing. *Sate* was an accepted spelling for *sat* during the seventeenth century and may indicate a pronunciation of [set].

A class of words not listed in Table VI omits a silent *e* which would ordinarily affect the pronunciation of the other letters in the word. In *choak* (82), *cloaths* (for *clothes*, 40, 101, 347, +) or *cloathing* (57, 87), *doat* (69) or *doats* (53), *shoar* (301) or *a-shoar* (269), *smoak* (57, 155, 302), and *stroaking* (299) the vowel combination *oa* is used for [o], whereas modern English uses an *o* with a final silent *e*. We still use the *oa*, of course, in such words as *soar*, *coarse*, and *hoarse*, but even to these words we have sometimes, as in the last two examples, added a final silent *e*, as we often do after a long vowel. Each of the examples chosen has, too, a homonym or near homonym spelled *o-e* (sore, course, horse).
and an earlier form spelled respectively sore, corse, and horse. In the same way, each of the words which Congreve used has an earlier o-e spelling; according to the Oxford English Dictionary, clothes was used in the thirteenth century, cloaths from the sixteenth to the eighteenth; dote in the thirteenth, doat from the sixteenth to the present; smoke in the twelfth, smoak from the sixteenth to the nineteenth; schore from the fourteenth to the seventeenth, shoar from the sixteenth to the eighteenth. Broaker (422), now broker, seems to parallel the forms listed. Pairings (57), used for parings, may show a similar phenomenon also, though with a different vowel sound.

The letters ea representing [i] where modern English would write e-e, as in complete rather than compleat, is a parallel phenomenon also. This spelling occurs in compleat (304), extrem (330), extremes (370), extremely (26, 165, 370, +), leach (426), wheadle (408, 427), and wheadld (400, 438). Two of these words, leach and wheadle, may have possessed Old English forms which contain the digraph æ, which could account for the presence of the a in the seventeenth-century spelling. Leach is from the Old English læce, which meant either the blood-sucking worm or a physician; the two words may have been distinct in Old English, although they are commonly thought to have been one word. The etymology of wheadle is unclear, but it may be the survival of a special sense of the Old English verb wælian, to beg, from wædl,
poverty. The Old English spelling æ, which originally had a distinct pronunciation, fell in with [ɛ], often spelled ea, in the seventeenth century and by the eighteenth became [i], spelled in modern English e-e or ea. The now unphonetic ea is apparently beginning to be replaced by the more phonetic e-e spelling since the seventeenth century. In only one word, steddy (325), does Congreve use an e where modern English would use ea, and the sound represented here is not [i]. Congreve's spelling may represent a phonetic recasting or a confusion in etymology. The word came from the Anglo-Saxon stæd, a place or shore. The words stede, a place, and stædig, sterile, are related to stæd but are not direct ancestors of steady.11

A final spelling development since seventeen hundred which involves the e is the substitution of i for e or e for i in modern English. In imploy'd (101), impower'd (434), inhancing (159), intire (26, 38, 171), intirely (3, 140), intitle (33), and intreat (204, 395), Congreve uses an initial i with m or n where modern English substitutes an e. In each case, the word is spelled with an initial e in its earliest English form; the e became i in the sixteenth or seventeenth century and reverted to e in the eighteenth or nineteenth. In contrast to these forms, Congreve's encrease (70) and enquire

10Robertson, p. 101.

(78, 212) are now begun with an i. The e is in accord with the immediate etymology of both words, as it is with employed and the other words listed above. Encresse is from the French encreistre and enquire from the French enguerre. Both words appear in earlier Latin forms with an i (incrēscēre and inquērēre); perhaps these later i forms represent Latinized spellings. Similarly, Congreve uses imploy, which came into English through the French employer, from an earlier Latin form implicare; impower, intitle, and intreat, which begin with the French prefix em or en, a development of the Latin in; enhance, which came from the French enhaucier, a form of the earlier Latin in- prefix with altiāre; and intire, which came from the French entier, a modification of the Latin in-teger.

The cases in which Congreve uses an internal e where i now prevails or an i where e now prevails are more difficult to explain, although they are less numerous, than those involving an initial vowel change. Vertue (90, 158, 329, 345) and vertuous (28, 90) may, like the words discussed above, represent Latinized spellings since the base word comes directly from the French virtu but has the Latin virtus as an earlier ancestor; unlike the forms just discussed, the final Latinization of these words has occurred since the seventeenth century rather than before or during it, however. Both e and

12See p. 53.
spellings occur by the thirteenth century, and both occur in Congreve's comedies; virtue (182, 183, 194, 233, 248, 253, 265, 289, 392, 393, 422, 425, 426) and virtues (248, 329), as well as virtuous (117), occur and apparently represent the more popular spelling. The e variation was not entirely lost until the eighteenth century, however. The spelling ideot (96) cannot be explained through etymology, since both the French idiot and the Latin idiot are spelled with an internal, as well as an initial, i. The form idiot (340, 377, 385) was more popular with Congreve as well as with most writers of his generation. The i found in mungril (72) is similarly unetymological, as is the y, for the word is probably a double diminutive form (like pick-er-el and cock-er-el)\textsuperscript{13} of the Anglo-Saxon meng, mang, mong, a mixture. Many variations occur in the orthography of this word; mongrel does not become established until after the seventeenth century, and probably represents an attempt to reveal the word's etymology. Mungril was probably a pronunciation spelling and indicates that seventeenth-century pronunciation was the same as the "preferred" pronunciation listed in modern dictionaries. The form was in use from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century.

In contrast to what may have been a tendency to Latinize spellings by using an i rather than an e, the seventeenth

century writers almost invariably kept the French spelling ou rather than revert to the simpler and more nearly phonetic o spelling found in Latin, in such words as those listed in Table VII. British English still occasionally uses some of these forms, of course, because, as Lounsbury states, the y, "that unnecessary vowel, shows that the word was derived immediately from the French, and only remotely from the Latin."  

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words in which Congreve used ou where Modern American English uses o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>behavior 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controulable 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colour 93, 362, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enamour'd 376, 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endeavour 398, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favour 38, 114, 332, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harbour 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honour 42, 113, 215, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humour 1, 130, 230, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour 113, 126, 143, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirour 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mould 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbours 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valour 36, 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapours 136, 344, 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vigour 36, 313, 345, +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spellings ie and y for [i], [i], or [aɪ] seem to have been about as irregular in the seventeenth century as they are today. The problem of whether to change a final y to ie before adding an ending was apparently not quite as great then as now, however; one then had a better chance of being correct if he did not change a y. This was especially so for the verbs ending in y to which 'd was added. Since ied might possibly have represented two syllables, such words as apply'd (28, 215, 264), satisfy'd (153, 159, 174, +), and

---

14 Lounsbury, p. 5.
try'd (109, 212, 267) generally ended in y'd, a spelling which could not represent two syllables. The y'd endings can be observed on many of the verbs listed in Appendix A. Following a similar pattern, Congreve uses the noun soliloquys (29) and the adjective unlucky'st (181), which do not change y to ie before adding inflectional endings. Many words which now end in y, on the other hand, were spelled with a final ie in the seventeenth century. These words include verbs, nouns, and adjectives, as shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
WORDS IN WHICH CONGREVE USED A FINAL IE WHERE MODERN ENGLISH USES Y

| Busie 125, 164 | Mollifie 92 |
| Busied 199 | Mortifie 130, 131, 219 |
| Certifie 221 | Noisie 123, 410 |
| Controversie 44, 252 | Petrifie 432 |
| Courtesie 39 | Prophesie 119, 277, 295, + |
| Defie 95, 244, 427, + | Qualifie 81, 148, 236 |
| Easie 31, 114, 314, + | Satisfie 229, 315, 425, + |
| Ecstasie 155 | Secresie 91, 218, 408, + |
| Effigie 27, 54 | Signifie 283, 288 |
| Fortifie 94, 432 | Testifie 39 |
| Gratifie 206, 217 | Tipsie 128, 410 |
| Hypocrisie 67, 149, 308 | Topsy turvy 208, 414 |
| Jealousie 28, 148, 266, + | Uneasie 29, 148, 288, + |
| Justifie 61, 115, 186 | Vagarie 176 |

A few of these words show ie stems but change to y before a final inflection; though justifie appears in the plays, justifying (117) does also; both mollifie and mollifying (134), qualifie and qualify'd (160), satisfie and satisfy'd (232,

15 See below, pp.
278, 363) are used. Before the ing ending, one might expect y because of the awkward -ieing which would otherwise result. The y must be used, again, because ied could represent two syllables. All of the words in Table VIII were written with ie endings in the seventeenth century and with y endings now; they represent the modern tendency to use y at the ends of words and i or ie otherwise. 16 The y ending is kept, as Jespersen states, before endings which are "felt more or less independent elements" only, as in ladyship. 17 Ladyship (265, 287) was used in the seventeenth century as it is today, but the tendency to use i internally predominated in this word. Congreve uses Ladiship some twenty times from page 371 to page 437 alone. He also uses an internal i in embrio (358, 397), oisters (252), staid (for stayed, 351, 371, 410), and plaid (for played, 329). He uses a y, however, in enjoyn'd (1), fryar (393), livelyhood (291), magpye (78), party-coloured (64), satyrical (2), syres (118), and tygers (142). The choice of i or y seems random, though consistent for any one word used except oister and enjoin'd (388). The distinction between die and dye had not yet developed, and Congreve used both spellings for our word die. He likewise makes no distinction between lie and lye, and some of his humor is based on a confusion of the two meanings "to sleep" and "to tell a

17 Ibid.
falsehood," as when Heartwell, the title character in The Old Batchelor, says, "Lying, child, is indeed the art of love" (64).

Congreve uses the letter u or w in some words in which modern English would use the other. Congreve uses w in lawrela (107, 119, 120); he uses u in example (409); he alternates in some words: baud (408) and bawd (26); persuade (53, 148, 257, 262, 305), persuaded (236), persuading (31, 317), and dissuade (323) as well as persuade (91, 374), persuaded (47, 135, 345, 367), and persuading (98); both sawce (41, 102) or saucy (80, 94, 406) and sauce (294); crowds (225) and crowd (129); tarpawlin (258) and tarpaulin (325). Only baud from this group seems to have any particular etymological significance; it may represent a belief that the word came from the Old French baud, meaning "gay." The Oxford English Dictionary entertains no speculations on this word's origin, but states that it is not from the French baud. Congreve uses poultry (237) for paltry perhaps because the sound was spelled au in such words as baud.

There were only two groups of words in which Congreve used a spelling for a consonant sound which differs from the spelling a modern writer would use. The phenomenon represented by the first group, much like the ou for o group, is still seen occasionally in modern British spelling. It is composed of words which end in [k] and which are spelled with a final ok, whereas modern American English uses only o.
The phenomenon was common in the seventeenth century; the specific words which Congreve used displaying this tendency are listed in Table IX.

TABLE IX

WORDS IN WHICH CONGREVE USED A FINAL CK
WHERE MODERN ENGLISH USES G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>acrostick 201</th>
<th>lambicks 139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>almanack 209</td>
<td>lunatick 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almanacks 295, 311</td>
<td>melancholick 64, 146, 275, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antick 64</td>
<td>mimick 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bishoprick 231</td>
<td>musick 141, 252, 440, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caustick 103</td>
<td>musick-master 49, 50, 63, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cholerick 60, 198</td>
<td>musick-meetings 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cholick 84, 85, 87, +</td>
<td>panegyrick 215, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comick 1, 116</td>
<td>pathetick 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critick 114, 239, 371</td>
<td>pedantick 317, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticks 109, 116, 234, +</td>
<td>physic 33, 34, 373, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestick 182, 281, 351</td>
<td>politick 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epigrammatick 167</td>
<td>politicks 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanatick 27, 67, 309, +</td>
<td>publick 42, 113, 235, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelick 170, 313, 408</td>
<td>rhetorick 51, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gothick 404</td>
<td>rustick 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroick 136, 139, 165</td>
<td>splenetic 2, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroically 300</td>
<td>stoick 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieroglyphick 248</td>
<td>topticks 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieroglyphicks 239, 248</td>
<td>tragick 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieroglyphical 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The British generally can thank Boswell and Johnson for keeping what the former called "the Saxon k" at the end of these words. Lounsbury points out that "the Saxon k" was Boswell's "personal contribution to the original English alphabet,"\(^\text{18}\) and was not an integral part of the Saxon word, but was adopted to indicate that the preceding vowel was short. Ordinarily, a consonant following a short vowel was

---

\(^{18}\)Lounsbury, p. 292.
doubled, but when the consonant sound was [k], [tʃ], or [dʒ], spelled usually c or k, ch, or g, then the spelling became, respectively, ck, tch, or dg(e). In the words listed in Table IX, the short-vowel indicator is unnecessary in modern English. The vowels would be assumed short without it; one would invariably say [tik], not [təik], for tie as well as for tick.

The only other variation in spelling of consonant sounds in Congreve's comedies which a modern American reader might note is what could seem a confusion of c and s in the words listed in Table X.

**TABLE X**

**WORDS SHOWING CONGREVE'S USE OF C AND S IN SPELLINGS WHICH DIFFER FROM MODERN AMERICAN USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chace</th>
<th>405</th>
<th>fansied</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>defence</td>
<td>151, 359</td>
<td>offence</td>
<td>394, 404, 414, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispence</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>paradise</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estacies</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>practis'd</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expence</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>pretence</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenses</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>prophesie</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the words listed are given in both spellings in the Oxford English Dictionary: chace and chase, defence and defense, offence and offense, pretence and pretense. Of these four, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1961 edition) gives both spellings for two, offense and pretense, and lists defence as a British spelling of defense; it also gives both

---

19Jespersen, p. 64.
practiced and practised as acceptable spellings for the
verb. Defence and offence had two similar but distinct an-
ccestors in Middle English; offens and offense (-ce) are older
forms of offence; the former word accounts for the modern o
spelling, since offence, like defence, developed along the same
pattern as hence (from hennes, which became hens, then hence),
once (formerly ones, then ons, then once), and dunce (from
dun). Middle English defens and defense are ancestors of
defence; defens contributed the e spelling. One of the words
in Table X, chace, shows its etymology better than does the
modern American spelling. Chace came into English from the
Old French chacier, which itself later became chassier.

Of all the remaining words in which some orthographic
change has been made since seventeen hundred, only two group-
ings can be readily derived, and the groups are quite small.
The practice represented by the first, the use of the voiced
g where modern English would use the voiceless s in such
words as merchandise (422), surprize (93, 157, 289, +), and
teaze (93) persists today in Great Britain. The second
group, composed of atchiev'd, atchievements, and batchelor,
seem to represent a tendency to add the phonetic t in \([tʃ]\),
making ch represent only \([ʃ]\). The practice affected few
words and was prevalent only between the sixteenth and the
eighteenth centuries.

The remainder of the words which show spelling changes
since the seventeenth century cannot be readily grouped and
seem to represent rather random attempts to adjust spellings to etymology, either real or supposed, to pronunciation, or to fashion. Modern English orthography seems on the whole neither to reveal etymology more clearly nor to indicate pronunciation more exactly than did seventeenth century, though in isolated cases, either etymology or spelling may now be clearly distinguished by orthography.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Although spelling reformers have been attempting to improve and regularize the spelling of the English language since the thirteenth century, it is apparent that they have not been the motivating force behind changes in our orthography. They have probably been unable to unite their effort and effect changes because each has been too intent on his own system. Perhaps also the forces which operate within a language are so pervasive and uncontrollable that no mere group of reformers can hope to revise our spelling system any more than a high school speech teacher can regularize our pronunciation. For whatever reason, one can hardly escape the conclusion that English orthography has moved in no one general direction— it has become, for example, no more phonetic, as a whole—since the seventeenth century and that it is now neither noticeably better nor noticeably worse than it was at that time; it is only different from what it was then and more familiar to us.

The primary changes noted in comparing Congreve's spelling with that of modern writers have been divided into three categories; one category is composed of words which Congreve used as two-word forms, but which have become
compounds or hyphenated forms since Congreve's time; one is composed of the contractions which Congreve used; one is composed of words in which letters have been dropped or added or substituted for other letters since Congreve's time.

Even a comparison of the first two groups reveals contrasting, if not conflicting, movement within English since the seventeenth century, for two-word forms have tended to combine by passing through a hyphenated state and becoming compounds, whereas contractions, or forms using an apostrophe, have tended to separate into their original two-word forms in most cases.

The first group of words studied contains the compound personal pronouns, formed almost exclusively since the seventeenth century. The words are frequently used today and therefore probably represent the most important group of compounds listed. Besides this group of compounds formed with -self or -selves, other groups have been formed with -body, -thing, -where, -one, and -ever. Each compound, of course, represents an addition to the vocabulary of the English language, since the two words from which the compound was formed are retained in the language and since the compound, with a meaning of its own, is added. Even though the two words may appear in the same relative positions as when they are compounded, their distinct meaning as a compound is distinct from their meaning as two merely juxtaposed words: When one reads aloud the two sentences "I may choose
any one of the dresses?" and "Is anyone ready?" he can easily hear the distinction between the two-word form and the compound. Numerous miscellaneous compounds—maybe, forever, bystander, and instead, for example—have come into general use since Congreve's time; they may not easily be placed into any particular groups. The forms which are hyphenated in Congreve's comedies are listed in tables,¹ about forty-five words hyphenated in Congreve's works have since become compounds. Movement in the opposite direction is represented by only twelve forms which were regularly hyphenated in Congreve's comedies but which are not hyphenated today. Forms in which a hyphen may or may not be used today, according to the position of the words in the sentence, were not listed, though some occurred. Few forms were found which are now regularly hyphenated but which Congreve wrote as separate words. Since the hyphenated stage is generally transitional, one might expect that words hyphenated at any one time would be compounded at a later date and found as two-word forms at an earlier date. A comparison of Congreve's comedies and modern writing bears out this expectation in most cases.

The second group, the contractions Congreve used which have since reverted to two words, often seem, in their hyphenated forms, to indicate seventeenth-century pronunciation. The large group of contracted preterit or past

¹See above, pp. 24, 25.
participial forms listed in Appendix A² surely do so, as Swift's comments confirm. The use of -t or -'t for the past tense inflection -ed is consistent with the pronunciation of the words in which it is found, but there are many words which now are and, presumably, in the seventeenth century were pronounced with a final [t] which Congreve gave a regular -ed or -'d ending. Accomplished, advanced, approached, asked, aspersed, astonished, and attacked, to look no further than the a's, have just as definite a ending as balking, blest, or cuffied, but are never spelled with a final t. The t spelling, though no doubt introduced for as good a reason as that for which the -'d ending was introduced, never was as widely used as was the -'d. Perhaps the pervasive law of analogy prevented a further departure from custom than that represented by -'d.

The other contractions fall into much smaller groups. It was formerly contracted in such expressions as it is and it was or hang it and is it to 'tis, 'twas, hang't, and isn't, respectively. Today is may be contracted, as in it's, but it seldom is. Congreve's writing shows contractions of the when it comes before a vowel sound and of when it comes before a consonant sound, omission of y in such words as e'er, and of l in such words as wou'd; it also shows the forms till, tho', and thro', which are not conventional today.

²See below, pp. 70-64.
Some contractions—difference, for example—indicate the loss of a syllable much as -'d for -ed does. Possessive forms regularly used an apostrophe by the seventeenth century, but Congreve omits the apostrophe in many cases, especially in the form one's.

The final group is much the most complex. Like the other groups, it reveals some small, traceable movements, but no revolutionary developments: Words now tend to drop some final double letters which Congreve used, but modern English generally doubles final l as Congreve did not. It does not generally double a final c or k or use ck, as Congreve did, at the ends of words to show a short internal vowel in the final syllable. There is now a tendency to use y rather than i or ie at the end of a word and ie rather than y within it, whereas Congreve's writing does not show this tendency. Modern English uses a final silent e more regularly to show a long \[\text{o}\] or \[\text{e}\] instead of writing the sound as oa or ea. It begins several words—entire, for example—with an e though Congreve used an i, but in some internal positions it has merely substituted i's for e's or e's for i's with little regularity. Modern writers use virtue, not vertue, but mongrel, not mungril. In the same way, modern English has chosen crowd over croud, but persuade over perswade. It has simplified many ou spellings to o, as in vigor rather than vigour, and generally chooses s rather than c or z in such words as expense and surprise. These statements are made primarily,
of course, on the basis of a study of the practices of one writer, or one writer's printer. Since they are often based on only a dozen examples, they are statistically questionable, but most of these views are corroborated by evidence from the Oxford English Dictionary and other sources.

Such an analysis as that upon which this paper was based leaves one feeling that many small and relatively unimportant observations have been made, but that no real conclusion has been reached. One generally has this feeling when he is dealing with language. A myriad of elements which may be classed and subclassed indefinitely compose a language, and these details never reach a static, concluded state while the language lives, but gradually shift and develop in time as does anything alive.
APPENDIX A
FORMS OF THE PRETERIT OR PAST PARTICIPLE OF VERBS
AS THEY APPEAR IN CONGREVE'S COMEDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ed</th>
<th>-t</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abandon'd 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303, 356, +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abus'd 62, 274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365, +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish'd 134,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171, 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accus'd 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquainted 107,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126, 286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquir'd 386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admir'd 169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ador'd 36, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adorn'd 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanc'd 407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admitted 235, 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affrighted 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allarm'd 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow'd 2, 185, 224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alter'd 155, 278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amaz'd 28, 80, 86, 126, 137, 143, 174, 183, 389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 151, 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anatomiz'd 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answer'd 132, 266, 298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appear'd 71, 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeas'd 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply'd 28, 103, 215, +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in appendices indicate pages in Dobrée's edition of Congreve's comedies. Only three citations are given unless at least two forms of the preterit occur, when all are given; + indicates that more than three occur.
approach'd 182
approv'd 350
arriv'd 246
ask'd 234, 263, 298
aspers'd 437
assign'd 307
assur'd 64
astonish'd 84
attack'd 78
authoriz'd 408
awaken'd 47
bawl'd 104
bastinado'd 415

bedeck'd 76
behav'd 143
believ'd 90, 150, 188, +
beperriwig'd 394
bestow'd 366
betray'd 46, 73, 132, +
bewitch'd 52
bilk'd 222
bless'd 169
blest 63
boil'd 186, 302
borrow'd 114
bow'd 119
brib'd 232, 434, 436
butcher'd 37
butter'd 340
call'd 36, 290, 254, +
cannoniz'd 221
car'd 220
carry'd 171, 201, 266, +
catechiz'd 427
caus'd 52
censur'd 254
chain'd 270
chanc'd 36
chang'd 46, 174, 300, +

appointed 196
assured 170, 406
attended 377
bearded 63, 64
beecraved 394
bedded 347, 422

boasted 170
charg'd 349
charge'd 89, 176, 420

cloister'd 100
cloy'd 23

complain'd 344
composed 335, 390, 411
conceal'd 97, 115, 286
conceiv'd 210
concern'd 47, 75, 143, 151, 185, 202, 214, 287, 288, 314, 326, 373
condemn'd 235
conferr'd 183
confess'd 26, 114, 404, +
confin'd 121, 206

conquer'd 172, 130
consider'd 69, 289, 429, +
consign'd 428
constrain'd 130, 344

continu'd 345

contriv'd 151, 206, 405, 433

convinc'd 232
convince'd 148, 158, 196, 288, 331, 367, 400
countermin'd 105

cheated 115
coloured 64
committed 97, 43
communicated 115

concern'd 116, 288, 425

confiscated 431
confounded 258, 415

consented 238

consulted 277
contained 438
contented 142, 215
continued 262
contradicted 142, 387
contrived 149

controlled 202
convinced 143
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cover'd</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crack'd</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cram'd</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crown'd</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cry'd</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cur'd</td>
<td>118, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cufs</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curst</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damn'd</td>
<td>27, 221, 415, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>danc'd</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar'd</td>
<td>73, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deBLach'd</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decay'd</td>
<td>222, 304, 369, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceas'd</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceiv'd</td>
<td>81, 115, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declar'd</td>
<td>233, 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defects</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliver'd</td>
<td>4, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delver'd</td>
<td>29, 72, 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deny'd</td>
<td>212, 263, 370, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depos'd</td>
<td>119, 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deprav'd</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depriv'd</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deriv'd</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deserv'd</td>
<td>109, 137, 308, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design'd</td>
<td>88, 121, 217, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despis'd</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy'd</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devour'd</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>din'd</td>
<td>77, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disarm'd</td>
<td>126, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cradled</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daunted</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart'd</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desc'd</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desired</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despised</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detected</td>
<td>37, 380, 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devoted</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dined</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappoint'd</td>
<td>131, 296, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discharged</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disclos'd 26, 267
discover'd 74, 181, 299, +
disgrac'd 370
disguis'd 199, 419, 420
disoblig'd 59, 202
disorder'd 133
dispens'd 80
displease'd 117, 348
dispos'd 404, 405
dissembl'd 345
dissolv'd 433
distinguish'd 215, 235
disturb'd 276
divorc'd 121, 424
dress'd 318, 371, 386, 392
drest 160
dreamt 45,
dream't, 319
dropt 31, 39
dwindl'd 302
dy'd 41, 357
eclips'd 209
edg'd 134
employ'd 94, 143
encounter'd 90
enamour'd 376, 380
encourag'd 80, 132, 304, +
endeavour'd 126
endiw'd 430
endur'd 350
engag'd 148, 346, 364, 373, 439
enjoin'd 388
enjoy'd 109
enjoy'd 109
enlarge'd 407
enquir'd 370, 422
enrag'd 398
enrich'd 36
enroll'd 345
entertain'd 348, 385, 401

disguised 27
disinherited 356
distorted 334
distracted 86, 327
divorced 105, 183
dwindled 407
engaged 155, 225
enraged 301
envenom'd 53
escap'd 107, 137
esteem'd 1
excus'd 74, 117, 215, 368

experienc'd 429
explor'd 434
explain'd 269
expos'd 58, 224, 231, 266, 365
express'd 412
fac'd 149
fail'd 346
fashion'd 260
favour'd 126
fear'd 126, 202, 350
feather'd 422
fetch'd 103
fetter'd 366
fill'd 332
finish'd 88, 286
fix'd 194, 368
flatter'd 372
flea'd 37
fobb'd 299, 358
foil'd 119, 130
follow'd 25, 127, 405
fool'd 437
forc'd 29, 115, 224, 269, 270, 307, 313, 382, 410
form'd 263
fortify'd 142
foster'd 421
fram'd 66
frown'd 382
furnish'd 398

entred 64
excluded 345
excused 114
expected 52, 349, 398
exposed 103
expressed 115

forced 68, 72, 79, 84, 178, 313
forfeited 366, 430
fretted 377
frightened 37, 66, 70, 152, 260

frost-nipt 302
gain'd 48, 118, 368, +

gall'd 104
gather'd 279

gnaw'd 421
govern'd 142

... ... ...
griev'd 119
gull'd 158
	hand'd 231

... ... ...
hang'd 54, 257, 391

... ... ...
harken'd 114

hatch'd 177

... ... ...
hen-peck'd 301
hinder'd 383
his's 340
honour'd 312

... ... ...
horn'd 244, 302
hum'd 52
hurry'd 277

... ... ...
hush'd 126

... ... ...
husht 79, 261, 301

... ... ...
imagín'd 189
impair'd 104
imply'd 101
impower'd 434
imprison'd 366
improv'd 396
incens'd 366, 384
inclín'd 277

... ... ...
indu'd 118
influen't 321
inform'd 55, 174, 247

... ... ...
injur'd 105, 207, 210

... ... ...
inspir'd 297, 402

... ... ...
... ... ...

... ... ...
grafted 306
granted 234, 238

... ... ...
... ... ...

... ... ...
hapned 28
hated 367, 329
hindred 88, 154

... ... ...
hooded 317

... ... ...
indebted 345
indisposed 292

... ... ...
inherited 439
inserted 194
instructed 130, 375
intercepted 435
interested 368
interrupted 278, 279, 363
introduc'd 264
join'd 295, 389           ...       invented 114
judg'd 124
kill'd 189, 420            kept 68
kiss'd 59, 138, 247, 409, 411
knock'd 89, 235, 355
labor'd 1
lacr'd 239
laugh'd 129, 154, 410
learn'd 277, 314, 429, 438
lik'd 127, 268
liv'd 220, 252, 378, +
lock'd 244, 378, 405
lockt 261
lodg'd 378
look'd 74, 126, 152, +
lov'd 65, 134, 262, +
maint'd 215
manag'd 384, 441
mann'd 127
manur'd 118
marry'd 95, 99, 100, 103, 106, 158, 196, 270, 275, 280, 284, 301, 303, 313, 320, 324, 375, 377, 381, 383, 392, 398, 399, 406, 407, 413, 422, 423, 421, 440
mask'd 379
match'd 118, 431, 434
mention'd 43, 438         minded 330
misapply'd 169
miscarry'd 113
misinform'd 431
misplac'd 134, 152
mouth'd 32, 84, 381

mov'd 118, 345
murder'd 345, 381
nam'd 223
nick'd 281, 295 nick't 34
oblig'd 48, 116, 227, 238, 265, 268, 287, 329, 358, 385, 402, 413, 419, 431

observ'd 80, 117, 255, +
obtain'd 439
occasion'd 113, 287

offer'd 70, 159, 315, +
oil'd 408
open'd 428
oppos'd 140

ordain'd 91
order'd 246, 401
out-stripp'd 397
overcharg'd 33
overjoy'd 98, 176, 256, +
overstock'd 350
ow'd 277
own'd 26, 174, 205
pacify'd 38, 95, 367
par'd 275
pass'd 88, 431
pay'd 33, 38
penn'd 212
perform'd 51, 117, 154
perplex'd 225, 245

obliged 39, 87, 174

obliterated 290

offended 116, 117, 271, +

oppress 78
oppressed 133
out-jilted 397
out-witted 397

painted 238
parted 300, 398, 399
passed 424

perfected 430

persecuted 371
pick'd 95
pierc'd 389, 411
pillory'd 75
pinch'd 46
pinion'd 182
plac'd 169, 400
play'd 121
pleas'd 39, 51, 55, 115, 117, 152, 224, 241, 249, 344, 346, 371
poison'd 387, 416
pos'd 267
possess'd 45, 157
powder'd 248
practic'd 430
prais'd 48, 88, 121, +
pray'd 266, 267
prepar'd 95, 188, 434, +
prescrib'd 429
preserv'd 143, 366
press'd 45
presum'd 408
prevail'd 63
procur'd 156, 308
produc'd 368
profess'd 186
promis'd 105, 118, 225, 380
proposition'd 239
propos'd 229
prov'd 116, 121
provok'd 141, 142, 345, +
publish'd 214
persuaded 237, 345
pillaged 36
pleaded 126
pleased 64, 129, 143, 160, 215
pratled 35
pretended 88, 328, 342, +
prevented 81, 147, 276, +
profited 376
promised 73, 105, 141, 201
prostituted 428
provided 201, 330, 435, +
pull'd 316
punish'd 34
purchas'd 34, 39, 381
purloin'd 248
qualify'd 160
quarrel'd 274
quarrell'd 343, 387
rack'd 104
raffl'd 266
rail'd 384
rais'd 147, 355, 421
revish'd 84
recall'd 193
receiv'd 34, 169, 235, +
reconcil'd 360
reden'd 344
reduc'd 115, 220
refin'd 334, 396
reform'd 340
refus'd 104, 229, 238
remember'd 395, 396
remov'd 383
reign'd 119
repay'd 39
resembl'd 369
reserv'd 343
resign'd 308, 434
resolv'd 70, 155, 222, 234, 329, 344, 374, 389, 435
restor'd 216, 310
retir'd 123
return'd 118, 322
reveng'd 220, 416, 439, +
reviv'd 312, 431
quilted 421
raffled 266
raved 44
ravished 84
reconciled 37
related 349, 350
repented 266
represented 116
repulsed 134
requested 438
resisted 159, 265
resolved 114
rigg'd 271
ripen'd 286
rival'd 220
rouz'd 95
rubb'd 79
ruin'd 83, 91, 221, +
sacrificed 365, 368
satisfy'd 363, 393, 420, +
sav'd 37, 231, 326, +
scandaliz'd 58
'seap'd 121
scratch'd 294
scrawl'd 306
seal'd 72
seduced 422
seem'd 154, 169, 205
serv'd 42, 189, 221, +
settled 395
shar'd 366
shav'd 65
shew'd 117
shock'd 3
shrivel'd 302
shriek'd 427
sigh'd 134, 389
sign'd 72, 246, 420, +
silence'd 124
slabber'd 59
slander'd 58
smile'd 217
smother'd 434
snatch'd 54
sneak'd 412
spoil'd 45, 257, 385, +
starch'd 201
starved 421
rivetted 347
satisfied 67, 153
saved 40
selected 335
settled 195, 283
shifted 189
slighted 335, 343
345
spared 81
transplanted 128, 216
transported 152, 172, 380, +
troubled 137, 151
trusted 263, 264, 366, +

tyed 206
unaffected 346
unattended 370

undessembled 334
unexpected 195

unsuspected 175

unsolly'd 143
urged 126, 356
us'd 109, 263, 348, +
usher'd 428
utter'd 303, 314, 411
valu'd 328
veil'd 134, 317
ventur'd 39, 59, 304
vex'd 245, 296, 301

vext 141

vindicated 114
waited 402, 420
warn'd 210, 441
watch'd 134
weigh'd 69
wheat'd 400
whisper'd 262, 344
whor'd 105
wilder'd 205
wish'd 185, 398
work'd 26, 384
wreck'd 274
wrong'd 69, 132, 426, +
shipt 273
whistled 299
wounded 334
APPENDIX B

MISCELLANEOUS FORMS SHOWING VARIATIONS IN SPELLING
SINCE THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

ake 418
baid 104, 170
bisket 283, 285
chuse 89, 215, 386, +
chymist 307, 385
confident (for confidante) 304
courtesies (for courtseys) 160
crums 280
cuckow-eggs 340
discernable 382
drein (for drain) 94
eenow 412
fright (for frighten) 64
gibling 108
glew 433
grutch (for grudge) 413
hussey 176
lanthorn 126, 303
Mohametan 414

Mussulman (for Moslem?) 414
neice 240, 244, 342, +
oeconomy 382
outragious 299, 307
pacquet 371
prophane 427
receipts (for recipes) 219
risque (for risk) 422
serjeants 394
shew 26, 300, 364, +
shipwrack'd 147
skreen 204, 370, 408
sluce (for sluice) 93
spight 147, 311, 420, +
splenatick 179
streight 53
traiterous 181
villany 186
who's (for whose) 437
writ (for wrote) 118, 232, 438, +
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