

SMOLLETT'S MANIPULATION OF LANGUAGE  
IN THE TABITHA BRAMBLE AND WINIFRED JENKINS  
LETTERS IN HUMPHRY CLINKER

by

Jane Flick

B.A., University of British Columbia, 1971

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

in the Department of  
English

We accept this thesis as conforming to  
the required standard

The University of British Columbia  
October, 1975

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of English

The University of British Columbia  
2075 Wesbrook Place  
Vancouver, Canada  
V6T 1W5

Date 10 October 1975

## ABSTRACT

In this work I intend to explain and illustrate the simple and systematic language processes used by Smollett (in both simple and complex examples) and discuss the results he achieves. I intend to show that Smollett was extremely observant of normal variations in the language used around him and of linguistic variation governed by such parameters as region, social status, educational level, sex, or age; and, that he used this variety for the purpose of satire and straightforward humour, often producing puns, many of which have sexual and scatological double-entendres. Further, it is my contention that Smollett, far from confusing the reader with original and arbitrary processes, exploits normal systematic processes of natural language to the fullest extent. I do not mean this to be taken as implying that he lacked originality or creativity but rather that he had the ability to perceive that normal human language has almost unlimited potential for his particular purposes, hitherto almost unexploited in this manner. Also, he had the ability to carry out the extremely difficult task of opening this variety of language to the printed page in such a way that the reader could share his appreciation.

An understanding of Smollett's manipulation of language will enable the reader to peruse the passages under discussion with more ease

and satisfaction, and also with more accuracy than will be obtained from reading some of the published explanations, ingenious though they may be. It is my intention to provide the reader with the means to decipher words in the text which might seem puzzling so that he may enjoy the word play and the social allusions made through the language, just as an attentive reader might have done in the late eighteenth century.

This study is confined to an investigation of language processes applied to lexical items; no attention is given to syntax or grammar although even the casual reader will be aware of departures from standard grammatical practices, especially in Win's letters. Win's substandard grammar, like her misspellings, contributes heavily to Smollett's characterization of her.

The words dealt with in this study are those which deviate markedly from the standards of eighteenth century spelling and which, in the milieu of spelling reform, would strike the reader as substandard or vulgar, much in the same way that a cultivated reader of the twentieth century, schooled in prescriptive grammar, would instantly notice the use of double negatives such as "he didn't never." An examination of Win's and Tabitha's misspellings reveals which are merely orthographic departures from the conventional representation of spoken English and which are indicators of phonological or pronunciation variants. Purely orthographic errors suggest the writer's inferior education and, often closely allied, an inferior social position. When Lady Wentworth writes "All my fyer syde is in good health" or refers to "the Duke of Molberry," we can understand from her phonetic spellings



of fireside and Marlborough that she speaks a standard dialect but does not spell according to standard. But, when we encounter "Mr. Coshgrave, the fashioner in Shuffolk-street, tuck me out, and made me his own shecretary" (p. 211), we are to understand a distinctly different pronunciation of Cosgrave, Suffolk, took, and secretary. The indication of a variant pronunciation might lead the reader to search out the regional and social dialects in which such variants occur to discover what possible implications the writer wishes to make by recording these pronunciations. Pronunciation may also be indicated not by reported speech but by a seemingly naive form of phonetic transcription -- a rather artful means of characterization. This study, then, will focus on misspellings merely as misspellings, and on misspellings as indicators of pronunciation.

## CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Orthography	19
	Background to eighteenth century spelling	19
	<u>u/o</u> spelling variations	30
	Aspiration: <u>h/h</u> -less spellings	36
	Alternate spellings for unstressed syllables	40
	Word approximations	41
	Foreign words, loan words, folk etymology, proper names	
	Homonym spellings	56
	Eye Dialect	62
	Misdivision of articles	73
III.	Pronunciation	77
	Background to eighteenth century phonology	77
	Clipping	84
	Metathesis	86
	Dissimilation: <u>r/l</u> confusion	88
	Assimilation	90
	Consonant cluster simplification	92
	Excrescent [d] or [t]	94
	Loss of [r]: vocalization	95
	Loss of [w]: vocalization	96
	Intrusive [r]	97
	Inserted <u>r</u> to represent [a]	97
	Aspiration: addition and omission of [h]	98
	Interchange of [v] for [w]; [w] for [v]	102
	Substitution of [vr] for [wr]	104
	Voicing and Devoicing	105
	Devoicing	105
	Voicing	111
	Substitution of [f] for [hw]	113
	Substitution of [š] for [s]	113
	Substitution of [s] for [č] and [s] for [š]	115
	Substitution of [s] for [š]	115
	Substitution of [k] for [t]; [f] for [e], [ɔ]; and [t] for [e]	116

Vowel Changes	117
Intrusive schwa	121
Substitution of [ar] for [ɜr]	123
Raising of [ɛ] to [ɪ]	126
Raising of [æ] to [ɛ]	128
Lowering of [ɛ] to [æ]	129
Lengthening of [o] indicated by ou spelling	130
Unrounding of [ʊ] [ɔ]	130
Miscellaneous vowel changes	131
 IV. Conclusion	 134
 Footnotes	 141
 Bibliography	 164

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Patricia M. Wolfe, who has been extraordinarily generous with her time and her advice. I am especially grateful for her suggestions for the organization of the thesis material.

## I

### INTRODUCTION

When The Expedition of Humphry Clinker was published in June of 1771, only three months before Smollett's death, the novel must have surprised those readers who were expecting another Roderick Random (1748) or Peregrine Pickle (1751) from his pen. Smollett's earlier novels focus upon one character in each and take their titles from their heroes. Humphry Clinker can hardly be said to focus on one character and certainly not upon the titular hero, Humphry, a character picked up incidentally in the narrative. Humphry Clinker is a novel peopled with some well-developed characters but it is a novel without a hero, at least without a hero who might meet the expectations of the eighteenth century reader and very specifically a reader of Smollett's novels expecting a hero in the line of Roderick Random, Peregrine Pickle, Ferdinand Count Fathom or Sir Launcelot Greaves.

Smollett's earlier novels were very much a part of the picaresque tradition, a phenomenon which is not surprising in light of the great popularity which the genre enjoyed in the period. Smollett had translated and published Le Sage's Gil Blas in 1748 just prior to the publication of Roderick Random and had begun work on a translation of Cervantes' Don Quixote in the same year. That there was a demand for picaresque

literature is attested to by the several editions of Don Quixote in print at the time (and the preparation of yet another by Smollett), by the popularity of Smollett's own novels and, of course, by the even greater popularity of Fielding's novels. Joseph Andrews (1742), which bore on its original title page "The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and of his Friend Mr. Abraham Adams, written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes' Don Quixote," leaves no doubt about this appeal, nor do Jonathan Wild (1743), and Tom Jones (1749), the definitive novel of this type in English. Smollett's readers, who might reasonably have anticipated a new picaresque romp, must have been startled to find instead an epistolary novel -- but an epistolary novel with some differences.

The immense success of the epistolary novel had been established by Richardson's novels, Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded (1740), Clarissa (1747-8), and Sir Charles Grandison (1753-4). Pamela inspired no less than sixteen imitations and burlesques (including Fielding's Shamela) and Clarissa has secured for itself the pre-eminent place as the definitive epistolary English novel. Humphry Clinker is not a novel in the tradition of Richardson -- it lacks the complexity of psychological insight and the intensity generated by a correspondence which has essentially one subject for a focus. Humphry Clinker has for its formal structure the epistolary framework, but it is a novel of mixed genres. It is an adventure novel and a travel book in an epistolary package, calculated through its make-up to attract a wide audience.

The travel book aspect of Humphry Clinker capitalizes on the vogue for travel literature -- a vogue which Smollett pays service to in the

prefatory letter of Henry Davis, Bookseller, in response to the Reverend Jonathan Dustwich's attempt to sell the Humphry Clinker letters. Mr. Davis writes:

The taste of the town is so changeable. Then there have been so many letters upon travels lately published -- What between Smollett's, Sharp's, Derrick's, Thickness's, Baltimore's and Barretti's, together with Shandy's Sentimental Travels, the public seems to be cloyed with that kind of entertainment -- Nevertheless, I will, if you please, run the risque of printing and publishing, and you shall have half the profits of the impression . . .<sup>1</sup> (pp. 2-3).

Smollett is enjoying himself, especially in his acknowledgement of his own Travels Through France and Italy (1766) and Sterne's A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy (1768), which featured many sly digs at Smollett in the persona of the ever irascible traveller, "the learned Smelfungus".<sup>2</sup>

Besides taking advantage of the taste for travel books and for epistolary and picaresque fictions, Smollett has added the element of the familiar essay. Humphry Clinker provides sometimes a discourse on medicine and sanitation, an essay on national and personal economy, an essay on taste, an essay on sociology, and sometimes a paean for the splendours of Scotland. In this latter case he even goes so far as to introduce "a little ode [to Leven-Water], by Dr. Smollett, who was born on the banks of it" (p. 249) in one of Matt's letters. Humphry Clinker is very rich in its diversity of topics and interests.

But Humphry Clinker is especially fascinating as a novel of character and caricature. Through their differing points of view the letters reveal the characters as they see themselves and as they are seen by their travelling companions. The epistolary technique is most valuable

in the flexibility which it allows through point of view. We are treated to characters who show us about themselves while telling us about the others' characters. These lively letters, written by a family on a tour through England and Scotland, afford us hours of pleasure as we get to know more about the writers.

The principal personage of the letters, if there can be said to be a principal personage, is Matthew Bramble. He is a gouty country Squire who suffers from a variety of complaints and undertakes the journey in hopes of regaining his health at one of the many spas throughout England. Matt is essentially kind and generous, but these qualities are hidden beneath a temperamental and irascible personality. He is accompanied by his sister Tabitha, a stingy, middle-aged virgin searching for a husband; by his nephew, Jeremy Melford, lately a student at Oxford, who is rather ashamed of his conservative and countrified uncle; by his niece Lydia, a sentimental young girl fresh from a Gloucester finishing school; and by Winifred Jenkins, an ignorant young country girl, and lady's maid to Tabitha.

The letter writers correspond with persons whose letters are not included in the novel and we are left to speculate upon their various personalities from hints dropped in the letters. The one exception is Wilson, Lydia's admirer. Wilson is in reality a well-born young man, George Dennison, who disguises himself as a strolling player. It is in this guise that he meets Liddy. The letter which he writes to Liddy is a highly stylized and very stagey letter professing undying admiration. Smollett satirizes the excessively romantic ideas of both Wilson and Liddy through the outrageously affected styles of their letters.



Matthew writes twenty-seven letters which take up a little more than 37 per cent of the novel. These letters are directed home to Wales to his dear friend and physician, Richard Lewis. Doctor Lewis is addressed as Doctor, Lewis, and as Dear Dick, depending upon Matt's needs and moods. It is in these letters that the essay features are most pronounced as Matt shares his political, social, and philosophical views with his friend. Matthew Bramble and Doctor Lewis are equals and they may draw upon the same kinds of backgrounds of references in their letters. Matt may readily quote a passage of Horace or allude to some political happening, confident that Lewis will understand and possibly share his feelings. They are gentlemen of the world, sophisticated and well educated; they are not country bumpkins or boorish squires like Fielding's Squire Western or Vanbrugh's Sir Tunbelly Clumsey. Matt's letters (and Lewis' by implication) are well-informed and elegantly written with a real ease of style. They give the lie to the conventional image of the Welsh squire as a rustic oaf.

Jery writes to Sir Watkin Phillips, a college friend at Jesus College, Oxford, and we may observe his use of several styles of address -- Dear Knight, Phillips, and Dear Wat. It is evident that Jery wishes to be considered a part of Phillips' set at Oxford and he affects a familiar style of writing; his letters do not have the natural intimacy to be expected in letters between good friends. Jery's letters are informative and the narrative progress of the novel is advanced more by Jery's letters than by the others. The others' letters often serve merely as divergent commentary upon Jery's. He writes only one more

letter than Matt but since his letters are usually longer they account for about 46 per cent of the novel. Because Jerry is not on intimate terms with Phillips, his letters are filled with detailed descriptions of incidents of travel and of his companions. This is entertaining padding. He tends to report events factually although he is often at some pains to heighten the humorousness of situations for Phillips' benefit. Jerry, by deprecating his family, seeks to dissociate himself from it; he says, with some surprise, "I have got into a family of originals, whom I may one day attempt to describe for your amusement" (p. 8). The implication, of course, is that he does not belong with such a collection.

By making fun of his uncle Matt as "old Squaretoes" and his aunt Tabitha as an old maid, Jerry draws a line between himself and his elders. By making fun of Tabitha as "exceedingly starched, vain, and ridiculous" and Liddy as "remarkably simple and quite ignorant of the world;" he is able to emphasize his superiority to them in social and educational terms. In the cases of Tabitha and Win, he is further able to emphasize that they are Welsh bumpkins while he is not by making fun of their language and of their dress. For Jerry the impression of urbanity and polish is everything, and he employs the tactic of ridicule to reinforce it. He is, of course, superior to the women of the family simply because he is a man in a man's world, and his letters show this advantage in their style and frame of reference.

This is not to say that Smollett does not build into Jerry's letters some small means of puncturing his pretensions, especially

through Jerry's use of language. The commonplace knowledge of the classics so evident in Matt's letters is also illustrated in Jerry's letters to Phillips. On one occasion, Jerry quotes Horace in such a fashion that we must assume that Phillips would immediately identify the reference. Ironically Jerry, who is rather vain of his erudition, misquotes Horace.<sup>3</sup> On another occasion, Jerry tries to show off his knowledge by commenting on the faults of the "learned doctor's discourse" at Bath.<sup>4</sup> When Smollett wants to ridicule Jerry's pretensions via his language, he does not have Jerry misspell words or indicate a variant or dialectal pronunciation through his spelling (cf. Fielding's Jonathan Wild), he doesn't use reported speech to indicate dialect (c.f. Chaucer's students in The Reeve's Tale), and he doesn't have Jerry misuse language through malapropisms (cf. Shakespeare's Dogberry, Sheridan's Mrs. Malaprop). These are all methods of low humour. He uses all these techniques in Win's and Tabitha's letters, but he attacks Jerry's use of language at a different and higher level by attacking the young squire's pretension to erudition through language.

Of the remaining correspondents, Lydia Melford is the most fluent with about 6.5 per cent of the novel taken up with her letters while the ten letters of Win make up about 5.5 per cent and the six letters of Tabitha about 1.5 per cent. It may come as a surprise that Liddy is more loquacious than Win, since Liddy does not make as great an impression upon the reader. This might be explained by the rather flat characterization of Liddy -- she is little more than the romantic stage heroine who is all sensibility. Liddy seems like a paper-thin character when measured against the more substantial Win, who projects

a great flesh-and-blood vitality through her letters and exhibits a more realistic concern with every day happenings. Win can fret about her smock falling off in the bath and about having new feet knitted into her socks -- such worries are simply too real for Miss Liddy.

Lydia's diminution as a character may also be connected with the style of her letters. Liddy, unlike her aunt or her aunt's maid, has had a taste of formal education (at Mrs. Jermyn's in Gloucester). Her literacy and general familiarity with the art of writing polite letters may explain why her letters are less striking than those of Win or Tabitha. They are, for the most part, very ordinary letters which any young girl of a reasonable education might write to a dear school friend -- Miss Laetitia ("Letty") Willis -- or to her governess -- Mrs. Jermyn. Liddy's letters may very well be too good if we are to believe many of the criticisms of the period about ladies' letter writing. Certainly, Liddy's letters exhibit the strained romantic style (mentioned above in connection with Wilson's letter) but they also exhibit a certain artifice which was thought to be a special feature of women's letters.

Liddy's letter to Mrs. Jermyn is a letter in the polished school-girl style. It is measured and composed and a trifle stilted. The cultivated ending is done to excess when Liddy concludes "I shall have no peace of mind 'til I know my dear and ever honoured governess has forgiven her poor, disconsolate, forlorn, / Affectionate humble servant, til death, / Lydia Melford" (p. 9). This letter is immediately followed by a letter to her "dearest Letty." Miss Willis is treated to an

informal style of address as Liddy plunges into the letter with a great long rush of a sentence. The letter is alternately full of set-pieces of etiquette (e. g. "it is a grievous addition to my other misfortunes, that I am deprived of your agreeable company and conversation, at a time when I need so much the comfort of your good humour and good sense"), of proverbial fillers (e. g. "let us trust to time and the chapter of accidents; or rather to that Providence which will not fail, sooner or later, to reward those that walk in the paths of honour and virtue"), and of stagey exclamations, the high rhetoric of melodrama (e. g. "you may tell him I have no occasion for a picture, while the original continues engraved on my -- But no; I would not have you tell him that neither"). "Dear Letty" rates only an "affectionate Lydia Melford" in closing, probably a certain sign of a genuine affection (pp. 10, 11). Smollett's pleasure in poking fun at such an affected style of writing is obvious.

He also satirizes the content of Liddy's letters. For example, he has her write, "I begin to be in love with solitude, and this is a charming romantic place." Liddy dwells at some length on the pleasures of solitude, only to close her letter, "To make this place a perfect paradise to me, nothing is wanting but an agreeable companion and dear friend, such as my dear Miss Willis" (pp. 26-27). Smollett presents us with many such instances of Liddy's romantically muddled thinking; Liddy's romantic thoughts are particularly muddled because she parrots the language of rural solitude while delighting in the pleasures of company and of the cities, Bath and London.

Win's and Tabitha's letters present an entirely different, but equally conventional, idea of women's letters. These women are presented as semi-literates, Win's inadequacies being much greater than Tabitha's. These two conventional views, that is, of women's letters as charmingly but affectedly easy in their styles (like Liddy's) or as illiterate (like Win's and Tabby's) were pronounced, not only in the eighteenth century but also in the nineteenth. Consider, for example, this exchange between Catherine Morland and Henry Tilney in Northanger Abbey (1818):

"But, perhaps, I keep no journal."

"Perhaps you are not sitting in this room, and I am not sitting by you. These are points in which a doubt is equally possible. Not keep a journal! How are your absent cousins to understand the tenour of your life in Bath without one? How are the civilities and compliments of every day to be related as they ought to be, unless noted down every evening in a journal? How are your various dresses to be remembered, and the particular state of your complexion, and curl of your hair to be described in all their diversities, without having constant recourse to a journal? -- My dear madam, I am not so ignorant of young ladies' ways as you wish to believe me; it is this delightful habit of journalizing which largely contributes to form the easy style of writing for which ladies are so generally celebrated. Every body allows that the talent of writing agreeable letters is peculiarly female. Nature may have done something, but I am sure it must be essentially assisted by the practice of keeping a journal."

"I have sometimes thought," said Catherine, doubtingly, "whether ladies do write so much better letters than gentlemen! That is -- I should not think the superiority was always on our side."

"As far as I have had opportunity of judging, it appears to me that the usual style of letter-writing among women is faultless, except in three particulars."

"And what are they?"

"A general deficiency of subject, a total inattention to stops, and a very frequent ignorance of grammar."

"Upon my word! I need not have been afraid of disclaiming the compliment. You do not think too highly of us in that way."

"I should no more lay it down as a general rule that women write better letters than men, than that they sing

better duets, or draw better landscapes. In every power, of which taste is the foundation, excellence is pretty fairly divided between the sexes."<sup>5</sup>

Tilney is, of course, exaggerating for effect, but his views are quite clearly stated.

Win's and Tabitha's letters are vulnerable to Tilney's criticisms, for their strengths are minimal. Tabitha's letters, with only a sprinkling of dashes, show more attention to stops than we might reasonably expect. Win's letters, however, are entirely over-run with dashes -- that happy solution for the letter writer who does not understand the fine mechanics of punctuation. Even Liddy, unassailable by comparison, must come under attack, for she too exhibits an inattention to stops. As for subject, the letters of all three women would surely seem deficient to a critic like Henry Tilney. Liddy runs on about love, friendship and the tourist sights; Tabitha about home economy, her dog's laxative and her own patent medicines; and Winifred about scrapes, surprises and clothes. To a man, these would hardly appeal as subjects of interest since they so thoroughly smack of "puffs, powders, patches, Bibles, billet doux" -- the domain of women as Pope deftly expresses it in The Rape of the Lock.

Win's and Tabitha's letters reveal a great deal about their personalities. We learn that Tabitha is an ill-tempered and parsimonious old maid who sees herself as the great manager of the household fortunes at Brambleton Hall; and all this from her first letter, ostensibly designed as a letter of instruction to the housekeeper, Mrs. Gwyllim, who receives all of Tabitha's letters but one. Doctor Lewis receives a sharp letter

of rebuke from Tabitha, and that letter reveals her utter selfishness. Tabitha's letters rarely contain any description of events; they are too full of business and of Tabitha and they are a poor hunting ground for any commentary upon her companions.

Tabitha is blithely unaware that she is a ridiculous, antiquated harridan. In this respect, she may remind the reader of Congreve's Lady Wishfort, for she shares with her an absurd personal vanity impervious to all attack. Tabitha's greedy nature is apparent in every letter she writes. While her avariciousness is always apparent, her lechery is less so, but only because it is hidden behind a semi-transparent screen of language. Tabitha's letters are rife with sexual innuendoes. She is able to alter even a Biblical homily into a sexual double-entendre as she writes "I desire you will redouble your care and circumflexion, that the family may be well managed in our absence; for you know, you must render account, not only to your earthly master, but also to him that is above" (p. 156). Tabitha's distortion of the language is one of Smollett's most malleable means of rendering her character.

Win is revealed in her letters as gossipy, good-natured, impressionable, naive, and, unlike Tabitha, generous in her willingness to share her observations and feelings with her correspondent, her fellow servant, Mary Jones. And, in her own way, she too is interested in impressing her correspondent, although she does not have to work as hard as Jerry to do it. Win is beset by the desire to be better than she is, in short, to be as good as her "betters". Unfortunately for her, the only lady she is able to observe at close hand is Tabitha -- a poor model indeed. Liddy, it seems, is too close in age to Win to impress



her as a real, grown-up lady. Win's letters to Mary constantly assert that Mary can have no conception of the life Win is leading away from Wales. Win lords it over poor Mary saying at one time, "O Molly! you that live in the country have no deception of our doings at Bath" (p. 42) and, at another, "O, voman! voman! if thou had'st but the least consumption of what pleasure we scullers have" (p. 109). By the end of the novel, Win has moved far above Mary -- at least as Win sees it. And Win, who righteously asserted to Mary that she was certainly legitimate because her "parents were marred according to the rights of holy mother crutch" (p. 338), has managed this great social leap forward by marrying the bastard son of Matthew Bramble, the footman, Humphry Clinker. It is through this kind of comic irony and through Win's misuse of language that Smollett deflates her overblown aspirations. A thorough-going comic treatment of her semi-literate letters reveals her as a memorable and likeable character, while shattering her pretensions to a higher social status.

Win's and Tabitha's letters have many features in common. They are written to people at home in Wales, and they share many comic overtones -- misspellings, malapropisms, dialect features, and unintentional double-entendres. This similarity is odd when we consider Win's and Tabitha's disparate social positions. The marks of literacy and stylistic consciousness which are so much a part of the letters of Tabitha's social equals, Matthew, Jerry and Liddy, are strikingly absent in her letters. This curious point may possibly be explained by the social context. In the older generation, Matthew would naturally be more educated than Tabitha, just as Jerry, in the younger generation, is obviously

more educated than Liddy. Liddy too would probably have more formal schooling than Tabitha because the interest in educating women grew as the eighteenth century progressed. If Tabitha is characterized as a "maiden of forty-five" at the date of publication, the reader may assume that she would probably have been ready for schooling from her tenth year -- that is, about 1736. We may discover from literature of the period, from the publication of grammar and spelling books, and from John Newberry's first publications specifically for children in the 1740's, that the interest in educating women to read and write adequately was only just beginning to make itself felt outside of London. Liddy, of course, who is only seventeen, would have benefitted from this movement. Even so, we must observe that Liddy's education, beyond the question of literacy, is inferior to that of her brother.

We cannot be surprised by the level of literacy which Win displays in her letters. It is, in fact, quite unexpected that Win writes as well as she does since a master was under no obligation to see that his servants learned the two R's. Win's achievement of semi-literacy may be a reflection upon the congenial life at Brambleton Hall under Matt Bramble's direction or it may be a somewhat idealized view of servant literacy, since any smattering of literacy would be unusual. At any rate, it is crucial to Smollett's comic intentions to depict Win as semi-literate. It is through her mangling of language that he is able to present her as a lively serving girl with a servant's unique point of view while introducing a new range of humour into the eighteenth century novel.

One of the outstanding features of Humphry Clinker is the deviant language found in the letters of Tabitha Bramble and, even more noticeably, in those of her maidservant, Win Jenkins. Indeed, so unusual is the language that these letters can pose a problem to the casual reader. Some readers are led to pore over them with mounting exasperation and frustration, some to skim over them lightly, and some to skip them completely. The following are typical examples of passages from Win's letters; I have underlined the more perplexing words:

O, voman! voman! if thou had'st but the least consumption of what pleasures we scullers have, when we can cunster the crabbidst buck off hand, and spell the ethnitch vords without lucking at the primmer. (p. 109)

O! that ever a gentlewoman of years and discretion should tare her air, and disporridge herself for such a nubjack! (p. 306)

The captain himself had a huge hassock of air, with three tails, and a tumtawdry coat, boddered with sulfur. -- Wan said he was a monkey-bank; and the ould bottler swore he was the born imich of Titidall. (p. 352)

The first time I was mortally afraid, [of going into the bath] and flustered all day; and afterwards made believe that I had got the heddick; but mistress said, if I didn't go, I should take a dose of bumtaffy . . . (p. 43).

That she [the witch] mought do me no harm, I crossed her hand with a taster, and bid her tell my fortune . . . (p. 261).

Such passages have also caused difficulty for readers familiar with eighteenth century literature and even for scholars who have specialized in the language of these letters. For instance, of the underlined words in the passage quoted, Boggs remarks:

Perhaps to increase the linguistic complexity of Win's language and to puzzle future linguistic researchers, Smollett invented at least eight words for Win's vocabulary: scullers, taster, and cunster (in the exact sense in which he uses them) and tumtawdry, titidall [sic], bum-taffy [sic], nubjack,

and ethnitch (in any sense whatsoever). An investigation of the methods by which Smollett coined these words is the subject for another paper, but briefly they mean the following: scullers, "workers in a scullery"; taster, "a piece of money to buy a dram of spirits"; cunster, "understand"; tumtawdry, "inelegant rough wool cloth or inelegant rough wool multi-coloured cloth"; titidall [sic], a variant of Titivil, one of the demons in the mystery plays; bum-taffy [sic], "a laxative"; nubjack "a fellow fit for hanging"; and ethnitch, an adjective meaning "easily bound together."<sup>6</sup>

Boggs attempts to explain the lexical variants by investigating the possible etymological connections these words might display. He often searches far afield to do so.

However, I believe that such an attitude as Boggs displays in treating every puzzling word as if it were unique misrepresents the nature of Smollett's achievement. I do not believe that he attains his effect by perverting the normal meaning of words, far less by creating new coinages.<sup>7</sup> Rather, I intend to show that Smollett was extremely observant of normal variations in the language used around him and of linguistic variation governed by such parameters as region, social status, educational level, sex, or age; and, that he used this variety for the purpose of satire and straightforward humour, often producing puns, many of which are sexual and scatological double-entendres. Further, it is my contention that Smollett, far from confusing the reader with original and arbitrary processes, exploits normal systematic processes of natural language to the fullest extent. I do not mean this to be taken as implying that he lacked originality or creativity, but rather that he had the ability to perceive that normal human language has almost unlimited potential for his particular purposes, hitherto little exploited in this manner. Also, he had

the ability to carry out the extremely difficult task of opening this variety of language to the printed page in such a way that the reader could share his appreciation.<sup>8</sup>

In this work I intend to explain and illustrate the simple and systematic processes used by Smollett (in both simple and complex examples) and discuss the results he achieves. An understanding of Smollett's manipulation of language will enable the reader to peruse the passages under discussion with more ease and satisfaction, and also with more accuracy than will be obtained from reading some of the published explanations, ingenious though they may be.<sup>9</sup> It is my intention to provide the reader with the means to decipher words in the text which might seem puzzling so that he may enjoy the word play and the social allusions made through the language, just as an attentive reader might have done in the late eighteenth century.

This study is confined to an investigation of language processes applied to lexical items; no attention is given to syntax or grammar although even the casual reader will be aware of departures from standard grammatical practices, especially in Win's letters. Win's substandard grammar, like her misspellings, contributes heavily to Smollett's characterization.

The words dealt with in this study are those which deviate markedly from the standards of eighteenth century spelling and which, in the milieu of spelling reform, would strike the reader as substandard or vulgar, much in the same way that a cultivated reader of the twentieth century, schooled in prescriptive grammar, would instantly notice the use of double negatives such as "he didn't never." An examination of

Win's and Tabitha's misspellings reveals which spellings are merely orthographical departures from the conventional representation of spoken English and which are indicators of phonological or pronunciation variants. Purely orthographic errors suggest the writer's inferior education and, often closely allied, an inferior social position. When Lady Wentworth writes "All my fyer syde is in good health" or refers to "the Duke of Molberry", we can understand from her phonetic spellings of fireside and Marlborough that she speaks a standard dialect but does not spell according to standard. But when we encounter "Mr. Coshgrave, the fashioner in Shuffolk-street, tuck me out, and made me his own shecretary" (p. 211), we are to understand a distinctly different pronunciation of Cosgrave, Suffolk, took, and secretary. The indication of a variant pronunciation might lead the reader to search out the regional and social dialects in which such variants occur to discover what possible implications the writer wishes to make by recording these pronunciations. Pronunciation may also be indicated not by reported speech but by a seemingly naive form of phonetic transcription -- a rather artful means of characterization. This study, then, will focus on misspellings merely as misspellings, and on misspellings as indicators of pronunciation.<sup>11</sup>

I would like first to discuss the orthographic features of Win's and Tabitha's letters and then follow with a discussion of the variant pronunciations signalled by the misspellings. It is worthwhile, however, to look at the pedagogical background against which the women's spelling practices would be viewed and to consider the attitudes to spelling which had been established by the late eighteenth century.

## II Orthography

### Background to Eighteenth Century Spelling

Seventeenth century orthoepists were interested in spelling from a theoretical point of view. They could see that spelling was inconsistent in many words, and that one word could be spelled many ways; that words which were pronounced similarly were not spelled similarly; and that there was no consistent relationship between phonetics and orthography. For this reason, many orthoepists often directed their attention to sound-symbol relationships and discussions of the theory of sounds (e. g. Richard Robinson's Art of Pronuntiatio [1716]).

The later tradition, however, owes more to the ideas of Mulcaster (Elementarie, 1582) who was concerned mainly that each word should have one agreed spelling which everyone would use; his purpose was primarily practical and pedagogical. It is not surprising that this view should be seized upon in the eighteenth century; the rise of the middle class was accompanied by a rise in literacy with the belief that literacy was a mark of social status. And one of the ways of determining degrees of literacy was to establish a standard for spelling (and later, for pronunciation). Eighteenth century spelling writers were not interested in theory but in conformity to an accepted social standard. One of

the by-products of this growing desire for uniformity was the establishment of spelling pronunciations. The new knowledge of spelling was responsible for changing the pronunciation of certain words whose written forms for one reason or another do not indicate pronunciations which had become traditional. For instance, Theobald had a history of being pronounced Tibbald (as indicated) by Pope's spelling of the name of Lewis Theobald, the Shakespearean commentator), but because the pronunciation has been altered to reflect the spelling and is now Theobald, it is unlikely that a London bus driver would respond to a request to be put down at Tibbald's Road since the pronunciation is now old-fashioned if not altogether archaic.<sup>12</sup> The North American pronunciation of eat with a long e sound [i] as opposed to the standard British pronunciation of eat with a short e sound [æ] is another ready example of a spelling pronunciation. The snob value of correct spelling and a good pronunciation began to be recognized in the eighteenth century, and it is in this period that we find the beginnings of modern attitudes to spelling and pronunciation. Matters of spelling and pronunciation were of interest at an earlier date, of course, but the awareness of "correctness" at a broad level of literate society was not developed. Spelling was usually included in treatises on grammar or in word lists; it rarely rated its own treatise. Grammar and spelling books had begun to appear by the middle of the sixteenth century with such works as The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our English Toung (1551), An Orthographie (1569) and A Methode or Comfortable Beginning for All Unlearned (1570) by John Hart and, a little later, Willaim Bullokar's



Booke at Large (1580) and Brief Grammar (1586).<sup>13</sup> In the seventeenth century too, spelling was usually included in more general works. The interest in spelling reform did grow, however; Alexander Gil's Logonomia Anglica (1619), Charles Butler's English Grammar (1633) and James Howell's The New English Grammar (1662) were widely known. The works of Richard Hodges, particularly A Special Help to Orthographie (1643) and The Plainest Directions for the True Writing of English (1649), contributed to the developing interest in spelling as a separate area of knowledge. The new emphasis on spelling was, of course, related to a growing interest in phonology (or orthoepy as it was then called). The works of the spelling reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth century were not as strongly prescriptive as those produced in the eighteenth century.

The eighteenth century saw a rise in the number of books which dealt exclusively with spelling; the best known of these were Elisha Coles' The Compleat English Schoolmaster (1674) [a precursor, but important in the eighteenth century], John Jones' Practical Phonography (1701), Thomas Tuite's The Oxford Spelling Book (1726), the anonymous Irish Spelling Book (1740), Solomon Lowe's Critical Spelling Book (1755), and James Elphinston's A Minniature Ov Inglish Orthoggraphy (1795). By the end of the century, spelling -- that is, "correct" spelling -- had acquired a great social value.

The spelling reformers were joined by the lexicographers, who earnestly believed that it was possible to establish, once and for all, a uniform spelling which would be accepted as the correct form

for each and every English word. What was probably the most important eighteenth century development in the English language, the publication of Dr. Johnson's Dictionary in 1755, contributed mightily to this belief and the present-day image of Dr. Johnson as the divine lawgiver cum lexicographer is the result. While Johnson did acknowledge, for the most part, the prior claims of usage and did dispute the appeals to logic, Latin grammar, and entrenched prejudice which formed the foundation for the claims made by his contemporaries, his admiration for those who were his social betters often influenced his judgement. Along with his typical eighteenth century desire to "fix" the language went a good deal of respect for upper class usage. The customary spellings and pronunciations of the upper class provided the model for "correctness" in many instances. Johnson's desire to "fix" the language is necessarily tied up with his belief that "For Pronunciation, the best general rule is to consider those as the most elegant speakers who deviate least from the written word" (in his section on orthography). Although Johnson's prescriptions for orthography were less rigid than those for phonology,<sup>14</sup> the result was approximate in social terms. The implications of Johnson's "best general rule" are obvious; in order to speak "elegantly" it is necessary to follow a uniform orthographical standard without deviation. A deviation in speech might easily result from a deviant, that is to say, inelegant, orthography. Clearly, then, persons who depart from the standard spelling are inelegant and will, by their orthographic usage, label themselves as such -- or in Johnson's more opprobrious terms, class themselves with "the lowest of the people." By the end of the century, this value judgement, based as it is upon spelling, is a commonplace.

The lexicographers following Johnson tended to reinforce his view, especially with regard to analogy, and agreement between spelling and pronunciation. Under these circumstances, as the emphasis on "fashionable" pronunciation grew, there developed a kind of class dialect through the medium of spelling. John Jones' Practical Phonography (1701) was rather advanced in using pronunciation via a spelling book as a selling point. In his preface, he promised

The Book will shew any Beginner (who must without Instruction sound Words according to the visible Letters; and therefore very often falsly) to sound all Words rightly, neatly, and fashionably (how different soever they are, by view of the Letters, from the right Sound) at first sight, without a teacher  
 . . . .

This is a step away from the usual aim of spelling books, like Coles', to render English "in the plainest order."

The concern for fashion is of particular interest with regard to the misspellings in Tabitha's and Win's letters, and it is significant that lexicographers and orthographers take especial care in advising the ladies -- "The Fair Sex" -- of the social consequences which might arise from bad spelling. Stephen Jones, in his advertisement for A Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language (1796) observes:

The conversation of the Fair Sex, animated with gracefulness and elegance of diction, never fails to charm on paper. They always succeed in bearing off the prize of epistolary ease; but it sometimes happens, that perfect accuracy of spelling is unregarded in the midst of a copious and genial flow of sentiment. --- Whenever, therefore, any doubt may arise respecting the accepted mode of spelling a word, reference to this small cabinet will immediately remove it. --- The refined and delicate sentiments of a lady, when coming through the medium of a pen, should always appear in a corresponding dress. --- She should remember, that the purer the snow, the most conspicuous the speck.<sup>16</sup>

Jones' appeal for correct spelling assumes an interest in the social advantage of correctness, and it is amusing to observe the way in which he insinuates a connection between purity of spelling and purity of character. Jones couches the desirability of good spelling in very telling terms. He speaks not merely of proficiency in spelling; instead, true to the spirit of the times, he speaks of "perfect accuracy". His appeal is calculated to make the ladies' minds run along the tracks of fashion -- "gracefulness," "elegance," "the accepted mode" and "corresponding dress," these are all the concerns of those who wish no other aim in life but to charm, either in the salon or, as Jones suggests, on paper. And if they are to charm on paper, it must be in letters since "epistolary ease" was itself the height of fashion in the age of sensibility. The publication of Lady Mary Wortley Montague's Persian Letters in 1763 was a great sensation, and it was possible for one to become famous, like Horace Walpole, merely for writing letters.

Few women were such skilled letter writers as Lady Mary Wortley Montague, Elizabeth Montagu or Fanny Burney, but ladies of fashion were concerned to write well. The importance of the letter as a vehicle for sentiment as well as information was undisputed, in literary as well as private life. The epistolary novel enjoyed a considerable vogue from its rise in the middle of the century with Richardson's Pamela, begun as a series of model letters for the instruction of would-be writers, to its decline in the nineteenth century with Jane Austen's Lady Susan (posthumously published in 1871, but probably written in 1793-4).<sup>17</sup> The letters in the novels of the period were usually

well-written, of course, and correctly spelled. The reader of Pamela must exercise an extremely willing suspension of disbelief in accepting Pamela Andrews' letters as the work of a common serving girl. Apart from the letters' ethical concerns, which Fielding could not resist satirizing in Shamela and Joseph Andrews, Pamela's letters are too well written. The reader of Humphry Clinker, however, can readily accept Win Jenkins' letters as the more likely productions of a servant, not only because she offers a distinctly servant-centred view of her little world, but also because her style is so unfashionably low and her spelling so outrageously bad. For the eighteenth century reader attuned to the controversies over spelling -- the relation of "correct" spelling to "correct" pronunciation as a social indicator or the movement to introduce spellings based upon phonetic principles -- Win's spellings would provide much merriment.

The erratic spelling in Win's and Tabitha's letters immediately strikes the reader's eye. We must, however, give these spellings more than a cursory examination if we are to determine whether the effect is meant to be one purely of misspelling or whether Smollett is interested to show variant pronunciations. The fact that much of the humour is lost if the passages are merely heard and not seen suggests that the visual impact is significant. I shall, therefore, discuss the purely orthographic aspects of Smollett's representation of Win's and Tabitha's dialect insofar as I can disentangle this from the question of their individual elocution.

Smollett capitalizes on the growing acceptance of the idea of accurate spelling as an indicator, not only of literacy but also of

social status. He is able to use the spelling -- or misspelling -- practices of Win and Tabitha as characterizing features. Win may be quickly placed as a semi-literate servant writing the sort of letter a reader might expect from a flesh-and-blood maid servant. Tabitha's letters, however, offer more of a surprise. The content of her letters, the instructions to the head of a household for the management of a country estate, place her socially, but the style and the spelling are unexpected; a reader might reasonably expect her to present a more literate front than she does. While Tabitha's mistakes in spelling and word use are proportionately fewer than Win's, they stand out more; firstly because the reader sees the errors as more glaring in the letters of a lady -- even a countrified lady -- than in the letters of a servant (give or take the convention of the articulate, highly skilled Pamela Andrews), and secondly, because Tabitha's letters are otherwise quite conventional. They lack such ungainly grammatical structures as Win's "being as how I nose what I nose" or "Miss Liddy had like to have run away". It is possible to read aloud a letter of Tabitha's to a person unfamiliar with Humphry Clinker, slide over the fun provided by the misspellings and homonyms and concentrate instead upon the puns and malapropisms. The humour arising from the orthography is uniquely dependent upon the relationship of the reader to the printed page. There is simply no way in which the humour can be transmitted through another form. While it is conceivable (though not likely) that a drama or movie could be made of such epistolary works as Richardson's Clarissa or Burney's Evelina (1778), it is impossible to imagine a

successful transfer for Humphry Clinker in general or the characters of Win and Tabitha in particular. In one sense, then spelling is all, and Smollett has thrown open their letters with an invitation to indulge in the social snobbery of the times and pass judgement -- albeit a light-hearted one -- on his Welsh lady and her maid. The letters of Win would doubtless afford great pleasure to many ladies because they offer a very real reason for enjoyment -- almost any literate lady writing could feel superior to Win. Smollett has also anticipated his readers' enjoyment of the humorous possibilities resulting from a genuine "inelegance" in spelling and invited them to surrender themselves, in a way that Stephen Jones would have found abhorrent, to the power of "the fair sex" -- Win and Tabitha? -- to charm on paper.

Smollett is able to use the spelling to satirize the social affectations of Tabitha and Win. Tabitha's pretense to a proper basic education is badly punctured when she fractures common foreign words as well as common English words. <Noncompush> for non compos (44),<sup>19</sup> <bum-daffee> for baume de vie (6) and <neglejay> for neglige (6) illustrate Tabitha's powers. <Neglejay>, however, does seem to represent a fair attempt at French for Tabitha. Win's pretensions are just as humorously dealt with. Win affects the education of a superior lady's maid and lords it over Mary Jones:

. . . and I pray of all love, you will mind your vriting and your spilling; for, craving your pardon, Molly, it made me suet to disseyfer your last scrabble, which was delivered by the hind at Bath -- O, voman! voman! if thou hadst but the least consumption of what pleasure we scullers have, when we can cunster the crabbidst buck off hand, and spell the ethnitch vords without lucking at the primmer. (109)

Win's adjectives, ending as they do with a touch of sorrow for poor Molly who cannot, like herself, have any conception of the pleasures which scholars have who can construe terribly difficult books in an effortless or off-hand way are especially hilarious. Win must turn this great gift not to crabbed books -- which she can construe with ease (or so she says) -- but to Molly's letters which she must sweat to decipher. Though Win is obviously only semi-literate herself, she boasts to the other servants of her superior skills. Smollett parallels Win's affectation of education in another character trait, Win's personal conceit. Win manages to deceive herself into thinking that she gives the impression of being more attractive physically and more elegantly dressed than she is.

Writing from London (in the letter quoted above) Win boasts to Molly that she was so well dressed and so much the mirror of fashion that she was "taken by lamp-light for an imminent poulterer's daughter" (109). Surely this confusion represents the attainment of the pinnacle of recognition in the beau monde! Win, in addition to deluding herself, fancies that she will improve her station in the world if she copies the manners of a lady. And to Win's mind, she is fortunate enough to serve a real lady -- Tabitha -- who provides a ready model. Win's lack of experience, of course, makes it impossible for her to have a standard for judging Welsh ladies much less English ladies. The result of Win's misguided emulation is predictably funny, especially because of the great discrepancy in their ages. Jerry, at one point describes this emulation to his friend Phillips:



Nature intended Jenkins for something very different from the character of her mistress; yet custom and habit have effected a wonderful resemblance betwixt them in many particulars. Win, to be sure, is much younger and more agreeable in her person; she is likewise tender-hearted and benevolent, qualities for which her mistress is by no means remarkable, . . . but then she seems to have adopted Mrs. Tabby's manner with her cast cloaths. -- She dresses and endeavours to look like her mistress, although her own looks are much more engaging. -- She enters into her scheme of oeconomy, learns her phrases, repeats her remarks, imitates her stile in scolding the inferior servants, and, finally, subscribes implicitly to her system of devotion . . . (p. 208).

Jery's remarks indicate that Win's copying of her mistress' style extends to language -- "learns her phrases, repeats her remarks" --- and to her style of speaking. Since we know nothing of her upbringing, it is possible to speculate that she learned her letters from Tabitha. Jery would probably not be surprised to find Win copying Tabitha's spelling too.

Because Win's and Tabitha's spelling (i. e. misspellings) are strikingly similar in many cases, we are able to speculate upon the possibility that they represent variant pronunciations; this aspect of the spellings will be discussed later. But apart from indicating pronunciation, Smollett uses simple misspellings for different purposes. The mere fact that a word is misspelled at all affords the reader an opportunity to feel superior to and to laugh at the illiterate writer. In addition, male readers have an additional source of amusement in that both writers are females -- usually considered less gifted intellectually, and certainly, in fact, less educated than their male contemporaries. Furthermore, the type of misspelling allows Smollett to differentiate between the social levels of Tabitha as mistress and Win as servant. Thus misspellings are used as a means of comic characterization and

to highlight humorous social situations. For instance, a misspelling of baume da vie by Tabitha as <bum-daffee>(6) and by Win as <bumtaffy> (43)<sup>20</sup> illustrates a social difference as well as a difference in pronunciation. Tabitha's spelling, although a definite departure from the French, gives the reader the clue necessary to understand Win's version. Tabitha's spelling shows that she knows the words baume de vie are, somehow, separate French forms even though she may never have seen them written, that the d is essential, and that the accent falls on the final syllable -- this she indicates by doubling the final e to represent [i]. The substitution of u for o, very common in Win's letters (and possibly suggesting a pronunciation variant since Win seems to try to spell phonetically when she is in doubt), is not significant in Tabitha's letters.

### u/o Spelling Variations

As with most of Smollett's spellings, this use of u for o is not a purely random deviation but is, instead, made plausible by a common feature of standard English spelling. Many modern English words which are pronounced with [ʌ] are spelled with o, as son, come, honey, in contrast to sun, hum, runny, where u is used. This variation has its origin in early Middle English, where o was often (but not consistently) used where Old English had employed u for the sound [ʊ] when this occurred next to such letters as v, w, n, or m, since the sequences such as vu, wu, un, and um were not very legible in the contemporary calligraphy. This u/o variation for ME [ʌ] from NE [ʊ] is now firmly embedded in standard orthography, and it is not surprising that someone

imperfectly educated should become confused and extend this variation to words normally spelled with o. Thus, where educated people use o for [ɒ], [ɔ] as in lord, pot, and either u or o for [ʌ] as in son, sun, Win generalizes this to use either u or o not merely for [ʌ] but also for [ɒ], [ɔ] and also for [ʊ]; e. g. <buck> for book, <futt> for foot, <stud> for stood. The result is that in Win's spellings u/o are totally confused, and the choice of spelling seems often to depend on the availability of a pun e. g. <bumbeseens> (bum-be-seen) for bombazine (44). Smollett is able to inject a pun while adding to his characterization of her as a semi-literate. The consistency of Win's use of u for o might at first glance seem to suggest a consistency in pronunciation; that is, that Win has fronted and lowered [ʊ] to [ʌ] <lucking> for looking (109), and [ɒ] to [ʌ] <cullick> for cholic (307) with some regularity. But, it is probably the result more of spelling confusion than of pronunciation. A glance at Win's spellings reveals the following changes:

Misspelling	Standard Spelling	Page Reference
<u>u</u> for <u>o</u> ; usually [ɒ] or [ɔ]		
bumbeseens	bombazines	44
bumtaffy*	baume de vie	43
cuddling	codling	307
cullick	cholic	307
cully-flower	cauliflower	220
cumpliments	compliments	353
cunster	conster construe	109
cunty	county	43
Dunquickset	Don Quixote	306
gumbustion	combustion	43
huggling	ogling	220
Macully	Macawly	260
a nubjack	an object	306
pumpydoor	pompadour	44

scuffle	scoffer	306
scullers	scholars	109
smuck	smock	261, 337
sullenly	solemnly	307
Sunders	Saunders	260
Tummas	Thomas	307
tumtawdry	Tom-tawdry	352

u for o; usually [v]

buck	book	109, 338
cuck	cook	70, 71
futt	foot	108
hornbuck	hornbook	155, 221
luck	look	44
lucking	looking	109
stud	stood	155
tuck	took	155, 337, 307

\* note that Win must have known an old-fashioned pronunciation of baume / balm as [bɔ:m] -- by then it would probably be [bæ:m] or [bɑ:m] as today in Standard English.

Several of these spellings have an added interest in that they also suggest dialect pronunciations, <futt>, <stud>, and <tuck>. <sup>21</sup> Since this kind of spelling confusion is very slight in Tabitha's letters, we are able to assume that Tabitha is better educated -- as she naturally would be -- and has a wider knowledge of u/o spelling conventions.

But to return to Win's spelling, <bumtaffy>; Win duplicates the u of Tabitha's in <bum>, but the d appears as t here as in several other of Win's misspelled words and the final quantity, the indication of French accentuation, is missing. Win has not, at the time of setting out from Monmouthshire, any direct contact with French usage and certainly she has none of the advantages (which Tabitha questionably exhibits) of a passing familiarity with the language. It is not until she goes to a French friseur in London that Win "discovers" French, only to write a little sample of her newly acquired French for the

benefit of Molly:

. . . I have had my hair cut and pippered, and singed, and bolstered, and buckled, in the newest fashion by a French freezer -- Parley vow Francey -- Vee madmansell -- I now carries my head higher than arrow private gentlewoman of Vales. (109)

If this is the extent of Win's knowledge of French, it is not surprising that <bumtaffy> should be her nearest approximation of baume de vie.<sup>22</sup>

The number of substitutions of u for o in Tabitha's letters is very limited when compared with those of Win noted above. Again, it seems unlikely that any of these variants are connected with actual pronunciation. Instead, the alteration indicates a comic lowering of the words in which it occurs. Smollett gets a great deal of mileage out of these spelling errors, since rarely is he content with only one effect. As well as suggesting lack of literacy and a personal self-deception as to the extent of their achievements, many of Win's and Tabitha's misspellings produce puns -- frequently with sexual and scatological implications.<sup>23</sup> <Bum-daffee> takes the French original down a notch, and Smollett has embedded it in a series of directions to Mrs. Gwyllim concerning Tabitha's patent medicines;

Williams may bring over my bum-daffee, and the viol with the easings of Dr. Hill's dock-water, and Chowder's lacksitif. The poor creature has been terribly constuprated ever since we left huom. (6)

In the context, <bum-daffee> seems to be as much regarded as a laxative as a restorative and Tabitha moves easily to the subject of easings (i. e. dung) although she means to say essence of dock-water, on to a laxative for her dog and a discussion of the animal's constipation. If the misspelling does not simply lower the word <bum-daffee> through sound confusion, the context sinks it completely.

<Guzzling> for gosling (274) goes through the same kind of change in English. The vulgarity of the word adds a note of humour and suggests something about Tabitha's stinginess in running the Bramble household. Tabitha worries about the hinds having "excess to the strong bear" (6). She means, of course, that she can't bear the idea of the servants having access to the beer, and this is only one of many little economies she insists upon in her letters to Mrs. Gwyllim since she is determined that she "won't loose a cheese-paring" (44) if she can help it. In a later letter when she supposes "there is a power of turks, chikings, and guzzling about the house" (274) the reader is reminded of her obsession with frugality and her fears that the servants will be romping and guzzling beer while she is away. The mistaken form of <guzzling> for goslings underlines the intention of the pun, since <chickings> for chickens and <turks> for turkeys both retain the plural while goslings is converted to the singular, <guzzling>. In her first letter, Smollett uses another u for o spelling to make a pun of the same kind. She writes; "I desire you'll clap a pad-luck on the wind-seller, and let none of the men have excess to the strong bear" (6). <Pad-luck> for pad-lock, like <excess> for access, suggests a contrary meaning since it is the luck of foot-pads, particularly wine-cellar foot-pads, against which Tabitha is anxious to lock her door. Smollett pokes fun at her absurd concern while suggesting that she can't spell.

<Rumping> for romping appears when Tabitha writes, "I know that hussy, Mary Jones, loves to be rumping with the men" (6). Tabitha is anxious to dampen the high spirits of her servants who enjoy the pleasant past-times of a pot of beer and a good romp. Instead of merely

suggesting that Mary should restrain her high spirits, Tabitha suggests through the substitution of rumping that Mary is promiscuous and enjoys rumping which, as Farmer tells us in Slang and Its Analogues, was an eighteenth century slang term for copulation.

The most obvious of the sexual puns is Tabitha's use of <accunt> for account (156, 274, 351) in such statements as "you must render accunt, not only to your earthly master, but also to him that is above" (156) and "I desire you will get your accunts ready for inspection" (351). In the first instance, Smollett gets in another joke as well as the sexual pun by making fun of the language of the methodist preachers by playing with the text, "render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's". Tabitha also writes "I hope you will keep accunt of Roger's purseeding . . ." (274). This latter statement is followed a little further along by Tabitha's wish that "Roger search into, and make a general clearance of the slit holes which the maids have in secret." In both cases, Roger (slang for the penis) is probably well equipped to deal with Tabitha's instructions. This kind of sexual pun is very common in Tabitha's letters and, of course, in other literature as well.<sup>24</sup> Even though Win uses u for o with greater frequency this form, not as <accunt>, but as <cunty> for county (43), appears in her letters only once (it is otherwise spelled correctly, p. 352). Although Win does not exhibit Tabitha's obsession with sexual matters and man-trapping -- at least not to a comparable degree -- we cannot mistake the sexual double-entendre embedded in her letter when she writes (of a would-be suitor of Tabitha's) "There is Sir Yury Micligut,

of Balnaclinch in the cunty of Kalloway." She mangles Ballynahinch in Galway in such a way to produce, unmistakably, "ball in a clinch in the cunty" with an obliviousness of her creation, of course. While it might be argued that <cunty> was a variant pronunciation, this is highly unlikely since cunt had as notable a use (and history of use) in sexual slang in the eighteenth century as it does now. It is also difficult to imagine a plausible mispronunciation which this spelling might otherwise represent.

Aspiration: h/h-less spellings

Any reader of Win's letters cannot help but be struck by her obvious difficulties with aspiration; H's pop up in unexpected places and as cheerfully disappear when you expect to find them. This form of misspelling is found chiefly in Win's letters; there are only a few instances of the addition of h in Tabitha's letters and none of the dropping of h. The fact that h was never pronounced has little or no social and regional significance -- virtually no one pronounced it.<sup>25</sup> But educated people knew that although h was not pronounced many words that began with a vowel (in pronunciation) were spelled with h, and they knew which words they were. Win, however, knows only that some words which are pronounced with an initial vowel are spelled with h, but does not know which they are. Therefore, her spelling errors tell us nothing particularly significant about her pronunciation. They do, however, tell us (a) that her education is limited and her spelling imperfect and (b) that she has social aspirations, wishing to ape her



betters, since a person totally without an awareness of the social significance of h would simply omit all h's.<sup>26</sup>

The reduced number of confusions in Tabitha's letters would suggest that she knows the standard inconsistencies in the English spellings for words such as heir, honour, herb, and hour. Win, however, blithely writes <hair> for air (261, 306, 352), <arm> for harm (219, 261), <hair> for heir (337) and <hearth> for earth (155), in a haphazard run at aspiration. Of Win's selection of unaspirated forms, <umble> for humble (338), and <Umphry> and <Umpry> for Humphry (107, 108) were normally unaspirated in standard eighteenth century usage and seem, therefore, to represent misspellings only. That is to say, these spellings are approximate phonetic spellings of standard pronunciations<sup>27</sup> of her day although the modern reader might not recognize them as such. The contemporary reader would very likely have registered a smile at Win's ignorance of spelling and not at Win's "vulgar" pronunciation.

Aspiration is another area in which spelling pronunciation has had some effect; many words which were unaspirated in early Modern English have come to be aspirated in present day English, (as for example, hospital which was traditionally pronounced "ospital" or "spittle").<sup>28</sup> James Elphinston, using his own form of phonetic transcription to put the case for orthographical reform, is a good source for the original pronunciation of some of these words:

#### 8. OV FALSE ASPIRACION

But no example can warrant dhe aspiring ideller, dhat pretends to lead heir, heritage, heritable, heritor; herb, herbage, herbalist; honour, honorary, honourable; and even erritage, erritabel, erritor; erb, erbage, erbalist; onnor, onnorary, onnorabel; with dhe umbel umor ov dhe prezzent

our; hwich doubtless can alone be called our our. Yet aspirations cannot be denied to' inherrit, inherritance, inherritor, hereditary.<sup>29</sup>

Elphinston, writing about twenty-five years after the publication of Humphry Clinker, confirms some of Win's usages as her own kind of spelling pronunciations. With the exception of ⟨umble⟩ and ⟨Umphry⟩, however, it does appear that Win's sporadic aspirations, unlike the u/o spelling variation discussed above, may indicate an actual representation of pronunciation and will be discussed below under that heading.

The few faulty aspirations which appear in Tabitha's letters all involve the unnecessary addition of h and the context would suggest that the misspellings are not indicative of pronunciation as are Win's. ⟨Haired⟩ for aired (274), ⟨Harse⟩ for Arse (274), ⟨hearth⟩ for earth (78), and ⟨Hoyden's⟩ for Elden's (274), are Tabitha's only departures, and all have comic overtones. Tabitha, in anticipation of Lismahago's visit to Brambleton Hall for the winter's duration,<sup>30</sup> directs Mrs. Gwyllim to spare no pains in preparing the house:

. . . burn a fagget every day in the yellow damask room; have the tester and curtains dusted, and the father-bed and matrosses well haired, because, perhaps, with the blissing of haven, they may be yoosed on some occasion. (274)

Smollett, by slipping ⟨well haired⟩ and ⟨father-bed⟩ into Tabitha's directions, introduces a sexual double-entendre which intimates that Lismahago's visit is not the only thing which Tabitha is anticipating. ⟨Well haired⟩ is doubly funny as it was a widely used descriptive term for livestock.<sup>31</sup> Second only to Tabitha's obsession with man-hunting is her concern with the management of Brambleton Hall and of the livestock in particular. It is through the livestock that Tabitha

is able to further indulge her greed by making a little extra money for herself (see her letters, pp. 6, 44, 78, 274). Husbandry, animal or otherwise, is a subject very near and dear to the heart of Tabitha, and Smollett does not let slip a chance to poke fun at Tabitha's "earthiness".

In the same letter, Tabitha describes the <pearls> (i. e. perils) of her travels, especially her visit to the Devil's Harse a-pike and Hoyden's Hole, these famous sights being "The Devil's Arse in the Peaks"<sup>32</sup> and "Elden's Hole" (274).<sup>33</sup> The use of <Harse> for Arse is surprising here because it seems unusual that Smollett does not seize the opportunity to capitalize on the reference to Arse and let the word stand without the h, particularly since he immediately juxtaposes <Hoyden's Hole>. Instead of doubling the prurient possibilities of the place names, he seems instead to have chosen merely to indicate that Tabitha simply isn't able to spell the names of these sights,<sup>34</sup> well known to eighteenth century readers and to those who had travelled into Derbyshire and the Peaks District.<sup>35</sup>

<Hearth>, Tabitha's other aspirated variant, appears in a letter to Dr. Lewis. She complains of his dealings (on her brother's behalf) with the servants of Brambleton Hall. She inveighs against Lewis for lumping her affairs with "the refuge and skim of the hearth" (78) -- specifically the servants of Bramble's hearth -- and manages to twist a little the proverbial phrase, "the refuse and scum of the earth". The aspiration of earth as <hearth> seems to be another instance of Smollett's changing the word for the sake of a pun.<sup>36</sup>

### Alternate Spellings for Unstressed Syllables

Yet another feature of Win's spelling which is of little significance in Tabitha's letters -- except for obvious word play -- is her inconsistent spelling of unstressed syllables. But before we look at Win's large assortment of these spellings, let us look at those, a comparative few, which appear in Tabitha's letters. The only outstanding examples from Tabitha's are <concurrants> for concurrence (44), and <porpuss> and <porpuses> for purpose (156, 351); these are, typically, used to raise the laugh at Tabitha's semi-literate state. Concurrants appears in the opening lines of Tabitha's second letter and its effect, like that of <porpuss> which follows, is to curtail severely the seriousness of her rage at Dr. Lewis' actions:

I am astonished, that Dr. Lewis should take upon him to give away Alderney, without my privity and concurrants -- What signifies my brother's order? My brother is little better than Non-Compush. (44)

In the same letter, Tabitha tells Mrs. Gwyllim that she "wrote to doctor Lewis for the same porpuss," that is, to vent her rage on him because she has been "done out of" one of her precious animals. It is difficult to accept her indignation -- misdirected as it is against the charity of her brother -- when it is so badly expressed in her spelling. In the final appearance of <porpuses>, the effect of the misspelling is ridiculous indeed. Tabitha, showing some small signs of mellowing subsequent to her marriage to Lismahago, is trying to impress Mrs. Gwyllim with the solemnity of the occasion and the divine nature of marriage. She writes:

Heaven, for wise porpuses, hath ordained that I should change my name and citation in life, so that I am not to be considered any more as manger of my brother's family . . . (351)..

Smollett's apposition of <wise porpuses> to Heaven is hilarious in a sentence which vaguely echoes the religious idiom -- possibly that of the marriage service which Tabitha has just heard -- with "Heaven . . . hath ordained," etc. and proceeds to malapropism after malapropism. Tabitha is mocked in Jery's letters for her mouthing of the Methodist sentiments which she hears from Clinker, and this letter makes it abundantly clear why. The fact that the Heaven which ordains the fate of Tabitha is a heaven for "wise porpoises" adds a further touch of the ludicrous to the marriage proceedings which are so fully described in Jery's and Win's letters. The phonetic confusion of unstressed syllables in these words is not the point of the word play, then; it is the humour which results from the misspellings.

Win's inconsistent spelling of unstressed syllables does, however, contribute much to the portrait of her as a semi-literate who proceeds with her spellings by guess and by God. It is also evident that Win's spellings must represent pronunciation -- or lack of distinction in pronunciation -- as well as mere untutored orthography. The attempt to transcribe unstressed syllables is, of course, dependent upon Smollett's observation of speech practices -- the very normal process in rapid speech of reducing unstressed vowels to what the eighteenth century phoneticians referred to as "obscure" vowels. But it is the purely orthographic aspect which is of interest in indicating Win's level of literacy.

If we ignore the obvious misspellings which definitely indicate radical pronunciation variants (e. g. <fillitch> for village and <Hottogon> for Octagon)<sup>37</sup> and direct our attention to Win's orthographic representation of unstressed syllables, we will find a variety of spelling substitutions. Win's ignorance of the pertinent spelling conventions is most obvious in her medial and final spellings of unstressed syllables. In the medial position, she has

Win's spelling	Standard form	Substitution	Page Reference
Mitt <u>a</u> mouse	mitt <u>i</u> mus	a for i	155
mull <u>a</u> ner	mill <u>i</u> ner	a for i	42
kind <u>a</u> lsnuffs	candle <u>e</u> snuffs	a for e	338
conger <u>e</u> ror	conj <u>u</u> rer	e for u	155
bumb <u>e</u> seens	bomb <u>a</u> zines	e for a	44
oper <u>e</u> rition	appar <u>a</u> rition	e for a	261
sel <u>i</u> vdiges	savag <u>e</u> s	i for a	261, 352
gallow <u>o</u> manky	calam <u>a</u> manco	o for a	72, 337
Hottog <u>o</u> n	Octag <u>a</u> n	o for a	42
ex <u>o</u> rcise	exerc <u>e</u> se	o for e	156

These are all substitutions of one vowel for another, as indicated.

In an even larger selection of variants, y is substituted for any vowel in an unstressed medial position:

Win's spelling	Standard form	Substitution	Page Reference
pump <u>y</u> door	pomp <u>a</u> dour	y for a	44
Hilly <u>y</u> fents	eleph <u>e</u> nts	y for e	108
surr <u>y</u> mony	cerem <u>e</u> ny	y for e	337
monkey <u>y</u> -bank	moun <u>e</u> tebank	y for e	352
turkey <u>y</u> -shell	torto <u>e</u> ise-shell [tort-e-shell]	y for e	109, 155
Harry King's Row	Har <u>e</u> lequin's Row	y for e	43

Honey <u>m</u> ils	an <u>i</u> mals	y for i	108
hony <u>m</u> il	an <u>i</u> mal	y for i	43
cully- <u>f</u> lower	caul <u>i</u> flower/flour	y for i	220
manty- <u>m</u> aker	manteau <u>m</u> aker	y for o/eau	42
pill <u>y</u> ber	pillow <u>b</u> ere	y for o/eau	7
congy <u>r</u> ation	conju <u>r</u> ation	y for u	261

In the final positions, we find:

Win's spelling	Standard form	Substitution	Page Reference
gust <u>a</u> ss	just <u>i</u> ce	a for i	155
pru <u>s</u> ias	prec <u>i</u> ous	a for ous	306
Titid <u>a</u> ll	Tiddid <u>o</u> ll	a for o	352
discoun <u>s</u> elled	disconsol <u>a</u> te	e for a	338
scull <u>e</u> rs	schol <u>a</u> rs	e for a	109
im <u>i</u> ch	im <u>a</u> ge	i for a	352
fi <u>l</u> litch	vill <u>a</u> ge	i for a	108
Provid <u>i</u> nch	Provid <u>e</u> nce	i for e	352
conger <u>o</u> r	conju <u>e</u> rer	o for e	155
sil <u>u</u> fur	silv <u>e</u> r	u for e	42
sulf <u>u</u> r	silv <u>e</u> r	u for e	337, 352
bally [val <u>l</u> ey]	val <u>u</u> e	y for u	352
vally	val <u>u</u> e	y for u	220
gallow man <u>y</u>	calaman <u>o</u>	y for o	72, 337

Most of these spelling substitutions are understandable in terms of the confusion of sounds, since they represent the sounds designated in a phonetic alphabet by the schwa symbol [ə]. Of course, these spellings do not indicate any extreme differences in pronunciation since educated and upper-class speakers almost certainly, then as now, pronounced unstressed vowels as a schwa. Nevertheless, there has always been a tendency for teachers of English and especially elocutionists to emphasize falsely the pronunciation of these vowels. And, since

Walker and Nares, revered orthoepists of Win's century, felt that these vowels should be clearly articulated,<sup>38</sup> an indication of a tendency to merge these vowels would give the impression that Win's pronunciation is vulgar in spite of the fact that the spellings reflect nothing but the standard pronunciations of the eighteenth century.<sup>39</sup> By indicating this tendency to "slur" or "obscure" the vowels in Win's letters, Smollett is adding to the impression that Win's speech is exceedingly vulgar. And, as pointed out earlier, vulgarity or a relegation to a place with "the lower order of speakers" was socially damning in an age which placed an emphasis on elegance and order in all things.

#### Word Approximations.

Zachrisson, writing on spelling reform, remarks, "It has been said that no Englishman or American can spell with certainty an English word he has not seen written, or feel certain about the pronunciation of an English word he has only seen written and never heard spoken."<sup>40</sup> While this is overstating the case perhaps, it is clear that Win and Tabitha, in their misspellings or approximations of words, are not so very different from most English speakers.

The word approximations which appear in their letters are of two types. The first involves words which are unfamiliar to imperfectly educated English speakers. These words are often entirely foreign (e. g. <bum-daffee> for baume de vie) or have foreign roots (e. g. <excess> for access), usually from Latin or Greek. The second type of word approximation is simply an attempt to spell phonetically through the use of simpler homonym forms (<mare> for mayor) or to represent



standard pronunciations through simplified, quasi-phonetic spellings (<laff> for laugh, <cums> for comes). This latter approach to spelling in literary texts has been dubbed "eye dialect" by critics studying dialect representation. I will discuss these orthographic features and eye dialect with particular attention to the ways in which Smollett employs these techniques for comic effect in Win's and Tabitha's letters.

As we might expect, the number of foreign words badly fractured through spelling approximations is not as great in Tabitha's letters as in Win's. Tabitha's most obvious misspellings are <bum-daffee> for baume de vie (6), <Non-compush> for non compos (44), <neglejay> for negligee (6), and <Macklin> for Mechlin (6).<sup>41</sup> These words are entirely foreign. <Bum-daffee> and <neglejay> both render the impression of a genuine attempt at French pronunciation and the equally genuine, jarring accent which the spelling suggests.

Tabitha also produces some hybrid words -- words which are neither foreign nor English: <concurrants> for concurrence (44), <amissories> for emissaries (156), <occumenical> for oeconomical (352) and <constuprated> for constipated (6). These words are distinctly off-key, and since they are not exactly recognizable as English words, they are another medium for a minor attack on Tabitha's desire to impress with her knowledge of "big" words. This passion for big words, a great embarrassment to Matt and a source of amusement to Jerry, Tabitha indulges even when writing home to Mrs. Gwyllim. It is probable that Mrs. Gwyllim, a Welsh country-woman, would hardly be in a position to know the difference and, like Win, would assume that Tabitha, because she is

a lady born and bred, must be correct in all her writings. <Concurrants> and <amissories> are close in sound to the words they are meant to represent, and the error common to both is the blurring of the e sound. The erroneous word bases, currants and amiss, are both a little awry in the context. They are, however, words which Tabitha might normally encounter in conversation or writing, certainly with greater frequency than concurrence or emissaries. Currants has a decidedly rural flavour and reminds us of Tabitha's concerns with the produce of the Brambleton estate. Smollett uses these earth-bound touches throughout her letters, and another good example is Tabitha's request for her "rose-collard neglejay" (6). The reader is more inclined to think of collard greens than of an elegant and fashionably coloured garment.

Tabitha's spelling of <occumenical> with its similarity to ecumenical is incongruous in a discussion of directions for the preparation of Brambleton Hall and the hiring of a replacement -- a good maid-of-all-work who will not want "extravagant wages" -- for Win Jenkins. Tabitha's stinginess, dignified by the title of economy, could hardly be further from any "ecumenical" concerns; the mistake is ludicrous. The spelling error (disregarding for the moment the reversal of the sounds in the middle syllable) might possibly reflect Tabitha's old-fashioned education. After all, her main attempts at acquiring proper schooling would have been carried on in the late 1730's or early 1740's, when a strict observance of spelling analogous with classical forms was very much the fashion. The spelling might result from a vague knowledge that

economy belongs to that class of words [Greek root words beginning with oikos] which were spelled with oe instead of e. Not, of course, that Tabitha would be aware of this rule in such terms. It is more likely that it would simply be the case of "when in doubt, more is probably better". The old spelling, however, had pretty well disappeared by the middle of the century except for its appearance in the more conservative spelling books<sup>42</sup> and does not appear in the dictionaries of Sheridan, Walker, and Jones which were widely accepted as standard at the century's close.

Lacking a sound knowledge of Latin or Greek roots, Tabitha produces such spellings as <lacksitif> for laxative (6)<sup>43</sup> and <metamurphysis> for metamorphosis (274). The middle of <metamurphysis>, murphy, is a favourite bit of word play with Smollett. It appears not only in Clinker in the letters of Tabitha and Win, but also in Smollett's first novel, Roderick Random, also as a comical word contortion. Win's version is even more imaginative than Tabitha's; it appears as <matthewmurphy'd> for metamorphosed in her account of the discovery that Wilson is really the son of Charles Dennison. She says, "The player man that came after miss Liddy . . . is now matthewmurphy'd into a fine young gentleman" (337). Win's choice of the word adds a nice little touch of likelihood in that metamorphosed seems to be a popular word with Bramble and Jerry and so it is very likely that both Win and Tabitha would hear the word bandied about and wish to impress with it.<sup>44</sup> That the word seems to have been used concerning young George Dennison is obvious since Liddy, writing to Mrs. Jermyn in the letter which precedes Win's, writes: "--Ah! madam, the slighted

Wilson is metamorphosed into George Dennison, only son and heir of a gentleman, whose character is second to none in England, as you may understand upon enquiry" (336). Win is merely echoing Liddy's observation in her own inimitable way.

In Roderick Random, ⟨murphy⟩ is imbedded not in metamorphosis but in place of Morpheus in a very funny phrase. The form appears in a letter from Clarinda to Beau Jackson. Clarinda, like Win, is semi-literate and produces a hodge-podge of spellings which might easily have been lifted from one of Win's letters as far as the orthography goes although the style and content is very unlike anything which Win produces:

Dear Kreeter,

As you are the animable hopjack of my contemplaysins, your aydear is infernally skimming before my keymerycal fansee, when Murphy sends his puppies to the heys of slipping mortals; and when Febus shines from his merrydying throne; whereupon I shall canseeif old whorie time has lost his pinners, as also Cubit his harrows, until thou enjoy sweet purpose in the loaksheek harms of thy faithfool to commend,

Clayrennder,

Wingar-year, Droory Lane, January 12th.

This letter of Clarinda's offers a profusion of "errors"; misspellings and malapropisms abound and the density of spellings which represent pronunciation variants (⟨aydear⟩ for idea, ⟨slipping⟩ for sleeping and ⟨harrows⟩ and ⟨harms⟩ for arrows and arms) is greater than anything to be found in Humphry Clinker. Clarinda's letter is extremely concentrated in this respect because it is a "one shot" exposure of the nymph's pretensions to literacy and to consideration as one of the "fair" of the Beau Monde. Clarinda's passing knowledge of the classics, however,

should never have been committed to paper, for the divine <Clayrennder> seems to have the same difficulty with Morpheus and his poppies that Win and Tabitha find with metamorphosis.

When Win's difficulties with foreign words are compared with those of Tabitha, we come away with the sense that Tabitha has very little to worry about. Win's letters are replete with mutilated foreign words. In addition to Win's delightful matthewmurphy'd we find a variety of words and phrases which have suffered strange transformations. Proper names with a foreign twist are especially troublesome for Win; she writes <Matthewsullin> for Methuseelah (306) and <Issabel> for Jezebel (219, 220).<sup>45</sup> <Matthewsullin> like <Matthewmurphy'd> incorporates a familiar name, Matthew, and <Issabel> substitutes another familiar name (almost spelled correctly) for an uncommon one. (This transformation process is a common feature throughout the history of English word formation as unfamiliar words are reanalyzed in terms of familiar English words.)<sup>46</sup>

It is not at all uncommon for loan words to be transformed by speakers unfamiliar with the languages from which they are borrowed into compounds of familiar native words (e. g. Fr. mouseron became Eng. mushroom).<sup>47</sup> The process by which the unfamiliar word is changed by the illiterate or the unwary to a more common form (and thus becomes associated with a false word ancestry) is known as folk etymology.

James Gordon provides several examples:

When the separate elements of Old English tit + mase 'small bird' passed out of use, the compound became titmouse. In the same way shamefast became shamefaced, and hiccup was respelled hiccough, although the original pronunciation

has remained. The introduction of French words among the illiterate majority gave rise to a number of such novelties. For example, berfray, originally a tower built for simple protection, became belfry when put to a different use; carriole, originally a carriage for four persons, became carryall; chartreuse became charterhouse; appentis, originally a small outhouse built against a wall, became a penthouse; picois became pickaxe; primerole became primrose; and saliere, an instrument dispensing salt, entered into a compound word saltcellar, with the second element modified on the model of wine cellar.<sup>48</sup>

Smollett presumably had observed this process of substitution and realistically attributes it to Win as a character having a limited education; he is therefore able to enrich Win's repertoire of garbled unfamiliar words, both foreign and English.

Win creates a variety of interesting words through this process as she substitutes more homely words for foreign loan words. Win produces <squintasense> for quintessence (43), <speare> for sphere (353), <pumpydoor> for pompadour (44), <turtle-water> for toilette water (44), <turkey-shell> for tortoise-shell (109, 155), <freezer> for friseur (109), <impfiddle> for infidel (306), <valley> for valet (306, 338), and <shamble> for chambre (219, 306).

Smollett has a bit of fun with Win on the score of <Issabel>, using her gaffe to comment on her ignorance of the Bible story and to make game of her penchant for the Bible-quoting Clinker. To begin, he sets her up by having her describe the way in which she is dressed to go to a play in Newcastle. Her clothes and make-up are badly overdone because she has succumbed to the flattery of Jerry's foppish valet and taken his advice on how to dress stylishly. Win, however, fancies herself dressed in the latest Paris fashion and Smollett punctures this impression through Win's spelling; he has her write, "I thoft

as how, there was no arm in going to a play at Newcastle, with my hair dressed in the Parish fashion", deftly reducing Win's modishness to the circle of a country village. All this, merely to prepare us for a joke about a painted Jezebel.

When Win is attacked by a mob of colliers, she cannot understand why they call her <hoar> and <painted Issabel> for she seems to know of neither whores nor Jezebels.<sup>49</sup> Then, when Win seeks an explanation from her fellow servant and zealous Methodist, Humphry, she finds him unwilling to explain; he thrusts a Bible into her hand instead:

. . . I read of van Issabel a painted harlot; that vas thrown out of a vindore, and the dogs came and licked her blood -- But I am no harlot; and, with God's blessing, no dogs shall have my poor blood to lick: marry, Heaven forbid, amen! (219-20)

She is hardly wiser. The significance of the passage is lost on her if she takes the warning literally, fearing that the dogs will lick her blood and, certainly, she comes away from her reading unable to spell Jezebel. The object lesson might as easily be about Queen Esther as Queen Jezebel for all Win has learned.

Win's garbling of names is not confined to the exotic; she does as well with home-grown names, converting Dutton to <Ditton> (219, 220), Dennison to <Dallison> (352), Bullford to <Ballfart> (307), Melford to <Millfart> (352), Thomas to <Tummas> (307) and so on. In a description of the visit to Bath, Win triumphantly boasts to Molly

-- Dear girl, I have seen all the fine shews of Bath; the Prades, the Squires, and the Circlis, the Crashit, the Hottogon, and Bloody Buildings, and Harry King's Row . . . (42, 43).

What she really means is that she has seen the North and South Parades, the Squares, the Circus, the Crescent, the Octagon<sup>50</sup> [Chapel], Bladud's

Buildings and Harlequin's Row, all famous sights in Bath and the object of much criticism from Bramble in his letters.<sup>51</sup>

Neither does Win spare Irish or Scottish names. She writes from Bath of "Sir Yury Micligut, of Balnaclinch in the cunty of Kalloway" and we know from Jery's letters that she is referring to Sir Ulic Mackilligut from Ballynahinch in Galway (p. 60). Apart from the sexual puns, this little phrase includes two jokes designed to get a laugh from Smollett's Scottish readers who would enjoy <Kalloway> for Galloway in Scotland (and not Galway in Ireland), and for the reference to the mickle gut posture of Sir Ulic. In her letters from <Grasco> (260, 262) Win talks about <Loff Loming><sup>52</sup> (260, 261) and <Kairmann> (261) which, could the reader not guess, are spelled out by Matt and Liddy who also write from Glasgow about Lough Lomond and Cameron. Win is scarcely better with personal names; Sir George Colquhoun (243, 262) is rendered as <Sir George Coon> (261),<sup>53</sup> the reverend Mr. M'Corkindale (228, 237) as the reverend <Mr. Macrocodile><sup>54</sup> (260), Mr. Moffat as <parson Marrofat> (143), Archy M'Alpine (226) as <Mr. Machappy> (338) and Saunders Macawly as <Sunders Macully> (260). While these names do represent several kinds of phonological changes (e. g. metathesis in M'Corkindale / Macrocodile, Kairmann / Cameron; devoicing, Glasgow / Grasco; aspiration, M'Alpine / Machappy etc.), the transformations of these names seem to be ordered as much by a whimsical wish to create comical names as by any attempt to represent regularized sound changes.

The foreign word forms non compos and habeas corpus undergo a different and unique change when they are elevated to the status of proper names. Non compos appears as <Non-compush> (44) when Tabitha



in her usual irascible style complains about her brother's generosity:

-- What signifies my brother's order? My brother is little better than Non-compush. He would give away the shirt off his back, and the teeth out of his head. . . . (44).

Here Tabitha, in one deft stroke, turns her criticism of Matt into the highest form of praise for his selflessness; but from her point of view, it is not a laudable quality but something akin to madness. Tabitha has doubtless heard the term non compos and the way in which she refers to <Non-compush><sup>55</sup> indicates that she does understand the implications of the term. Her manner of reference, however, is laughable since she intimates that <Non-compush> could well be a notorious fool. A confusion of the legal term with a person seems possible, especially since Smollett uses a similar but more outrageous confusion in a letter of Win's; she writes about the arrest of Humphry Clinker:

Lord knows, what mought have happened to this pyehouse young man, if master had not applied to Apias Kirkus, who lives with the ould bailliff, and is, they say, five hundred years ould, (God bless us!) and a congeror . . . (155).

Win, in her credulous way, believes that a writ of habeas corpus, which she has heard mentioned in the course of Clinker's crisis, can only be a real, live conjuror who can set free the pious Humphry (for an account of the habeas corpus proceedings, see Jerry's letter, p. 150). Win's attempt to reproduce what she thinks she hears is very much constrained by her limited vocabulary and by the fact that she has no familiarity with Latin. These limitations are, in this instance, further complicated by her difficulties with aspiration -- she drops the h of habeas which ought, logically, to be changed into Hapias instead of <Apias>.<sup>56</sup> The whole transformation, <Apias Korkus>, is

a seemingly capricious bit of word play but it is, in fact, dependent upon several predictable sound changes and the obvious phonetic spelling of k for c in corpus. The total effect, in spite of the regularity of the forms, is one of droll confusion.

In the same passage Win presents the reader with a delightful word approximation, <pyehouse> for pious (155), formed by the process of folk etymology. The operating constraint is the necessity of producing an unfamiliar word, using known or familiar words as a basis for the construction. Win's faulty aspiration provides the excuse for the invention as she inserts the h into pious to produce <pyehouse>, a likely combination of two English words. This tendency to analyze -ous or -is endings as -house is evident in James Gordon's example of appentis reanalyzed as a penthouse quoted above. The opposite tendency, that of reducing words ending in -house to unstressed -us, is a common feature of lower class speech.

A loan word which is treated to the same inventive process is mountebank. Seldom used by present day speakers, mountebank was commonly encountered in eighteenth century newspapers, letters, and novels as a term of reproach; it was presumably popular in conversation too. Win converts mountebank into <monkey-bank> (352) as she reports what she overhears concerning Lismahago's wedding ensemble:

-- Wan said he was a monkey-bank; and the ould bottler swore he was the born imich of Titidall.

The two English words combined in this manner lend an even more ridiculous air to the outfit than is conveyed in Jerry's detailed description of Lismahago (347).

Smollett's linguistic cleverness in shattering these kinds of foreign words and then producing humorous English hybrid forms is further augmented by the element of credibility. Win's choice of words for her letters is very plausible, even considering her inferior composition skills. Her choice of words seems to be based upon her experience of language, particularly vocabulary, as we might naturally expect. But Smollett offers, indirectly, explanations of the source of these words by having the same words -- in their non-fractured forms -- appear in the letters of the other members of the family. As a result, Win's letters often provide a kind of comic echo as she tries to ape her betters with respect to their vocabularies. When Win writes, "it shall never be said I mentioned a syllabub of the matter" (221), we are not really surprised by her attempt to write such a word as syllable since we find Bramble writing: "but don't say a syllable of the matter to any living soul" (5). My earlier discussion of metamorphosis as **⟨metamurphysis⟩** (Tabitha, 274) and **⟨matthewmurphy'd⟩** (337) and habeas corpus as **⟨Apias Korkus⟩** touches on this same element of copying and the manner in which Smollett provides a plausible context for the hilariously copied forms. There are, of course, many other examples of this kind of explanatory reinforcement throughout the letters.

Another kind of plausibility is lent to Win's choice of words by the direct report which she gives us of her own consciousness of trying to copy foreign words. As a result, she makes up some very funny "franglais" forms such as "Vee madmansell" and "Parley vow Francey". Direct report is also given quite frequently through Jerry's letters

as he is especially amused by the absurd language of Win and Tabitha and gleefully comments upon it in his letters to Phillips.<sup>57</sup>

### Homonym Spellings

Turning now from Win's word approximations which alter foreign words into hybrid-English words, let us look at the word approximations which are attempts to spell phonetically through the use of simpler homonym forms. The homonyms are often used to provide humour through incongruity, as for instance when we find Win telling Mary about a servants' squabble in Bath in which the cook was "ready for to go before the mare" while she herself had "got a varrant from the mare" to search the cook's box (71).<sup>58</sup> Word substitution of this kind prompts a very elementary comic response when the reader is invited to imagine the literal confusion and to laugh at the ignorance which produces such a spelling.

I am disinclined to regard these word substitutions as malapropisms in the ordinary sense of the word since they are an appeal to the eye instead of the ear and not used with the same dramatic foolishness which we find in the language of characters like Fielding's Mrs. Slipslop (1742) or Sheridan's Mrs. Malaprop (1775). Win's malapropisms, apart from these simple homonym types, depend upon misspellings such as <angles> for angels (338) or upon a confusion of one big word for another as for example, <pursecution> for prosecution (72) and <repository> for suppository (7). Win's many spellings of the simple homonym type of malapropism would have no comic effect for the ear since often the pronunciations which the spellings reflect were widely recognized as standard. In fact, most of Win's mistaken words have a history of

confusion, and the pedagogical practices which meant to sunder such paired words as mayor / mare did little more than reinforce the confusion by always discussing the words as supposedly contrastive pairs. A cautionary note which warned students of English of the difficulties in separating these words and the necessity for absolute correctness was inevitably prefixed to tables of similar sounding words. The practice of introducing spelling words to be learned as "near alike" (in sound) or as "homophones" was evident in the work of the major seventeenth century spelling reformers, and notably in Hodges (c. 1640) and Cooper (c. 1687). Dobson (English Pronunciation 1500-1800) relies upon the "near alike" lists of these writers to ascertain current pronunciations, as upon many others. The practice of using homophone lists was taken for granted as a useful method and we can find many examples in eighteenth century spelling books.

From Tuite's The Oxford Spelling Book (pp. 80-101)<sup>59</sup> I have chosen a few words which Win confuses and which are found in "A Table of Words the same, or nearly alike in sound, but different in spelling and signification":

air, the element  
are, in being  
heir, to an estate

blew, did blow\*  
blue, a colour

cellar of liquors\*  
seller that sells

dew, on the grass  
due, a debt

hair of the head  
hare, a beast

Latin, a language  
laten, tin

male, the he of any kind\*  
mail, armour

mare, a beast  
mayor of London

pair, or couple  
pare, to cut, or clip  
pear, fruit

right, not wrong  
rite, custom, or ceremony  
wright, a wheelwright  
write with a pen

sole of a shoe  
soal, or sole, a fish  
soul and body

stood did stand  
stud an embossment

suit at law, or of cloaths  
suit, to suit, to match, or agree  
soot in a chimney

tail of a beast  
tale or story

tare amongst corn, or weight allow'd  
tear, to rend, or that drops from the eye

vail, or veil, a covering  
vale, a valley

valley, a dale  
value, worth

vial, a glass  
viol, a musical instrument

wane, or wane, or moon's decrease  
wain or cart  
wean a child from the breast

\*Also Tabitha

The Irish Spelling Book (pp. 133-48)<sup>60</sup> also offers a table "of Words the same, or nearly alike in Sound, but different in Signification, and in Spelling." The table contains many words listed in the earlier table by Tuite:

blow	<u>did blow</u>	right	<u>just or true</u>
blue	<u>a colour</u>	rite	<u>a ceremony</u>
cellar	<u>of Liquors</u>	wright	<u>a workman</u>
seller	<u>that selleth</u>	write	<u>with a pen</u>
dew	<u>from Heaven</u>	site	<u>situation</u>
due	<u>A Debt</u>	cite	<u>to summon</u>
do	<u>to do</u>	soal	<u>of a Shoe</u>
hair	<u>of the Head</u>	sole	<u>a fish</u>
hare	<u>on the Fields</u>	sole	<u>alone</u>
heir	<u>of an Estate</u>	stood	<u>did stand</u>
Latin	<u>old Roman</u>	stud	<u>an embossment</u>
Latten	<u>tin drawn</u>	tail	<u>the end</u>
mail	<u>Armour</u>	tale	<u>a story</u>
male	<u>an he</u>	vale	<u>below a Hill</u>
pair	<u>a couple</u>	veil	<u>a covering</u>
pare	<u>to cut</u>	wain	<u>a Waggon</u>
pear	<u>Fruit</u>	wane	<u>to decrease</u>
		wean	<u>a Child</u>

At the risk of being repetitive, I also quote from Solomon Lowe's Critical Spelling Book (1755). Lowe is often more helpful as a guide to contemporary pronunciation since he is willing to write such entries as "He had his portmanteau [port-man-tle] behind him" (96), and "A pair of chamois [shammy] shoes" (94), to guide his reader to the accepted pronunciation while advising him of "spelling preferables". Lowe gives several tables of "equivocals" which offer us some excellent information on spelling as it relates to pronunciation. In Lowe's "EQUIVOCALS, that have the Same (or Nearly the same) Sound but Different Spelling" we find:

The wind blew. A blue colour  
 A hoar-frost. A son of a whore.  
 'Tis latten, or iron tinn'd over. The latin tongue.  
 A coat of mail. A male child.  
 A stud of horses. He stood in the way.  
 The tares in corn. She tears her hair.  
 To veil the face. A vale or valley.  
 A servant's vails. The vales or valleys. She veils her face.  
 A bass-viol. A glass-phial.  
 To buy good wares. What cloaths he wears?

(pp. 100-111)

The lists give errors so common as to receive the particular attention of the orthoepists, and we are able to see that Win's and Tabitha's educations may only be judged in part by these mistakes since all kinds of people -- not just old-fashioned provincials or uneducated servants -- made them. The lists also provide a quick,

ready-made framework for Smollett's jokes. It is possible to assume that the commonplace nature of the lists and the general awareness of these bug-bears of spelling would incite the eighteenth century reader to smile immediately as he ticked off Win's mistakes. If, after all, the literate had suffered through the process of learning these distinctions, they would probably have an instant recognition of the errors and an instant pleasure in catching Win out. Smollett's use of these particular examples gives his readers (then as now) the opportunity to pass judgement on Win by feeling superior, to laugh at her mistakes, and to enjoy an additional touch of humour in Smollett's ability to put Win in her place within the social and comic range of the novel.

Tabitha's errors -- <blew> for blue (351), <dew> for due (274), <male> for mail (6) and <seller> for cellar (6, 45, 274) are all listed, but the fact that Tabitha seems to be relatively free of this type of error is another means of characterizing her as better educated than Win, not by informing us that she is a lady and Win a maidservant but through the evidence of her writing.

We may see from the tables that Win's mistakes are presented as proof of what happens when a careful attention to discriminating spellings of "like-sounding" or "near-alike" words is lacking. Win's homonym spellings are listed below, and a glance at the sentences in the text in which they occur will confirm the simple humorous intent of the mix-ups which Smollett has exploited.



baring	bearing	220
hair*	air	261, 306, 352
hair*	heir	337
hare	hair	107
hoar	whore	219
Latten	Latin	44
mail	male	42
mare	mayor	71
pear	pair	352
rights	rites	338
rite	write	107
sites	sights	180
sole	soul	197, 109, 155, 220, 306, 338
soot	suit	42, 261, 338
steeling	stealing	206
stud*	stood	155
tail	tale	70, 220
tares	tears eye	358
Vales*	Wales	109
Vails*	Wales	260
vally	value	220
vaned	weaned	109
veil	vale	155, 338
viol	phial / vail	352
ware	wear (noun)	338, 219
wares	wears (very)	338

\*See pronunciation below for discussion of obvious features: aspiration, v/w interchange, also, note dialect pronunciation (as well as standard) indicated by u/o substitution in stud.

The puns which derive from these spellings are sometimes a little risqué, as for instance when Win says "O, If I was given to tail-baring [two puns in one blow], I have my own secrets to discover" (220). This we expect from Smollett. Or, the puns are sometimes sly as when Smollett has Win write two puns on vails (the payment or profit which servants expected to receive in addition to a regular wage or salary).<sup>61</sup> One is a traditional anti-Scots joke (playing on miserliness) as Win refers in passing to "SUNDERS MACULLY, the Scotchman, who pushes directly for Vails" (260) as the deliverer of her letter. The other is a little dig at Win as she is fancying

herself better than she is; after she has dressed up in cast-clothes and had her hair elaborately -- and it is clear by implication, foolishly -- coiffed, she boasts, "I now carries my head higher than arrow private gentlewoman of Vales" (109). Smollett gets several digs at Win's vanity here as he also mocks the ladies' hair fashions of the times.<sup>62</sup> Win's little bubble of pride is burst by her unfortunate comparison since any gentlewoman of Wales is, on the first count, a mere provincial frump and any gentlewoman of vails is, on the second count, merely a servant and beneath the consideration of the beau monde.<sup>63</sup> Smollett's homonym spellings are used to develop such puns as these, and quick references to the pages cited in the list of Win's homonym spellings will reveal more puns and incongruities to any twentieth century reader who may have merely skimmed the letters.

### Eye Dialect

In addition to the use of homonyms for alternate spellings, we also find substandard spellings which represent standard pronunciations.<sup>64</sup> The spellings are quasi-phonetic as, for example, <cums> for comes in Tabitha's first letter which begins "When this cums to hand, be sure to pack up . . ." (6). This practice is generally designated as "eye dialect" by those studying the representation of dialect in literature. Such spellings mean nothing phonetically; they are merely a sort of visual signal to the reader that the dialect speaker -- or in the case of either Win or Tabitha, the dialect writer -- is not literate. Eye dialect forms occur with reasonable frequency in the writings of most authors who attempt to represent dialect.<sup>65</sup>

Sumner Ives comments:

To the extent that an author relies on this purely visual dialect, he can be said to be deliberately overstating the ignorance, or illiteracy, or his characters. Some of it, however, seems to be inevitable even in the most carefully done literary dialect. In fact, some of it actually facilitates the reading. For example, the addition of a final [t] to once necessitates the spelling of the first part of the word as WUN-, since ONCET would suggest a two syllable pronunciation; similarly, the EE in P'LEECEMAN, though it indicates the conventional vowel, is justified in order to prevent the unwary reader from pronouncing P'LICE -- to rhyme with slice.<sup>66</sup>

Smollett's eye dialect words usually employ simple spelling substitutions familiar to all English speakers. These substitutions do not alter the sound although they radically alter the appearance of the words and do much to endorse the impression of Win and Tabitha as semi-literates. The two sounds of c are rendered as k in ⟨Klinker⟩ for Clinker, ⟨Kandles⟩ for candles, and ⟨looker⟩ for lucre and as s in ⟨sitty⟩ for city<sup>67</sup> and ⟨sivil⟩ for civil. "Silent" letters are lost: b is lost in comb coom; initial k is lost in know, knew, knows ⟨no, new, nows, nose⟩; w is lost in wrap ⟨rap⟩, wrapped ⟨rapt⟩ and sword ⟨sord⟩; h is lost in rheumatics ⟨rummaticks⟩ while gh is lost by means of alternate spelling conventions. We find ⟨nite⟩ and ⟨lite⟩ (night and light), ⟨tho't⟩ and ⟨bro't⟩ (thought and brought), and ⟨thy⟩ (thigh). The letter t is doubled in ⟨bitt⟩ and ⟨fitts⟩. Alternate spellings appear for the same sound as, for example, ur for ir in ⟨burd⟩, ⟨thurd⟩, ⟨shurt⟩, and ur for er in ⟨murcy⟩, ⟨survice⟩, and ⟨pursecution⟩.<sup>68</sup> In addition, we have ch for ti in ⟨menchioned⟩, x for cc in ⟨axident⟩, and ck for ch in ⟨stomick⟩ (stomach) and for c in ⟨tincktur⟩ (tincture) and ⟨rummaticks⟩ (rheumatics). "Obscure" sounds are treated with similar endings, as ⟨imich⟩ for image,

⟨cowitch⟩ for cowhage, ⟨marridge⟩ for marriage, ⟨clapt⟩ for clapped and ⟨rapt⟩ for wrapped. The letter f is substituted for the more complex ph spelling to produce ⟨fizzogmany⟩ for physiognamy<sup>69</sup> and ⟨disseyffer⟩ for decipher and for the gh spelling to produce ⟨laff⟩ and ⟨enuff⟩. The vowel combination ous is pared to us as in ⟨skandelus⟩ for scandalous.

A misspelled word such as ⟨menchioned⟩ suggests a closer relation between spelling and sound through ch than does the conventional ti; the implication seems to be that Win tends to simplify her spelling because she has a simple education at best. By applying conventional spelling rules, Win produces ⟨primmer⟩ for primer,<sup>70</sup> ⟨sware⟩ for swear, and ⟨tare⟩ and ⟨taring⟩ for tear.<sup>71</sup> She also produces ⟨yuse⟩ for use (both verb and noun forms), as Tabitha produces ⟨yoosed⟩ for used, by inserting the y sound which the pronunciation suggests. In the same way, she spells one and once as ⟨wan⟩ and ⟨wance⟩ since the w sound is there in the pronunciation, and the conventional spelling, given English spelling rules, suggests a pronunciation for one as own predicted by the final silent e and likewise for once. Win's w is logically, if incorrectly, added.

Many of these eye dialect spellings are simply phonetic renderings, as ⟨Dunquickset⟩ for Don Quixote,<sup>72</sup> ⟨marokin furze⟩ for American furs, ⟨ass of etida⟩ for asafoetida, ⟨litel⟩ for little, ⟨purpuss⟩ for purpose (a more reasonable spelling and a charming pun since a cat does purr), and ⟨Prades⟩ for Parades and ⟨gardnir⟩ for gardener, both of which record the natural tendency to shorten the pronunciation by squeezing out the unstressed vowels.

Smollett's solid instinct for plausibility when combined with a cleverness in controlling the complexity of his word changes<sup>73</sup> produces some excellent eye dialect forms. As Ives points out, some care must be taken to guide the unwary reader away from a mispronunciation. Smollett is careful to do this. When he has Win write <coom> for comb, he eliminates the silent b, but he also lengthens the quantity of the o sound by doubling it so that the reader cannot possibly mistake it for the short o in come. As a by-product, he is able to suggest a dialectal pronunciation and to get a little rustic reverberation by intimating that Win knows more about coombs than about combs. <Ginneys> is another excellent example; Smollett has simplified guineas to its obvious sound content, but had he been less skilful, he might have produced <gineas> or <ginneas> which could have been open to interpretation as a three syllable word.

His phrase <marokin furze> is also interesting. It appears in Win's description of the wedding ensemble of Tabitha:

As for madam Lashmiheygo, you nose her picklearities -- her head, to be sure, was fintastical; and her spouse had rapt her with a long marokin furze cloak from the land of the selvidges, thof they say it is of immense bally. (352)

<Marokin> is clear with its k for c and its haphazard spelling of unstressed vowels;<sup>74</sup> <furze> is a straightforward phonetic rendering. The phrase is particularly humorous since it suggests that Win doesn't know about America and cannot therefore understand the difference in a <marokin> and American; to Win, it is merely "the land of the selvidges". <Furze> is a very common word (and a homonym of furs) and this is merely another rural overtone which is injected into

Win's letter. Phonetically, the phrase is pretty clear, especially since we have the exact "translation," (even of <bally> for vally for value) in Jery's letter of November 8th:

She was dressed in the stile of 1739; and the day being cold, put on a manteel of green velvet laced with gold: but this was taken off by her bridegroom, who threw over her shoulders a fur cloak of American sables, valued at four-score guineas, a present equally agreeable and unexpected. (347)

A glance through the following list of eye dialect spellings will attest to the formation of the spellings using the techniques mentioned above. Interested readers may also consult the page references to investigate possible puns which arise as a result. For instance, we get a punning twist in statements in the letters such as Win's "But I nose what I nose" (306). Win's letters, from her first in which she tells Mary that "we servints should see all and say nothing" (7), are full of indications that Win is always "nosing" out the news. Win's letters are sprinkled with tantalizing assertions: "But I scorn for to exclose the secrets of the family" (307); "O gracious! if God had not given me a good stock of discretion, what a power of things might not I reveal, consarning old mistress and young mistress" (42), and "But you nose, Molly, I was always famous for keeping secrets" (43) -- this last statement pleasantly suggesting that Win overlooks the fact that you cannot keep secrets and be "famous" for keeping them too. Win's assertions are inevitably preceded or followed by some inadvertent bit of gossip. But Win's nosiness often protects her from the full brunt of her mistress' anger, a point which she well understands when she says to Molly that she has escaped a real scouring

from Tabitha because "she knows as I know whats what" (43). As we here get pure information and no pun, both the spellings are correct. It is through puns such as <nose> for knows (a substandard verb form as Win uses it) that Smollett can add to the humorous characterization of Win, while reinforcing the view of her as semi-literate through the use of eye dialect.

Win's eye dialect spellings:

Aberga'nny	Abergavenny	43
Aberga'ny	"	44, 155
Abergany	"	306
axident, axidents	accident	43, 337
bitt	bit	107
bro't	brought	107
burd	bird	306
burth	birth	306
clapt	clapped	261
coom	comb	109
cowitch	cowhage / cowage	70
disseyffer	decipher	109
Dunquicket	Don Quixote	306
eyther	either	43
enuff	enough	71, 220, 220
fitts	fits	42
fizzogmany	physiognamy	42
flurtation	flirtation	220
furze	furs	352
ginneys	guineas	70
Glostar	Gloucester	6, 306
imich	image	352
kandles	candles	71
Klinker	Clinker	107, 108, 109, 155
laff	laugh	43
lite	light	70, 352
looker	lucre	155
marokin	(A)merican	352
marridge	marriage	338
menchioned	mentioned	221
murcy	mercy	307
nite-cap	night-cap	71
(fort)nite	fortnight	337
no	know	71, 307
new	knew	261
nows <sup>75</sup>	knows	262

nose	knows	43, 109, 306, 307, 307, 338, 352
Prades	Parades	42
primmer	primer	109
pumpydoor	pompadour	44
pursecution	persecution	72
	(malapropism for prosecution)	
pye-bald	piebald	108
rap	wrapp	219
rapt	wrapped	43, 352
remembring	remembering	43
shurt	shirt	306
sitty	city	108
sivil	civil	108
skandelus	scandalous	71
sord	sword	108
sower	sour	109
stomick	stomach	43, 262
survice <sup>76</sup>	service	42
sware	swear	71, 155
tare, taring	tear (v.)	306, 306, 307
tho't	thought	108, 108
thy	thigh	337
trollopes	trollopee*	42
thurd	third	338
wan	one	306, 338, 352 43, 44
wance	once	307
yuse	use (n.)	155
	" (v.)	221

\*A loose-fitting gown.

Tabitha's eye dialect spellings are significantly fewer since her educational level ought to preclude most of these kinds of errors:

anemil	animal	6
bloo	blue	6
cums	comes	6, 45
gardhir	gardener	6
Glostar	Gloucester	6
litel	little	6
purpuss	purpose	78
rummatics	rheumatics	351
tincktur	tincture	45
yoused	used	274

While the place names <Glostar> and <Abergany> are definitely peculiar in their spelling appearance, they are not peculiar as indicators



of pronunciation because they are phonetically correct. Also, Gloster was used for a long while as a standard spelling. Solomon Lowe is careful to indicate the correct pronunciation in his Critical Spelling Book (1755) by means of phonetics. He writes "At abergavenny [ab-er-ghe-nee] in monmouthshire"<sup>77</sup> and "He lives at gloucester [glos-tur]."<sup>78</sup> Any reader familiar with these towns would recognize the eye dialect form as correct in its representation while enjoying a laugh at Win's and Tabitha's spelling.

In addition to these whole-word eye dialect forms, there are vestiges of eye dialect technique in several other misspelled words. That is to say, a word like <korkus> for corpus, which is subject primarily to transformation as a loan word, also represents an attempt at eye dialect because the k in <korkus> is a clear indication of the normal pronunciation of c in corpus. The same is true of <shamble> for chambre with regard to the sh for ch. Another example is the substitution of u for ou as mentioned in connection with <skandelus> (and also, of course, the c for k); this is also evident in <churned> and <churning> for journeyed and journeying, but the main point of interest is Smollett's attempt to represent a variant pronunciation ([č] for [j], see below), and a tendency to shorten the words by omitting the -ey in journeyed and journeying.

Another example of a word in which the chief focus is pronunciation is <ketched> for catched or caught. The most significant feature indicated by Win's spelling is that the word is a substandard dialect verb form, but the use of k for c (which indicates nothing about

pronunciation) is a simple use of eye dialect spelling. Smollett is able to use one spelling to indicate several things about Win's approach to language.

In byebill for Bible<sup>79</sup> Win has combined two short, familiar words but the pronunciation "appears" slightly different according to English patterns of stress than that for Bible. Nonetheless, this spelling represents a use of eye dialect since the reader cannot mistake the close proximity of the words and the intent to represent Bible.

The following lists present examples of eye dialect features which appear in these mixed forms -- forms in which loan word formation, variant vowel or consonant pronunciation, dialect usage, or variant stress patterns might be of more interest as indicators of social dialect than the mere misspellings with which they are combined.

Win's lexical items:

axercise	exercise	43
byebill	Bible	219
churned	journeyed	260
churning	journeying	261
distinkson	distinction	306
furder	further (farther)	70, 338
ketched	caught (caught)	70, 71
kimfittable	comfortable	307
kindalsnuffs	candlesnuffs	338
selvidges	savages	261, 352
siserary	certiorari	70
skewering	scouring	72
shamble	chambre	214, 306
surrymony	ceremony	337
veezel	weasel	306

Tabitha's lexical items:

guzzling	goslings	274
kergo*	cargo	274
purseeding	proceeding	274
skewred	scoured	274

\*This may be a simple misspelling -- she knows some words with [ar] are (er), e. g. Derby.

These lists of eye dialect words (or variations) might give the impression that Smollett relies very heavily upon eye dialect to convince the reader of the semi-literate states of the two women. But this is not so. Smollett uses many other linguistic means to convey this notion, and the actual number of eye dialect usages, when compared with all the deviant spellings or word usages in the letters, will be seen to be surprisingly small.<sup>80</sup> It is, in fact, difficult to find a passage which has a good cluster of eye dialect spellings because they are sprinkled about through the letters. In the following passage, the underlined eye dialect words illustrate this point:

The cuck\* brazened it out, and said it was her rite\* to rummage the pantry; and she was ready for to go before the mare\*: that he had been her potticary\* many years, and would never think of hurting a poor sarvant\*, for giving away the scraps of the kitchen -- I went another way to work with madam Betty, because she had been saucy, and called me skandelus names; and said O Frizzle\* couldn't abide me, and twenty other odorous\* falsehoods. I got a varrant\* from the mare\*, and her box being sarched\* by the constable, my things came out sure enuff; besides a full pound of vax\* candles, and a nite-cap of mistress, that I could sware to on my cruperal\* oaf\* . . . (71-2).

\*Indicates variants.

This passage has a greater proportion of eye dialect spellings than is usual in Win's letters; even so, of the eighteen variants indicated, only the four underlined are eye dialect spellings.<sup>81</sup>

Eye dialect is essentially caricatured spelling, and it contributes, in Humphry Clinker, to the rather overblown, comic treatment of Win and Tabitha as characters. They are caricatured through their own misspellings as surely as through their exaggerated behavior or character

traits, and the illusion of the letters as originals rather than Smollett's creations doubles the force of this self-caricature.

Opposing this tendency towards exaggeration in spelling are several counterforces. The humorous frequency of eye-dialect spelling is balanced in Humphry Clinker by correct spellings and by Smollett's attempts to represent features of real dialects, even if the representation is not always consistent with one dialect.<sup>82</sup> Another important counterbalance for the impressions which the use of eye dialect promotes is the very serious content of Bramble's letters -- his social and philosophical concerns -- and the highly informative quality of Jery's letters. The impressions received from Win's and Tabitha's letters are heightened in their ridiculous usage by the contrast to the more elegant letter writers, Bramble, Jery, and Liddy, while at the same time, the silliness of the content is naturally minimized through the point of view provided by the variety of letter-writers.

Another feature of Win's orthography which does not have any significance for pronunciation is her habit of attaching articles to following or preceding words, as for example, her writing of <nubjack> for an object (306) or <narro> for ne'er a, i. e. never a (107, 155). Because she is only semi-literate, she does not necessarily understand where the words ought to be divided and she becomes confused when she writes them down. In the same way, she writes <marokin> for American (352) and omits the A because she assumes it is an article preceding a word. In her sentence, "her spouse rapt her with a long marokin furze cloak," she uses the a as an article preceding the adjective -- its normal placement in conventional usage. Since she is geographically ignorant

of America, she appears to assume that a <marokin> fur cloak is obviously just another kind of fur -- like an ermine fur cloak or a fox fur cloak.<sup>83</sup>

### Misdivision of articles

The misdivision of articles has been observed as an ordinary feature of English from Middle English onwards.<sup>84</sup> It has been common for final n in the indefinite article to attach itself to a following noun beginning with a vowel as, for example, newt (ME an ewte; OE an efete, cf. modern dialect form an eft) and a nickname (ME an ekename). However, in umpire (ME noumpere), adder (ME nadder) auger (ME nauger) and apron (ME napron, naperon), the process has been reversed: the n of the noun has attached itself to the article.<sup>85</sup> This first kind of misdivision is a prominent feature of Cockney speech, and William Matthews traces it back to the sixteenth century, remarking the "attaching the n of 'an' to the following word, a nold hore, a nebe (an ebb), at a nend, a nold man."<sup>86</sup> In the eighteenth century it would doubtless be classified as a mark of vulgarity on the printed page.

Speech at normal speed has no breaks in the stream of sound, so that there would be no division between the article and noun in an object, and its transcription as a nobject would not be any indication of deviant pronunciation. Hodges (1644) includes such phrases as an arrow: a narrow, a notion: an ocean in his "near alike" list and Cooper (1685 and 1687) even lists such examples in his "alike" list while warning against them as "barbarous speaking." Clearly it is not barbarous speaking these spelling reformers are concerned with as much as barbarous spelling insofar as pronunciation variants cannot be discerned beyond "alike" quality in homophone lists.

Smollett has observed the process of misdivision, perhaps through personal experience and a sharp ear for the confusion (if indeed it could be discerned), or perhaps through a knowledge gleaned from his reading of the prescriptive pronouncements commonly encountered in eighteenth century spelling books and grammars. In either case, he would be aware of such an error as a sign of inferior or social dialect when he attributes this process to Win. Psychologically, the attribution is very convincing as a "real" linguistic feature in Win's letters: first, because it has been observed by language historians to be a natural language occurrence for many people -- especially to dialect speakers;<sup>87</sup> second, because it is utterly convincing as a feature of characterization that a person of Win's educational background should make this kind of error.

Win's misdivisions include <nubjack> for an object (306), <narro> for never a (107, 155) and nurro for never a (220) and the related form <arrow> for ever a (109, 352). The words appear in the following contexts:

<nubjack>:

-- O! that ever a gentlewoman of years and discretion should tare her air, and cry and disporridge herself for such a numjack! (306)<sup>88</sup>

<narro / nurro / arrow>:

. . . which shews that . . . a hound [may] be staunch, thof he has got narro hare on his buttocks . . . (107).

As for master and the young 'squire, they have as yet had narrow glimpse of the new light. (155)

. . . and behold there is nurro geaks [jakes] in the whole kingdom, nor any thing for poor sarvants, but a barrel with a pair of tongs thrown a-cross . . . (220).

. . . and, thof he don't enter in caparison with great folks of quality, yet he has got as good blood in his veins as arrow privet 'squire in the county . . . (352).

I now carries my head higher than arrow private gentlewoman of Vales. (109)

Of these misdivisions <nubjack> seems to have been especially puzzling to modern readers although it is unlikely that an eighteenth century reader would have been puzzled, since the phrase "an object of affection" was current; certainly, an eighteenth century reader familiar with the century's sexual slang would not have been too bemused. Arthur Boggs has made a complex etymological argument for the word formation<sup>89</sup> but in this, as in most other examples of Smollett's word play, the simplest linguistic explanation is the likeliest solution.

Smollett is using the expression "object" in the most usual slang manner, that is "the object of one's affection," just as he uses it (spelled correctly) in Peregrine Pickle when he writes "This composition, which seems to have been inspired by a much more amiable object . . ."90 At the same time, he is able to suggest an alternate slang usage and its dialect usage as a "deformed or diseased person; a miserable creature; an imbecile"<sup>91</sup> -- a usage which would amuse many of Smollett's readers.

<Nubjack> is a superb example of Smollett's ingenuity in getting several effects from one variation. It provides the following linguistic variants: (1) faulty word division, (2) u/o spelling confusion, (3) consonant cluster simplification,<sup>92</sup> (4) dialect usage, and (5) a salacious pun. Surely it is an injustice to Smollett's creativity with language to suggest that he is merely combining two slang terms?

<Narro>, <nurro>, and <arrow> for never a and ever a do not present any difficulties since they are simply phonetic transcriptions of

familiar vulgar pronunciations and of dialect pronunciations which are still in use today (see OED). Wright's EDD gives the history of the dialect use and many examples. Win's letters contain the whole spectrum of forms in the development of never a which is as follows: never contracts to ne'er; [e] becomes [ɔ] before [r] (see ⟨sartain⟩, ⟨sarvant⟩, ⟨parson⟩ in discussions of pronunciation variants) to produce nar. So we have these steps; never a to ne'er a to nar a to nar -- the article being replaced by the schwa [ə] as it is joined to nar as the unstressed syllable of narro. Smollett's use of this form is specifically mentioned by Partridge in discussing arrow in A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English. Win has the following examples:

ne'er	it shall ne'er be said	261
ne'r a	it has got ne'r a bottom	261
na'r a	and na'r a smoak upon our backs	42
narro	thof he has got narro hare on his buttocks	107
narro	As for master and the young 'squire, they have as yet had narro glimpse of the new light.	155
nurro	there is nurro geaks in the whole kingdom	220
arrow	I now carries my head higher than arrow private gentlewoman of Vales	109
arrow	as arrow privet 'squire in the county	352

Because the form was so widely recognized as dialectal, it could be used with a guaranteed effect in suggesting the vulgarity of a character. Fielding uses the form frequently in Tom Jones (1749) and manages, at one point, to get both usages into one sentence, "There is narrow a one of all those officer fellows but looks upon himself to be as good as arrow a squire of £500 a year" (VIII, ii). Smollett, in using the forms, manages a pun or two as well as the suggestion of vulgarity (107, 155).



### III

#### Pronunciation

##### Background to eighteenth century phonology

We have seen in Win's and Tabitha's letters that Smollett has used spellings (i. e. misspellings) which have no significance for pronunciation to indicate the womens' different social and educational levels, and in addition we have seen that these spellings are the result of a careful and conscious manipulation to produce comic effects in a variety of wordplays. When we turn our attention to the spellings which do have significance for pronunciation we will see that Smollett has used phonological features to denote social and educational levels again in a different way and also to indicate regional features of speech.

Smollett uses a selection of well-known phonological features associated with Welsh-English speakers in the letters of both women since he is interested to classify them as Welsh; he also uses a selection of features associated widely with rustic dialect speech. These variant traits mark Tabitha and Win as countrified. The exact location of the regional characteristics is not as significant as the fact that these traits signify that the women are not fashionable and do not speak the received pronunciation of London. In addition, he uses phonological indicators of Cockney speech of the eighteenth century. He does not want to show that they are Cockneys; rather he is interested

in typifying them as vulgar speakers, and the Cockney variants were widely recognized (and decried) as the very quintessence of vulgarity in the period. It is a fairly common literary practice to use Cockney speech traits merely to suggest vulgarity.<sup>93</sup> In short, Smollett draws upon a wide variety of pronunciation variants to create a convincing comic characterization for each of the women. But before we look specifically at his manipulations of normal language processes, let us look at the attitudes toward pronunciation common in the period to see how the eighteenth century audience may have viewed his variant pronunciations via spelling.

Börje Holmberg, writing On the Concept of Standard English and the History of Modern English Pronunciation (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), discusses the development toward the Received Standard Pronunciation of our time. He discusses when and in what connection the desire to reach uniformity in the colloquial language has been expressed, what criteria of Standard English have been approved, what types of pronunciation have been accepted and what changes in the attitude to Standard English have occurred. His outline of eighteenth century attitudes toward pronunciation -- attitudes very consistent with the spelling attitudes discussed earlier -- is very helpful in recreating the climate of opinion in the period. With the information Holmberg offers and the period sources to which he directs his readers, we are able to judge with more accuracy the effect of Smollett's use of spelling to indicate pronunciation.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries no definite standard of pronunciation existed although the movement toward a standard was

underway, as evidenced by the fact that the orthoepists of the time felt that a certain pronunciation was to be preferred to other types. Class distinctions were not a prominent feature in any of the works which dealt with pronunciation although Gill (1619) is notable for his attack on the allegedly affected speech of a type of upper-class woman whom he calls Mopsae, but this is contrary to the kinds of social attack which follow in the eighteenth century. In the seventeenth century

Appeals for "better" pronunciation were not chiefly based on social conditions. No 17th century grammarian advises his reader to avoid this or that pronunciation because it is heard only among the lower classes. It is clear that the feeling had not yet grown up that pronunciation was a class shibboleth. This was to come later, when the suddenly well-to-do bourgeois were trying to rise above their stations . . . . It can be said with reasonable justification that the feeling for a standard that did exist in the seventeenth century was largely theoretical, and hardly influenced the speech of the average educated speaker.<sup>94</sup>

It is in the eighteenth century that we find the beginnings of the present attitude toward pronunciation for it was then that a decidedly snobbish attitude toward pronunciation developed. John Jones' Practical Phonography, published at the turn of the century, throws some light on changing attitudes. Although he is, himself, very tolerant in his attitudes toward variant pronunciations, he does announce (as mentioned earlier in connection with spelling) that he wants to teach his readers to pronounce "fashionably." Jones' tolerance was a feature unusual in later orthoepists. Isaac Watts has the dubious distinction of being the first to compile lists of words with pronunciations to be avoided -- pronunciations, that is, which are common in London,

"especially among the vulgar." Watt's introduction of this technique is important because the label of vulgarity was to become the most effective means with which to attack pronunciation in the eighteenth century.

The interest in pronunciation as a social indicator (of class or region) was growing, and many of the orthoepists of the period attempt to focus their reader's attention on the acquisition of the "best" pronunciation while alerting him to the possible social consequences of a "bad" pronunciation, that is, regional or lower class pronunciations. The introduction of pronouncing dictionaries in the latter half of the eighteenth century is a further testament to this particular interest in pronunciation. Earlier generations had been satisfied with word lists which were especially useful as guides to spelling. Once advances were made with respect to spelling reform and the establishment of spelling standards, it was only natural that standardized pronunciation should seem the next step. And of course, pronunciation guides were an essential aid.

While Dr. Johnson's Dictionary (1755) was the major publishing event of the age, its usefulness as a dictionary did not entirely satisfy subscribers with a desire for pronunciation guidance. Sheridan's General Dictionary (1780) was a work of monumental significance and constituted a great advance in lexicography by providing for the first time a simple and workable system for indicating pronunciation; the other "pronouncing" dictionaries which followed, including John Walker's A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary (1791), were considerably influenced

by Sheridan's methods and attitudes (and usually acknowledged their indebtedness to Sheridan). The writers of these dictionaries exerted a profound influence on educational methods and writers of text-books for the next fifty years and, of course, on the average literate man.

Dr. Johnson's influence cannot be minimized, however. Although his Dictionary lacked a pronunciation guide for individual words, it did not lack a general guide. Johnson's position regarding pronunciation was very much in line with his position on spelling. He was as interested in seeing the language "fixed" in the mouth as on paper, and his pronouncement that "the best general rule is to consider those as the most elegant speakers who deviate least from the written word" firmly established a class consciousness of pronunciation and the idea that words should sound as they are written. His relegation of deviant speakers to "the lowest order" and his insistence on the written word as the model of speech paved the way to speech reform and the proscription of variant pronunciations. It was inevitable in this climate of opinion that variants should come to be regarded as "corruptions", and it is to this attitude in the eighteenth century that we owe many of the pedagogical practices of Victorians and Moderns who decry alternate forms in speech as corrupt. The idea of "purity" of language is also a commonplace in the period.<sup>95</sup>

The belief in "fixed" principles which led to the establishment of a standard of language as "reputable, national, and current" (i. e. good use based upon "reputable custom" in the capital)<sup>96</sup> also led to the establishment of a standard pronunciation based on the speech of "the better sort of people at London".<sup>97</sup> London as the geographical

standard had been assumed for several centuries and this aspect of the standard is not unusual, but the social criteria defining "the better sort of people at London" are harder to pinpoint. We may, however, assume fashion and learning as two of the necessary criteria.

A person who spoke with an unfashionable provincial accent or revealed a lack of education through his speech was stigmatised as never before when speech became a social yardstick and "correct" pronunciation was of prime importance. And that person who revealed by his speech that he was a member of "the lower order of people at London" (i. e. the Cockneys) was doomed to social disgrace. For the author who wanted a guaranteed comic effect, an emphasis upon provincial pronunciations (e. g. Fielding's Jonathan Wild, Smollett's Deborah Hornbeck) was a safe bet.

Variant or dialectal features in speech were reserved for comic characters; it is unthinkable for instance that Sophia Western could speak in the broad Somerset dialect attributed to her father. Proper heroines spoke correctly and wrote correctly and this convention is very obvious in Smollett's novels. His female characters tend to be either unapproachable paragons (e. g. Aurelia Darnel [SLG], Emilia [PP], Monimia [FCF], and Narcissa [RR]) or buffoons (e. g. Grizzle Pickle, [PP], Clarinda [RR], Mrs. Gobble [SLG]) although Dolly Cowslip, in spite of her dialect speech, comes off a little better than the reader might initially expect and is treated to some non-humorous human qualities in her characterization. When a Smollett heroine writes a letter (e. g. Narcissa's letter, Roderick Random, Chapter VX) it is an elegant letter, well-spelled and without a tinge of variant features: it is

only his "comic heroines" -- the buffoons -- Win, Tabitha, Deborah Hornbeck and Clarinda -- who write horribly misspelled letters full of words which assault the reader's eye and suggest variant pronunciations through their orthography. This technique of language use is an effective if conventional means of suggesting character; it is also an effective means to signal to the reader that he is to make social judgements about a character on the basis of language, written or spoken.

Smollett manipulates Win's and Tabitha's spellings to produce a large number of pronunciation variants. It is my intention to deal with the most obvious of these by concentrating upon the language processes used to create the variants and by concentrating on the ways in which the consonants and vowels have been affected by these changes. In determining the pronunciation Smollett would associate with the orthographic conventions I am assuming that the changes in spelling are made with reference to educated London English since Smollett was well aware of the antagonistic attitude towards the Scots (cf. Dr. Johnson) and the stigma attached to Scottish pronunciations (see Roderick Random, Chapter XIII). Via the persona of Matt Bramble he comments on it in Humphry Clinker:

I think the Scots would do well, for their own sakes, to adopt the English idioms and pronunciations; those of them especially who are resolved to push their fortunes in South Britain. I know, by experience, how easily an Englishman is influenced by the ear, and how apt he is to laugh when he hears his own language spoken with a foreign or provincial accent. I have known a member of the House of Commons speak with great energy and precision, without being able to engage attention, because his observations were made in the Scots dialect, which certainly gives a clownish air, even to sentiments of the greatest dignity and decorum. (231)

As a writer, he would use the standard if possible to assure himself of a wide audience.

My treatment of consonantal changes, losses, or gains will be more extensive than that of vowels because it is possible to interpret with some degree of accuracy the probable intentions behind consonant alterations. With vowels, however, it is different. The interpretation of vowels and vowel quantities indicated by standard orthography -- even manipulated orthography -- is exceedingly difficult, a fact which most present-day recorders of dialect still find in spite of an international phonetic alphabet and electronic means of recording.

### Clipping

A feature of English word formation which Smollett observes and uses in his word play is clipping or aphaesis.

An abbreviation, or clipped form, must be regarded as a new word, particularly when, as it frequently does, it supplants the longer form altogether. Thus, mob can be said to have supplanted mobile vulgus 'movable, or fickle, common people,' and taxicab to have supplanted taximeter cabriolet to the extent that the longer form is no longer associated with it, and two new words, taxi and cab, have taken over independently. A special type of abbreviation consists of what is left over after an initial unstressed syllable has been lost; 'scuse and 'cause (for excuse me and because), two childish speech forms may illustrate. Frequently, this phenomenon has resulted in two different words, for instance, fender, fence, cute, squire, and sport, which are simply aphaetic forms of defender, defense, accute, esquire, and disport. Sometimes, however, an aphaetic form may occur simply as a variant of the longer form, for instance possum (from opossum) and coon (from racoon).<sup>98</sup>

In the eighteenth century, for instance, pothecary and spittle (or spital) were aphaetic forms of apothecary and hospital.<sup>99</sup> The Irish Spelling



Book of 1740 provides examples in a table "Of Words commonly spoken shorter than they are written" of words which were created through the dropping of unstressed syllables:

Ill med'cin poticary purtenances sample scape spittle stablsh state sumner surgeon venturer vittles	} for {	evil medicine apothecary apurtences example escape hospital establish estate summoner chirurgeon adventurer victuals
---	---------	--

(The Irish Spelling Book, p. 148)

While modern day English has retained some of these shortened words in standard usage (e. g. sample, surgeon), spelling pronunciation has restored the older forms in other (e. g. hospital, apothecary). It is clear, however, that the above list was meant as a guide to pronunciation and not to shortened spelling forms since the conventional spellings are also given. We may assume, therefore, that Win's misspellings of this kind are another means of classifying her as illiterate in spite of the fact that the spellings do represent ordinary pronunciation and not an inferior pronunciation.

Smollett has Win use three common eighteenth century words, scaped (72, 260), potticary (71)<sup>100</sup> and squire<sup>101</sup> and, using the same principle of aphetic formation, invents two others, <marokin> for American (352)<sup>102</sup> and <trigging> for intriguing (70). While scaped and potticary did not survive the censure of the prescriptive spelling teachers beyond the end of the eighteenth century, they did survive as widely-used

dialect words.<sup>103</sup> It is not very likely, then, that Smollett's use of these words was used to reinforce the view of Win as a country bumpkin even though that is doubtless the impression the words make upon readers of the nineteenth century and the modern period. Instead, the misspelled forms are but another comment upon Win's illiterate state.

### Metathesis

Metathesis is the transposition of speech sounds, most usually of a consonant and a vowel, though two consonants may metathesize (e. g. wasp / waps). In English, the most common metathesis involves [r] and a vowel; it may occur when [r] precedes a vowel, as in perty for pretty, hunderd for hundred, apern for apron, and pernounce for pronounce, or when [r] follows a vowel as in northren for northern, eastren for eastern, southren for southern, and cistren for cistern.<sup>104</sup>

Win has both types of [r] metathesis:

[r] and a following vowel:

affear'd	afraid	261
Kairmann	Cameron [kæmɾən]	261
Mattermoney	matrimony	352
portend	pretend	338
pursecution	prosecution	72
purtection	protection	353
purtests	protests	338
purvail	prevail	219
portend	pretend	338

preceding vowel and following [r]:

cruperal	corporeal	72
crutch	church	261, 338, 338
Macrocodile	M'Corkindale	260
praticle	particle	262
preformed	performed	337
profuming	perfuming	220

Tabitha has three of the first type:

partake	protect	6, 274
partected	protected	45
purseeding	proceeding	274

and one of the second:

acrons	acorns	156
--------	--------	-----

Smollett uses the metathesis of [r] in Win's letters to create such puns as "-- My parents were marred according to the rights of holy mother crutch, in the face of men and angles. . ." (338) in the middle of her protestations that she "didn't come on the wrong side of the blanket," or a reference to the "holy bands of mattermoney" (352) when discussing the weddings of the three happy couples. The matter of money has, by this time in the novel, had a great deal to do with the appropriateness of the ladies' choices. Smollett is able to create puns while categorizing Win as a vulgar speaker,<sup>105</sup> and hinting at Tabitha's possible regional dialect.

In addition to the predominant [r] types of metathesis there are several others; examples of other frequent metatheses are tragedy for tragedy, revelant for relevant, aks for ask, and waps for wasp. Of these, Win has <ax> (262) and <axed> (43, 219) for ask, and <asterisks> (7, 220) for hysterics.<sup>106</sup> Wright, while entering AKSE, AXE, AX, in his Provincial Glossary, dignifies the word by stating "This word which now passes for a mere vulgarism, is the original Saxon form, and used commonly by Chaucer and others."<sup>107</sup> The form is standard in dialectal usage.<sup>108</sup>

Win also reverses n and m to produce <fizzogmany> for physiognamy (42) -- another word probably unfamiliar to her in its conventional

form while possibly not in its dialect form fizzog.<sup>108</sup> This particular metathesis, like aks for ask, is a vulgar usage which is dialectal in general and a Cockneyism in particular. Pegge notes the Cockney reversal, vemon and vemonous<sup>109</sup> along with other examples of Cockney metathesis recorded in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Modern anenomes for anemones is of the same order.

Tabitha has n and m reversed in <occumenical> for oeconomical (352) and [č] and [s] reversed in a metathesis-like formation, obviously in the interests of introducing an off-colour pun, in <beshits> for beseeches (156).

Related to metathesis and to the assimilation of [n] to [m] is a speech confusion associated with vulgar usage, the confusion of [n] and [m]. We find Win writing <sullenly> for solemnly (307) and <warming> for warning (107). In both cases, Smollett is exploiting malapropisms to produce incongruity. The first instance is particularly humorous as Win asserts, "I have sullenly promised to Mr. Clinker, that neither man, woman, nor child, shall no that arrow said a civil thing to me in the way of infection" (307). This is more of Win's characteristic pride in being "famous for keeping secrets" -- Molly, as usual, doesn't count as "man, woman, nor child" -- and Win's unwillingness to promise secrecy could hardly be more blatant.

#### Dissimilation: [r] - [l] confusion

Dissimilation is a "phonetic process in which two neighbouring sounds that were once alike become different. In the words derived

in English, Italian, and French from Latin peregrinus the first r has become dissimilar to the second one by changing to l: pilgrim. Sometimes one of the neighbouring sounds will disappear completely. This kind of dissimilation is illustrated in the common pronunciation of library, February, secretary in which the first r is lost in each word."<sup>110</sup> Dissimilation depends, in part, upon the difficulty of forming the separate sounds. Because the liquids [l] and [r] are closely related in articulation, there may be some confusion in the auditory discrimination of these sounds and in the reproduction.<sup>111</sup> In certain languages other than English, [l] and [r] are the same sound (i. e. they represent one phoneme), and the use is entirely predictable according to whether the sound occurs in a word initial, medial, or final position. Speakers of oriental languages, for instance, find it difficult to learn [l] and [r] as separate sounds of English (i. e. as two phonemes) and, as a result, produce reversed sounds.<sup>112</sup> For speakers of English, this reversal is likely to occur, but the fact that a seeming confusion is evident in dissimilation suggests that the confusion might be mistaken for dissimilation itself.

Smollett's keen ear must have caught the process of dissimilation for he has performed a little sleight of hand with Win's spelling to suggest a peculiarity of her speech, the confusion of the liquids. He has Win write <Grascow> and <Grasco> for Glasgow (260, 262) and <Harry King's Row> for Harlequin's Row (43), using r for l. Using l for r, she writes <scuffle> for scoffer (306) and <shamble> for chambre (219, 306). In the latter case, Win's confusion is further complicated by her misinterpretation of a foreign word.

## Assimilation

Assimilation, by contrast, is the phonetic process by which one sound changes to resemble or become identical with a sound near it. Assimilation may come about because two sounds resemble each other in that they are articulated in the same part of the mouth.

The two pronunciations spelled strength and strenth illustrate this. The sound of ng in the first pronunciation comes to resemble the sound of n in the second. The second one is easier to pronounce because both the n and the th are articulated in the front of the mouth. In ngth, the tongue is in the back of the mouth for ng and moves to the front of the mouth for th. In strenth then, we have a pronunciation shortcut; the sound of ng has been assimilated to, has been made like, the sound of n. In a second kind of assimilation, one sound becomes identical with another. An example of this can be found in the pronunciation of horseshoe. The usual pronunciation might be spelled horshoe. Here the final s of horse is assimilated to, has become identical with, the sh sound of shoe. This standard pronunciation is a shortcut; it reduces the movements of the tongue from two to one at this point in the pronunciation of the word.<sup>113</sup>

All utterances are consecutive, and it is a feature of virtually every known language that speakers tend to alter vowels and consonants to shortcut the process of articulation. Assimilation is just one of Win's many ways of shortcutting language, for instance, <horshoe> for horseshoe (261)<sup>114</sup> and <impfiddle> for infidel (306). The assimilation process to produce <impfiddle> is as follows: [n] becomes [m] (i. e. a palatal nasal moves forward to become a labial nasal) because [m] is closer in point of articulation to [f] (a labio-dental fricative) than [n], and the [p] (a bilabial stop) just naturally intrudes in smoothing the move from [m] to [f]. Win's formation of impfiddle is also conditioned by the fact that she analyzes the unfamiliar word as a compound of two ordinary English words, imp and fiddle.<sup>115</sup>

Although [n] becomes [ŋ] before velars in stressed syllables, there is a tendency in English speech to substitute [n] for [ŋ] in unstressed syllables (e. g. huntin', shootin', fishin', which are spellings used to indicate a phonetic value of [n], the palatal nasal). Because of this, improperly educated people know that some words which they pronounce with [n] are spelled ng, but do not know which words [n] words to spell ng. They therefore hypercorrect and spell [n] with ng when really n is the correct spelling.<sup>116</sup>

Assimilations of [n] are common in English as nasals tend to assimilate to a following consonant (e. g. before [g] or [k]). At all periods of the language [n] tends to become [ŋ] before velars. The change is regular in stressed syllables and occurs, for example in monk, canker, and banquet.<sup>117</sup> Although prefixes in in- and com- commonly contain [n], this may not be so in words in which the prefix is felt as inseparable (e. g. income, conquer, concrete, congress).<sup>118</sup> Win's letters have only one example of this form of assimilation, <carrying crow> for carrion crow (306) in which the following [k] affects the [n].

But Win's and Tabitha's letters have another common feature, closely allied with this change. There are many examples of [ŋ] for final [n].

From Win's letters:

Addingsborough	Edinburgh	221
assings	essence	307
Harry King's Row	Harlequin's Row	43
mounting	Mountain	261, 261
pursing	person	108, 352
Loff Loming	Loch Lomond	260
	[final [d] dropped]	

and from Tabitha's:

chickings	chickens	274
easings	essence	6

This inverse pronunciation of [ŋ] for [n], represented in spelling by ing for in, is very common among "would-be-fine-speakers" and marks them as social climbers as it does Win and Tabitha.<sup>119</sup> This change is also evident in earlier English; we find Shakespeare's <cushings> (cushions), <javelings> (javelins), and <Napking> (napkin) illustrating this reversal.<sup>120</sup> Smollett's use of this in the letters often occasions some fun as for example, when Edinburgh is fittingly turned into Adding Borough in honour of the Scots' penny consciousness. And essence is turned into easings (a widely used dialectal word for dung, as mentioned earlier) in Tabitha's letter and into <assings> -- with the obvious "shock value" -- in Win's letter.<sup>121</sup> Tabitha's misspellings are interesting since one is connected with an off-colour joke and the other, <Chickings>, is not terribly far off from the common diminutive term chicklins, listed in Johnson's dictionary. Tabitha is talking about eggs hatching and a "power of turks, chickings and guzzling (goslings) about the house" and it is possible that her error is meant not to be a glaring use of [ŋ] for [n], but merely an ignorant spelling.

#### Consonant cluster simplification

Closely related to assimilation is consonant cluster simplification, a process in which a group of consonants is reduced to only one instead of two,<sup>122</sup> or two instead of three.<sup>123</sup> Assimilation may occur in certain final groups where the second consonant is often lost, normally



by assimilation to the first.<sup>124</sup> From the late fourteenth century onward final [d] and [t] are lost after dentals, after [k], and after [p]. The process is assimilatory; [d] (and more rarely [t]) is lost after [n], and [t] after voiceless consonants (especially [k] and [p]). It was apparently common in vulgar and dialectal speech.<sup>125</sup> Smollett provides examples of these consonant cluster simplifications in Tabitha's "vulgarisms", <partake> for protect (6, 274)<sup>126</sup> and <talons> for talents (78), and in Win's <parfeck> for perfect (337)<sup>127</sup> and <nubjack> for (a)n object (306)<sup>128</sup> and in <temp> for tempt (219).

Smollett also has Win simplify Baynard's into <Baynar's> (306), a loss of [d] following [r] and another final position simplification. Dobson illustrates this particular assimilation with the homophone pair leper / leopard.<sup>129</sup> He does, however, note that loss of dentals after [r] is not frequent and cites harness / hardness in the medial position as one of the few examples.<sup>130</sup>

In certain words a medial consonant is lost by being assimilated to a following consonant. The development when in progress is considered characteristic of vulgar or dialectal speech (like the final simplification), but historically is quite frequent and has produced some of our present existing forms. In general these forms were produced by changes originating in Middle English.<sup>131</sup> From the fourteenth century onward there is a marked tendency to simplify a group of three (or four) consonants by losing the sound of the middle one (or last but one). The consonants lost are those that are lost in the final position (as discussed above), but the assimilatory process occurs more frequently when another consonant follows.<sup>132</sup>

This medial consonant cluster simplification is found in Win's <Hottogon> for Octagon (42)<sup>133</sup> in which the [k] is assimilated to the following [t], and in <contentible> for contemptible (352) in which the middle consonant [p] is assimilated to the following [t] and the [m] is further assimilated to the nasal [n] since the nasal [n] is closer in point of articulation to the dental [t] than to the labial [m]. It is also found in <bran-new> for brand-new (337)<sup>134</sup> and in <grinestone> for grindstone (107)<sup>135</sup> in which the dental is lost after [n].

#### Excrescent [d] or [t]

Smollett attributes to Win a tendency to add dental sounds to certain words in her letters, and this addition is a common procedure. In late Middle English and in Modern English there is a tendency for "excrescent" stops to develop after nasals; this is the result of a premature closing of the nasal passage, so that the release of the oral stop is a distinct articulatory process and is heard as a distinct sound. It is very common for a dental stop, [d] or [t], to be "tacked on" to the end of a word; our words ancient, pageant, and parchment developed their final t's in the fifteenth century by this process.<sup>136</sup> The addition of a dental where it is normally absent is frequently a feature of dialect speech. In the dialects in a few instances, a t has been added after n, f, or s, as in sermont, suddent, vermint, scruff (scruff), and wunst (once).<sup>137</sup> Win adds t only once, writing <sarment> for sermon (155).

The addition of d is more common, usually developing after l, n, r. Wright notes that it is seldom, if ever, found north of Yorkshire except in a few isolated words, drown, gown, yon, and scholar. But some common examples of excrescent d are: feeld (feel), drownd (drown), gallond (gallon), gownd (gown), sound (swoon), wind (wine), and millerd (miller). We find some of these in Win's letters: <bands> for banns (352), <wind> for wine (108), <drownding> for drowning (260), <sounded> for swooned (261) and a curious use of <and> for an in the phrases, "for she never spun and hank of yarn in her life" (338). We find only <wind-seller> for wine-cellar (6) in Tabitha's letters. The addition of d or t to indicate the sounds of [d] and [t] is easily recognized as a feature of dialect speech and it was, in the eighteenth century, as now, characteristic of Cockney speech -- the speech of "the vulgar sort of people at London" as Walker puts it. Stage representation of dialect often uses final t in Irish English and final d in Cockney English. But for Smollett's purposes, the addition of either was an immediate indicator of vulgarity.

#### Loss of [r]: vocalization

The omission of r in comfort, comfortable, forward, and Lord to produce <comfit> (108, 220, 261), <kimfittable> (307, 307), <forewood> (306, 307) and <Laud> (43) is another commonly recognized linguistic process which has affected English in the early Modern English period -- that of the vocalization of [r] in unstressed syllables. That is to say, [r] (except before a vowel or syllabic consonant)<sup>138</sup> is vocalized to the schwa [ə], a sound to which Modern English [r] is closely allied.

In unstressed syllables the result is to obliterate the distinction between syllabic [r] and [r]. The vocalization of [r] is common in dialect forms in the early Modern English period and the vocalization of [r] in all syllables is a development of Modern English which has lost post-vocalic, preconsonantal and final [r] everywhere, even when stressed, in Standard English.

### Loss of [w]

Dobson, in a discussion of the vocalization of consonants, observes the loss of [w], especially before [v] and [o]. He notes the change of swoon to soun in the late fourteenth century, noting that excrescent [d] was usually a prominent feature of this particular word.<sup>140</sup> Win has this very form in sounded for swooned (261). Of this particular word Walker comments in his Critical Pronouncing Dictionary (p. 57), "In swoon, however, this letter [w] is always heard, and pronouncing it soon is vulgar." Win is again damned by her usage. Of the loss of [w] before [v] Dobson remarks that it "is primarily a Scottish and Western development but is not confined to these dialects; [see Wright EDG, p. 207]. Dickens shows it in the Cöckney speech of the Wellers" (Dobson II, p. 980). Win exhibits a loss of [w] in wool to produce <owl> (219)<sup>141</sup> and in world to produce <orld> (220), and in pennyworth to produce pennorth (43).<sup>142</sup> All of these pronunciations appear as dialect, as do <comfit>, <kimfittable> and <forewood> (also as forwad, forrad, etc.) and are recorded in the EDD. These spellings also mark Win's pronunciations as substandard.

### Intrusive [r]

Another feature of Win's speech indicated by her spelling is the presence of "intrusive r". By "intrusive r" is meant a pronunciation with [r] where this is not etymologically "justified", that is, where the r is not descended from Early Modern English [r] and does not occur in the spelling. The r is inserted only before a vowel and by this we know that [r]'s were no longer pronounced before a consonant. Intrusive and linking r's (e. g. law and order sounded as lore and order) are frequently, in literature, used as a characteristic mark of vulgarity.<sup>143</sup> Jespersen remarks that "the oldest example, perhaps, is in Smollett (quoted by Storm [in Englische Philologie, 1892, p. 919]): your aydear is: the windore opened."<sup>144</sup> Smollett used the intrusive r in the letters of Clarinda (Roderick Random) and Deborah Hornbeck (Peregrine Pickle) to suggest lowness, and he uses it to the same purpose in Win's letters in ⟨fellor⟩ (43, 70), ⟨vindore⟩ (219), and ⟨windore⟩ (220, 307).<sup>145</sup> Win also inserts r into the middle of a word; we find ⟨odorous⟩ for odious (71). This last, however, seems more plausibly to exploit the malapropism since it is humorously joined with falsehood in ⟨odorous falsehood⟩ to suggest Win's outrage at having someone tell a "stinking lie" about her. Tabitha has no instances of intrusive r beyond her misspelling of ⟨constuprated⟩ for constipated (6).

### Inserted r to represent [a:]

Related to the intrusive r, but only in appearance, is Win's spelling of ⟨Chrishmarsh⟩ for Christmas (352). This is not an example

of intrusive r; rather, it is an attempt to represent a long vowel sound of [a:], similar to that in Standard British English, path and glass. Jespersen notes that "it may be mentioned that ar is the only way of popularly indicating the sound of [a:], as when people are intended to pronounce Iago as "Yargo" or E=argo" . . . or answer as arnser . . . . Thus also must be explained the spelling marm for ma'am, for instance, in Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes books."<sup>146</sup>

Aspiration: addition and omission of [h]

Win's haphazard spelling of h-less words with h and vice versa would incline a reader, at first glance, to think that her spelling represents her own pattern of faulty aspiration in speech. It is, however, less likely that Win's spelling represents faultily aspirated or non-aspirated words than that it indicates that she is unable to distinguish such words but is anxious to write them correctly. It follows that she is aware that some words not pronounced with h are spelled with h -- as humble, honour, humour, and hospital in the eighteenth century -- while words pronounced with h were also spelled with h. Smollett's technique here is a sure-fire way of exposing Win's ignorance, be it of spelling or pronunciation.

The loss of h in many circumstances is a feature of educated speech; in rapid speech (I've, I'd, you'd), in the second part of many compounds (Nottingham, shepherd), after [r] (Durham, forehead -- "forred" in Standard British English), and between a strong and a weak vowel (vehicle, nihilism).<sup>147</sup> While the leaving out of h in the above cases is a part of educated speech, the omission of h takes place indifferently

in all classes of words in all English dialects except the very northernmost, parts of Durham, Cumberland,<sup>148</sup> and in East Anglia.<sup>149</sup> Here [h] is completely lost as a significant part of the sound system, and the same is true of the vulgar speech of the towns (e. g. Cockney in London).<sup>150</sup>

Accompanying this loss of [h] is the phenomenon of the false insertion of [h]: Jespersen explains the phenomenon:

When people lose the sense of [h] as a distinctive sound, it is a matter of indifference to them how a vowel begins; they do not hear any difference between [ha] with the gliding from a more open position of the vocal chords . . . and the simple [a] with a rapid inaudible transition from silence to vocal vibration . . . . Many novelists would have us believe, that people who drop their aspirates place false aspirates before every vowel that should have no [h]; such systematic perversion is not, however, in human nature. But they sometimes inadvertently put an [h] between two vowels (rarely after a consonant), especially when the word is to receive extra emphasis, and of course, without any regard to whether the word "ought to" have [h] or not. The observer, however, to whom [h] or no [h] is significant, fails to notice the words which agree with his own rule, but is struck with the instances of disagreement, deducing from them the impression of a systematic perversion. ("Am an' heggs").<sup>151</sup>

Win's spellings, like most of the variants in her letters, are not consistently "perverse" in their applications. She may write two forms, one correct and one incorrect, on the same page as for example, "and she told me such things -- describing Mr. Clinker to a hair", and "but the ould admiral could not have made his air to stand on end" (p. 261). (Note that Win puts in h between two vowels and drops h after a consonant; cf. Jespersen's comment above.) This feature of using two forms may represent a kind of realism but it is more probable that Smollett is concerned to introduce only a manageable number of

variants into one particular section so that the reader's sense is not "overloaded" with a variety of information to interpret.

Jespersen discusses the disappearance of [h] and remarks that it is very difficult to tell how old the disappearance is.<sup>152</sup> The first mention of it is in 1787 when Elphinston talks about the "ils, ouzes, earing the owls in dhe hevening, orse, art, arm, &c." Walker, in his discussion of the four faults of pronunciation of the Londoners (see below under discussion of [v] for [w] etc.) complains of their "not sounding h where it ought to be sounded, and inversely." Walker writes:

A still worse habit than the last [not sounding h after w] prevails, . . . that of sinking the h at the beginning of words where it ought to be sounded, and of sounding it, either where it is not seen, or where it ought to be sunk . . . . This is a vice perfectly similar to that of pronouncing the v for the w, and the w for the v, and requires a similar method to correct it.<sup>153</sup>

Walker is outlining the poor speech of "the lower sort of people at London" and we can observe that Win is classified as the lower sort,<sup>154</sup> theoretically from Wales.

Win's spellings are as follows:

addition of <u>h</u>		
Busshard	Buzzard	155
Haddingborough	Edinburgh	220, 220, 220
Halteration	alteration	352
hanger	anger	220
hair	heir	337
hays	eyes	307
heys	eyes	306
hearth	earth	155
Hottogon	Octagon	42
hillyfents	elephants	108
honeymils	animals	108
honymil	animal	43



hugling	ogling	220
hylands	islands	261, 261
peyhouse	pious	109, 155, 261
Machappy	M'Alpine	338

omission of h

air	hair	261, 306, 352
arm	harm	219, 261
art	heart	262
a done	have done	7
Apias	habeus	155
asterisks	hysterics	7, 220
exaltations	exhortations	260
umble*	humble	338
umphry*	Humphry	107
umpry*	Humphry	108

\*These words, as indicated above in the discussion of h spellings, are spelled as normally pronounced in the eighteenth century.

Some of these haphazard spelling changes are the result of Smollett's intent to pun. ⟨Halteration⟩ and ⟨hylands⟩ provide two ready examples. Jerry speaks of marriage in terms of being "noosed" (333) while Matthew observes "-- I have great hopes that he [Lismahago] and Tabby will be as happily paired as any two draught animals in the kingdom" (339); such remarks are a cheerful preparation for Win's announcement:

PROVIDINCH hath bin pleased to make great halteration in the pasture of our affairs. -- We were yesterday three kiple chined, by the grease of God, in the holy bands of mattermoney . . . (352).

The suggestion of halters, pastures, chains, and bands sets up a nice association to reinforce Matthew's earlier observations. ⟨Hylands⟩ for islands appears in Win's description of Loch Lomond:

. . . Loff Loming, which is a wonderful sea of fresh water, with a power of hylands in the midst on't. -- They say as how it has got n'er a bottom, and was made by a musician . . . and [has] a floating hyland . . . (261).

Smollett is, of course, having Win confuse the Highlands of Scotland with the islands of Loch Lomond.

These spelling changes provide additional opportunities for malapropisms in such phrases as "I was going into a fit of astericks" (220), "Ould Scratch has not a greater enemy upon hearth than Mr. Clinker" (155) (a comparison which somewhat diminishes Mr. Clinker's area of sovereignty in this regard), and "she would cast the heys of infection upon such a carrying crow" (306) followed immediately by "I have seen with my own hays" (307).<sup>155</sup> There are several other interesting malapropisms resulting from this haphazard insertion or deletion of h.<sup>156</sup> Smollett, as usual, gets two effects instead of one from a single alteration.

Interchange of [v] for [w]; [w] for [v]

The interchange of v and w is another striking feature which appears only in Win's letters; Tabitha's are free from any suggestion of this variant pronunciation. The confusion of [v] and [w] has long been thought to reflect one of the most obvious "errors" in Londoners -- specifically Cockney -- pronunciation and direct attention was first given to the deficiencies of their pronunciation in the eighteenth century.<sup>157</sup> By the end of the century we find Walker inveighing against the four "faults of the Londoners": (1) Pronouncing s indistinctly after st; (2) Pronouncing w for v, and inversely; (3) Not sounding h after w;<sup>158</sup> and (4) Not sounding h where it ought to be sounded, and inversely. He is joined by Stephen Jones in 1796. With reference to the interchange of v and w, Walker says:

The pronunciation of v for w, and more frequently of w for v among the inhabitants of London, and those not always of the lowest order, is a blemish of the first magnitude. The difficulty of remedying this defect is the greater,

as the cure of one of these mistakes has a tendency to promote the other. (pp. xii-xiii)

It is this very confusion which writers of literary dialect have seized upon to characterize Cockney speech.<sup>159</sup>

Walker makes an interesting point when he says that w for v was more frequent than v for w. It is extremely doubtful whether the variant was ever as popular as the novelists suggest. While w for v is still a commonplace in words like wicious, wittles, weal, and winegar in nineteenth century novels (Dickens' Sam Weller and Thackeray's Jeames Yellowplush), it has dropped out of modern Cockney pronunciation and is rarely used. And v for w seems to have disappeared completely before the end of the nineteenth century; an informant of Matthews, born in 1865, could not recall ever having heard v for w. Smollett is partially responsible for the use of these interchangeable spellings as a commonplace feature of literary dialect as a result of his introduction of them in his early novels. Matthews remarks that after the spelling wingar (vinegar) in Roderick Random, these variants become the chief characteristic of Cockney dialogue in novels and they are condemned by the critics for being an oversimplification of the dialect.<sup>160</sup> Walker's suggestion that the substitution of v for w was encouraged by attempts to correct the reverse (and more common) substitution is a plausible explanation, if not in terms of difficulty in the actual articulation of the sounds, then perhaps in terms of hypercorrection which results from a confusion as to when to pronounce one and when the other.<sup>161</sup> Win probably knows that the interchange of v and w is frowned upon and in her anxiety to be correct, she hypercorrects.

Amusingly, she produces more v for w spellings than the reverse. Win's spellings are as follows:

[w] for [v]

wally	valet	219
willian	villain	155
winegar	vinegar	44

[v] for [w]

Vails	Wales	260
Vales	Wales	109
van	wan (one)	219, 219
vaned	weaned	109
varrant	warrant	71
vas	was	219
vax	wax	71
vee	oui (Fr.)	109
veezel	weasel	306
Velsh	Welsh	220
Velchvoman	Welshwoman	262
Welch	Welsh (Welch)	261
vindore <sup>162</sup>	windore (window)	219
ving	wing	70
vitch	witch	261
vite	white	72
	(wite, no aspiration)	
vitness	witness	71
voman	woman	109, 109
vords	words	261, 109

The only example from Tabitha's letters is <Villiams> for Williams (78, 156) which she also spells correctly as Williams (p. 6).

Substitution of [vr] for [wr]

Also related to Win's interchange of v and w is a curious change of vr for wr in <vriting> (109) and <vronging> (71) -- certainly not a Londoner's characteristic even though it makes the same impression upon the eye. As a representation of a pronunciation variant, initial [vr] is unusual. Even in the dialects it is uncommon;<sup>163</sup> there is

a mere handful of vr entries in the English Dialect Dictionary: vreck (wreck), vratch (wretch), vrath (wrath), etc. with vreet and vreyt (write) from Scotland and Lancashire. Interestingly, the variant is frequent only in Scotland, Somerset, and Devon -- all areas with which Smollett had some familiarity.<sup>164</sup> At any rate, Smollett is using the device as another convenient and obvious means of representing Win's inferior speech through writing.

### Voicing and Devoicing

The process of voicing and devoicing are evident in Win's (and to a lesser extent in Tabitha's) letters. A voiced sound is one made when breath forced from the lungs vibrates the vocal cords. All vowels are voiced sounds, as are some consonants. Voiceless sounds are those made without vibration of the vocal cords. Some consonants are voiceless. The voiced stops are [b], [d], [g] and the voiceless stops are [p], [t], and [k]; the voiced fricatives are [v], [ð], [z], and [ʒ] and the voiceless fricatives are [f], [θ], [s] and [ʃ]. The voiced affricate is [ʤ] and the voiceless is [ʧ]. When a word with a voiced consonant (e. g. gain) is pronounced without voicing (e. g. cain) we may say that the consonant [g] has been devoiced to [k]. Voicing is a reversal of the process.

### Devoicing

Devoicing is a feature of Welsh phonology and the slang term for a Welshman, Taffy, is based on the Welsh pronunciation of Davy with the [d] devoiced to [t] and the [v] devoiced to [f]. This nickname, like Sawney for the Scot's Alexander, was popular in the eighteenth century.

In Win's letters we find a range of devoicing while in Tabitha's devoicing is restricted to [t] for [d] and [f] for [v]. The examples from their letters are:

[p] for [b] (Win)

Apias	habeas	155
Tapitha	Tabitha	338
Brample*	Bramble	338
Brampleton*	Brambleton	352
Opaniah	Obadiah	338
pyebill*	Bible	155, 306
pyeblow*	by-blow	338

\*Note that Win doesn't devoice the initial [b] of Brampleton, Brample, while she devoices the initial [b] of pyebill, pyeblow and not the medial.

[t] for [d] (Win)

Ballfart	Bullford	307
bumtaffy	baume de vie	43
Millfart	Melford	352

(Tabitha)

impotent	impudent	78
----------	----------	----

[f] for [v] (Win)

bumtaffy	baume de vie	43
fillitch	village	108
firchin	virgin	108
silfur	silver	42
sulfur	silver	337, 352

(Tabitha)

bum-daffee	baume de vie	6
lacksitif	laxative	6
leaf	leave	78
safe	save	78

[k] for [g] (Win)

cain	gain	155
chuckling	juggling	306
Kalloway	Galway	43
	[confused with Galloway in Scotland]	
Grascow, Grasco	Glasgow	260, 262, 262

## [č̣] for [j] (Win)

checket	jacket	352
chined	joined	352
chuckling	juggling	306
churned	journeyed	260
churning	journeying	261
cowtich	cowhage	70
fillitch	village	108
firchin	virgin	108
imich	image	352
unbreech	umbrage	338

## [ṣ̌] for [z] (Win)

Busshard	Buzzard	155
----------	---------	-----

## [s] for [z]

bumbeseens	bombazines	44
close	clothes	219
Issabel	Jezebel	219, 219, 220, 220

## [č̣] for [ẓ̌]

rouch	rouge	219
-------	-------	-----

## [s] for [ṣ̌]

sillings	shillings	219
----------	-----------	-----

To the eighteenth century reader with a "good ear" this devoicing may have meant several things -- all of them prejudicial to Win's and Tabitha's pretensions to a place in the fashionable world. Devoicing (as also voicing which will be discussed below) was characteristic of Cockney speech; Matthews gives many examples from early Cockney, among them leaf (leave), errants (errands), apsent (absent), weefer (weaver), ballit (ballad), vacabond (vagabond), and necklect (neglect). Mayhew (1861) adds chewlry (jewellery).<sup>165</sup> Under these circumstances, devoicing in Win's and Tabitha's letters is a very telling mark of vulgarity. Devoicing is also very important in contributing to Smollett's

characterization of Win and Tabitha as Welsh, since devoicing was recognized as the most obvious single feature of Welsh speakers of English.

Walker, in his preface to his Critical Pronouncing Dictionary (1791), writes about the features of pronunciation peculiar to different groups of people and how these peculiarities may present problems for such speakers as wish to be in command of the best sort of English pronunciation. He glances in passing at provincial dialects, remarking that "there are dialects peculiar to Cornwall, Lancashire, Yorkshire, and every distant county in England" but he singles out for attention the speech of the natives of Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and London (i. e. Cockneys). We are indebted to Walker for doing this because he provides us with a good deal of information about how the Englishman of the eighteenth century thought the Welsh pronounced English, or even, perhaps, how the Welsh did speak. Walker writes:

Besides a peculiarity of inflexion, which I take to be a falling circumflex, directly opposite to that of the Scotch, the Welch pronounce the sharp consonants and aspirations instead of the flat . . . . Thus for big they say pick; for blood, plood; and for good, coot. Instead of virtue and vice, they say firtue and fice; instead of zeal and praise, they say seal and prace; instead of these and those, they say thece and thoce; and instead of azure and osier they say aysher and osher; and for jail, chail. Thus there are nine distinct consonant sounds which, to the Welch, are entirely useless.<sup>166</sup>

Walker specifically mentions the devoicing of [b], [d], [g], [v], [z], [ž], and [č], all of which are used in Win's letters.

It is very likely that Smollett could have drawn upon such commonplace assumptions concerning Welsh speakers as are voiced by Walker some years after the publication of Humphry Clinker. Usually, these kinds of simplified beliefs about how a certain group of non-natives speaks



English tend to become common property, much in the same way that present day English speakers may attribute to Japanese speakers a certain difficulty with [l] and [r]. It is possible that a formula of sorts could be easily applied to suggest a Welsh pronunciation merely by indicating devoicing. Fluellen's speech in Henry V is characterized in this way; he exclaims <By Cheshu> for By Jesu and uses phrases such as "a' uttered as prave words at the pridge as you shall see" and "it is like a coal of fire, sometimes plue and sometimes red" (III, iv). Shakespeare repeats <prave> and <pridge> several times to emphasize the devoiced quality of the words. He also has Fluellen repeat the interjection "look you" over and over again.

Smollett uses devoicing as a characteristic of the Welshman, Morgan's speech in Roderick Random, and he also uses the repetition of "look you", a feature which he may have borrowed from Shakespeare's characterization of Fluellen. Smollett, however, extends the range of devoicing beyond that used by Shakespeare and it is possible that Smollett, through personal contact with Welsh speakers, perhaps during his period of service as a ship's surgeon or at some other time in his life, may simply have observed very carefully at first hand these Welsh characteristics.

In keeping with a firm sense of utilizing the features which will guarantee maximum effect, Smollett has concentrated on the very obvious devoicing of [b], [d], [g], [v] and [j] to [p], [t], [k], [f], and [ç]. A confusion in voicing in a word like <fillitch> for village is immediately recognizable as English gone awry and immediately suggestive of a substandard form of pronunciation. Devoicing of the most obvious

kind guarantees that a reader will register the form as alien (assuming he knows of Cockney usage), or as provincial (assuming he knows of Welsh usage). In any case, Smollett is able to suggest a substandard or vulgar usage by a few telling changes in the spelling. And, of course, he is able to introduce a few puns in dubious taste as in the devoicing of [d] to [t] which produces two farts and a bum in <Ballfart>, <Millfart>, and <bumtaffy>, or, in the same devoicing in Tabitha's letter, a risible malapropism with <impotent> for impudent. This last has a few very funny associations for the reader attuned to Tabitha's unconscious obsession with sex.

Welsh is generally thought to lack the affricates [tʃ] and [dʒ]; this assumption is based upon modern Welsh phonology and is contrary to Walker's observation about the substitution of [tʃ] for [dʒ] in eighteenth century Welsh phonology (i. e. the Welsh say chail for jail) and to Smollett's practice of using [tʃ] for [dʒ] in Win's letters (e. g. <churning> for journeying . Gary Underwood asserts that Welsh normally lacks both [tʃ] and [dʒ] and that this is reflected in the substitution of [ʃ] for either of these affricates with the result that gentleman becomes <shentleman> and cheese becomes <sheese> in Morgan's speech in Roderick Random.<sup>167</sup> He argues that the Welsh do have the phoneme [ʃ] and that it is the closest possible replacement for either [tʃ] or [dʒ]. Walker's observation runs contrary to this and tends to lend contemporary authority to Smollett's many examples of devoiced [dʒ] as a phenomenon which the eighteenth century reader might be familiar with as a Welsh characteristic.

The absence of the phoneme [dʒ] in the Welsh sound system is also reflected interestingly in the unconventional substitution of [g]

for [j] in Win's and Tabitha's letters. Thus we find:

Win's:

angles	angels	338
congeror	conjuror	155
congyration	conjunction	261
geaks	jakes	220
Gerusalem	Jerusalem	109
ginketting	junketting	70
gurney	journey	109
gustass	justice	155
magisterial	majestic	108
St Gimses	St. James'	108

Tabitha's:

gurney	journey	156, 274
--------	---------	----------

These particular substitutions are reasonably interpreted as [g] for [j], even in the case of <congyration>, <congeror>, and <magisterial> where the medial g could possibly represent [j] as it does in such common English words as changeable, collegiate, registration where the [g] is followed by a vowel. Smollett's care in having Win spell these words with g instead of j indicates that he wishes to ensure that the reader will interpret them as variant pronunciations. And, of course, we must as usual be aware of Smollett's humorous intent in having Win produce malapropisms (e. g. <angles>, <magisterial>) and a little dig at Justice Buzzard as a "gusty ass."

### Voicing

The contrary process of voicing is directly opposed to the representation of Win and Tabitha as Welsh speakers of English. It is, instead, a commonly recognized feature of the Cockney dialect and, like other Cockney features, deplored as vulgar. Matthews says:

Voicing of normally voiceless stop consonants is a feature of vulgar speech. Such spellings as pardner, beedle, eggspect are frequent in literary Cockney and they are symbols for a much more extensive reality: the Cockney tends to "dull" or voice voiceless consonants in many other words, prodestant, samwidge (sandwich), mizzletoe, carpender, 'Obkins, etc. . . . Elphinston declares that in vulgar London speech, p, k, and f were pronounced b, g, and v and cites the following examples: padrole, pardner, proddestant, prizes (prices) vew (few). Other illustrations are: Errors of Pronunciation, beadle (beetle) . . . gobble (cobble); . . . Pegge, skrimidge, radidges, rubidge, furbridge; Mayhew, . . . beadle, pardner, mizzletoe, etc.<sup>168</sup>

Voicing is not as important in the letters as devoicing when considered in terms of the number of examples Win and Tabitha produce. We have:

[g] for [k] (Win)

frog	frock	352
gallowmanky	calamanco	72, 337
in garnet	incarnate	70
gumbustion	combustion	260, 262

[v] for [f] (Win)

vagaries <sup>169</sup>	figaries / vagaries	109
varthing	farthing	43
viol <sup>170</sup>	phial / vial	307

In Tabitha's letters there is only one example of v substituted for f, <reverence> for reference (274).

What appears to be the voicing of [t] to [d] in <discounselled> for disconsolate (338) is probably the result of attaching an inappropriate prefix (e. g. dis-) to a word which would not normally have it, to suggest illiteracy. The fact that it is an isolated example would suggest that it is not devoicing but a vulgarly formed malapropism. Win does add the wrong prefix to other words (e. g. <discamp> (70), <unclose> (306), <disseyfer> (109), etc.) and this feature of formation is also found in countrified speech<sup>171</sup> as well as in Cockney.<sup>172</sup>

### Substitution of [f] for [hw]

A peculiar pronunciation of [f] for [h.w] is indicated by Win's spelling of <fey> for wey (262) <fiff> for whiff (220), and <fipping> for whipping (109).<sup>173</sup> This sound change is not characteristic of Standard English, however. Wright tells us that "initial hw has become f in northeast Scotland in such words as what, wheat, wheel, whelp, when, where, wey, while, whine, whistle, white, why."<sup>174</sup> Smollett may have been acquainted with this pronunciation, although it was not common in his home area of western Scotland; if so, he may have registered the sound as a distinct provincialism and may simply have thrown it in to produce a little yokel flavour in Win's letters. Amusingly, Tabitha has one example, in <phims> for whims (78), which is spelled with the ph spelling for f. Her possible mispronunciation, although duplicating Win's, affords a slightly different twist in the humour. Tabitha's spelling may indicate that she is aware of the presence of h in the conventional spelling (or pronunciation) and, in her anxiety to be correct, she misspells, using ph for wh, only to prove that a little learning is a dangerous thing indeed. Her error seems -- only visually, however -- to be a cut above Win's.<sup>175</sup>

### Substitution of [ʃ] for [s]

The change of s to sh is a vulgar and dialectal change. In dialects generally there is a tendency for [s] to become [ʃ]; it affects chiefly final [s], but also medial, and occasionally, initial [s].<sup>176</sup> In the eighteenth century this change was recognized (notably by Elphinston

who gives cutlash, nonplush, and frontishpiece) as a vulgarism and found its way into lists as still another pronunciation which the elegant speaker must avoid. The change is still a feature of present day dialects, particularly Cockney.<sup>177</sup> Win has a fair sampling of spellings indicating this pronunciation change:

Chrishmarsh*	Christmas	352
Crashit	Crescent	42
Lashmiheygo	Lismahago	352
Lashmihago	Lismahago	306
Lashmyhago	Lismahago	306
Mattrash	mattress	307
Parish	Paris	219

\*Note two changes in one word but retention of initial Ch in the spelling instead of possible eye dialect k.

Tabitha's only use is in <Non-compush> for non compos (44), a form which we might compare with the Cockney's <non-plush'd> for non plussed.<sup>178</sup>

In addition to illustrating the ignorance of spelling conventions and suggesting vulgar pronunciations, Smollett has, in some instances, managed to squeeze in some puns. His opinion of the Crescent at Bath is probably one with that of Matt Bramble, who complains bitterly about the building movement based on geometric figures. Through Win's misspelling and possible mispronunciation, Smollett can introduce the idea that such architecture as the Crescent is "crass shit". Win's <Parish> for Paris as mentioned above in connection with her mangling of foreign names is a good slap at her pretensions to fashionable dress. We might also suspect a pun on old Lismahago who is under the lash of Tabitha's affections.

Dobson notes that when the change of s to sh occurred after n, the result was n(t)sh which was identified with older -nch. Such word

pairs as quince / quench, lance / launch are the result. Win produces one of these in <Providinch> for Providence (352) in the phrase, "PROVIDINCH hath bin pleased", which echoes an earlier letter of Tabitha. Win's echo of "It has pleased Providence to . . ." (274) is a very straightforward example of the maid copying the mistress.

Situation of [s] for [c̣], [s] for [ʃ]

The pronunciation phenomenon of [s] for [c̣] as indicated by Win's spelling of s for ch would seem to be related to sh for s, but it is very difficult to explain as a normal English phonological process. There is no evidence for ch altering in this way, even in the dialects. As Wright points out, words which have ch in the literary language generally also have it in the dialects. Even s for sh which appears in Win's <sillings> for shillings (219),<sup>179</sup> <distinkson> for distinction (306), <prusias> for precious (306) and <seeps> for sheeps (220) is unusual. s for sh in an initial position may be found in a few isolated dialect words; srimp (shrimp), srink (shrink), sriuel (shrivel), sroud (shroud), sруб (shrub), and srug (shrug).<sup>180</sup> Of these, srimps and sруб were common Cockney until the end of the nineteenth century but seem to have disappeared since there is no evidence for this pronunciation in modern Cockney speech.<sup>181</sup> For Smollett's purposes it is useful as a reinforcement of Win's vulgar speech.

I am inclined to think that the particular change of ch to s does not represent pronunciation at all, but is simply a pronunciation-like indicator which Smollett has thrown in to measure Win's inability to spell. At the same time, he is possibly interested in making a

slightly off-colour pun. The variant s for ch is found in three places in the novel, but it appears only in one word, <sin> for chin; the contexts are similar:

I dropt my petticoat, and could not get it up from the bottom -- But what did that signify? they mought laff, but they could see nothing; for I was up to the sin in water. (43)

O gracious! if God had not given me a good stock of discretion, what a power of things might not I reveal, consarning old mistress and young mistress; Jews with beards, that were no Jews; but handsome Christians, without a hair upon their sin, strolling with spectacles, to get speech of Miss Liddy. (42)

. . . and I was shewn an ould vitch, called Elspath Ringavey, with a red petticoat, bleared eyes, and a mould of grey bristles on her sin. (261)

I am, at this point, willing to concede that I may be "reading into it" since my search for sin as a slang term connected with the genitals has, to date, turned nothing up; but in light of Smollett's propensity for making salacious jokes or commenting on vulgarity while showing off Win's misspelling, I think that <sin> for chin is not simply an unexplainable mistake in representing pronunciation.

Substitutions: [k] for [t]; [f] for [θ], [ʃ]; [t] for [θ].

Three curious consonant variants occur in Win's spelling and all of them are indicative of Cockney pronunciation; k for t, f for th, and t for th. These variants were and still are recognizable as Cockneyisms and, with the limited exceptions of [t] for [θ] as phonological variants for the Shetland and Orkney Islands and the Isle of Man, are not typical of any other dialect.<sup>182</sup> An eighteenth century reader aware of received pronunciation standards and the proscription of Londoner English would recognize them as Cockneyisms and it is very



likely that a reader unfamiliar with these specific vulgarisms would assume them to represent some form of provincial pronunciation.

K for t appears in ⟨monkey-bank⟩ for mountebank (352) and ⟨turkey-shell⟩ for tortoise-shell (109, 155); these words conform to Cockney Hamlick (Hamlet), vomick (vomit) and benefick (benefit).<sup>183</sup> F for th is used in ⟨oaf⟩ for oath (72, 155) which conforms to Cockney mouf (mouth), loph (loth) and Redriff (Rotherhithe).<sup>184</sup> T for th [θ], is used in ⟨Mattew⟩ for Matthew (338) and ⟨turd⟩ for third (338) which conform to the Cockney terd (third), Tersday and Tiersday (Thursday).<sup>185</sup> T for th [θ] is used in ⟨farting⟩ for farthing (220).<sup>186</sup> The introduction of another seemingly naive use of fart and turd is facilitated by this sound change. And Win's dismissive "I vally not his going a farting" is humorously intensified as a result of the change.

### Vowel Changes

The interpretation of vowel quantities in literary representations of dialect speech is extremely difficult. For instance, when we find path in a text, we may be uncertain whether it is to be pronounced with a low front vowel [æ] or a back vowel [ɑ] since the spelling cannot indicate for us the length of the vowel and our understanding of the spelling will depend upon our own pronunciations (i. e. whether we normally say path in the standard British English manner or in the manner predominant in North America). The earlier discussion of the introduction of r into a word like marster for master to indicate a long a [ɑ] suggests one of the difficulties. When a reader without

[ɑ:] in his own dialect encounters the spelling marster, he is inclined to identify the sound with tar or bar with the full pronunciation of [r] in his own dialect.

In addition to the difficulty with quantity or quality of a vowel, a reader is also at some odds in ascertaining the impression which the author wishes to convey by altering the spellings of vowels. If, for instance, an author uses r in marster to indicate a long a, what is the reader to think? If the reader also has a long a in his dialect, it is unlikely that he will attach a stigma to its use or will register it as a variant at all. If, on the other hand, he does not have the [ɑ:], he is inclined to view the variant as characteristic of a regional or social dialect unlike his own.

Alterations in the spelling of vowels may not simply indicate a change of one vowel pronunciation for another. For instance, when we encounter the spelling of <fintastical> for fantastical (352), an isolated example of i for a in the text, possibly meant to represent [ɪ] for [æ], we observe the change in the first syllable. At first glance i for a indicates the pronunciation of fin as opposed to fan in the first syllable, possibly the result of the raising of [æ] to [ɪ]. But, since we cannot know the stress pattern which Smollett assumed his readers would attribute to the word as normally spoken, the i may only represent an obscuring of the vowel (if the stress is on -tas-, as it normally would be in modern pronunciation) and not a fully stressed alternate vowel (as it would be if the stress were on fin-). The remove in time compounds a difficulty such as this.

It is crucial that we, as readers, understand the norm against which we must measure a deviation. This norm will necessarily be affected by the author's own speech habits, his acuteness in observing vowel quantities, and by the accepted speech of the audience for whom the work is projected. We cannot know Smollett's personal articulation of vowels although we do know that he had a distinct, Scottish accentuation of vowels which laid him open to mockery in the contemporary press.<sup>187</sup> Smollett's powers of language observation were considerable if we may judge from his attempts in all of his novels to represent dialect either through reported speech, or letters, or by his attempts to catch the very idiosyncratic tricks of such characters as Hawser Trunnion in Peregrine Pickle and Captain Crowe in Sir Launcelot Greaves. Even with these considerable powers, Smollett may not have been capable of registering the differentiation of vowel sounds. After all, Smollett was not a trained linguist; and, when we consider that it takes a year or more of sustained application for a modern student of dialect to learn to transcribe accurately, we need not be disappointed with Smollett's attempts. Smollett's technique of indicating dialect features is only one contribution to the artistic wholeness of the novel.

Audience expectation is a prominent feature of the norm, since we may assume that Smollett's variants are meant to be immediately recognizable as pronunciations diverging from a standard. And that standard was probably, in Walker's terms, the speech "of the better sort of people at London." Certainly, Smollett's readers were the literate members of society, and of the beau monde -- people who enjoyed

being in on the latest fashion, be it clothes, amusements, or books. Smollett's variants are intended to be viewed (or "heard") alongside the standard London pronunciation. Against this background, dialect pronunciation and dialect words -- frexious, obstropulous, etc. -- would show up distinctly. It is very easy for a reader to spot the dialect words and dialect grammar even at a distance of two hundred years. The pronunciation of consonants is also an accessible area since the quality of consonants has not altered greatly; we have little difficulty distinguishing when a [g] is replaced by a [k], when two consonants are reversed, or when a consonant has been omitted. Vowels, however, present greater difficulties because it has always been difficult to record them exactly.

Phoneticians and language historians engage in heated debate about the interpretation of a vowel from spellings and homophone lists and from statements of earlier phoneticians. This interpretation problem often leads to such statements from Dobson, for instance, as "Wyld is mistaken in his belief that Gil records [i:] in the speech of the Mopsae," or "Luick's explanation is forced on him by his incorrect view that ME [y:] was pronounced [iy] or [jy] in the sixteenth century." Proof of the differing view is inevitably undertaken in an elaborately reasoned footnote which, if it proves nothing else, proves that the interpretation of a vowel is a very taxing chore indeed.

There does seem to be a consensus of opinion about certain vowel quantities, however. The interpretation of certain spelling changes seems necessary simply because the examples from the text are not,

like <fintastical>, isolated examples. The fact that Smollett may introduce a number of examples of one change ought to alert the reader that he is probably making some point about the altered pronunciation. In many cases, however, there will be only one spelling change possibly, but not necessarily, indicative of a pronunciation variant. It may be meant primarily as a spelling error. For example, we find Win writing <creesus> for crisis (307), possibly representing a change of diphthong [aɪ] to the high front vowel [i]. Since Walker indicates the normal pronunciation as "kri-sis" with "the long diphthongal i, as in pine, ti-tle," we know that Win's pronunciation must, according to her spelling, differ from the standard. How are we to interpret it? Simply as non-standard or, perhaps as a dialect pronunciation common in parts of Scotland, Yorkshire, Cumberland and Somerset where advise is pronounced adveese?<sup>188</sup> Surely the importance must be merely in the difference indicated -- any difference from the standard. And in a case where the pronunciation variant has some consistency (and interpretation of the spelling seems to be consistent with phonological history) perhaps then we may look for differences which would have some definite implications (i. e. vulgarity, dialect) for the eighteenth century reader.

#### Intrusive Schwa [ə].

Smollett also notes the phenomena of intrusive vowels or consonants in speech. Although these intrusions occur in the speech of well-educated people with some frequency, they are usually associated with

vulgar or dialectal usage. An intrusive schwa<sup>189</sup> sometimes occurs between consonants in certain words, for instance, between l and m in elm, film, between n and r in Henry, between r and m in alarm (to produce a pronunciation similar to the archaic variant, alarum), between th and r in arthritis, between th and l in athlete and in many other such consonant environments. Walker and Jones both regard the intrusive schwa as a "blemish in speaking" and comment upon it in a lament for the defects of Cockney pronunciation:

The letter s after st, from the very difficulty of its pronunciation, is often sounded inarticulately. -- The inhabitants of London, of the lower order, cut the knot, and pronounce it in a distinct syllable, as if e were before it, but this is to be avoided as the greatest blemish in speaking, the last three letters in posts, mists, fists, etc. must all be distinctly heard in one syllable, and without permitting the letters to coalesce. For the acquiring of this sound, it will be proper to select nouns that end in st or ste, to form them into plural, and pronounce them forcibly and distinctly every day.

(Walker, 1791, Preface, p. xii)

(Jones, 1797, p. 19)

Walker also deplores a similar habit in the Irish:

It may be observed too, that the natives of Ireland pronounce rm at the end of a word so distinctly as to form two separate syllables. Thus storm and farm seem sounded by them as if written staw-rum, fa-rum; while the English sound the r so soft and so close to the m, that it seems pronounced nearly as if written stawm, faam.

Nearly the same observations are applicable to lm . . . .

(Walker, p. xi)

Win's only example of this "blemish" is her spelling of beasts as

<beastis> (108).

<Beastis> is very similar to a form which appears almost twenty years earlier in Peregrine Pickle in a love note which Deborah Hornbeck writes to Peregrine. She includes directions to her hotel, marked

by "two postis at the gait, naytheir of um vory hole."<sup>190</sup> This is but one of many linguistic indications in Mistress Hornbeck's letter (as also in Win's) that the lady is semi-literate and belongs to a low social order indeed -- the Cockneys.<sup>191</sup> <Beastis>, or its near equivalents, baistes` and bee-ustez,<sup>192</sup> is a dialect form primarily although Halliwell lists it with the note, "BESTEZ. Beasts . . . now a common vulgarism."<sup>193</sup> From such evidence as this we find that Win is again cast into the company of "people of the lower sort" from London and of dialect speakers from the country.

#### Substitution of [ar] for [er]

Win's spelling (and to a lesser extent, Tabitha's) reflects the common eighteenth century pronunciation of ar for er in such words as <consarned>, <sarched>, <sarvant>, <sartinly>, etc. This pronunciation is due, in part, to an historical development of er to ar dating from late Middle English; this change may be illustrated by such examples as ME ferre becoming far, ME sterre becoming star, and ME percely becoming parsley. This development was common in proper names too; for instance, we have Jervois becoming Gervase and later Jarvis and the occupational sergeant becoming Sargent.<sup>194</sup> In person we have a splitting into two words: parson "clergyman" and person "human being"; the specialized meaning of parson prevented people feeling person and parson to be the same word, and the two pronunciations have survived as separate words.

The pronunciation of ar for er, however, began to fall under general censure in the eighteenth century as a vulgarism and the

pronunciation thereafter was a ready indicator of vulgar or dialectal speech.<sup>195</sup> At the beginning of the century we find Jones (In Practical Phonography [1701]) stating as a matter of fact that the sound of a is written e "in Berks, Clerk, eleven, Herbert, Merchant, Mercy, Owen, phrentick, verdict, yellow. &."<sup>196</sup> By the end of the century, the tide has turned and we find the following in Nares' Orthoepy (1784):

Sometimes, but not very frequently, this vowel [E] takes the sounds of other letters. It is pronounced . . . like A short, in celery (generally), in clerk, mesh, serjeant, terrier, yellow. Errand and errant have this also in common usage, but are more becomingly pronounced with the proper short sound of E. Merchant formerly was pronounced as if there was an a in the first syllable; but it has now returned, with all its derivatives, to the proper sound of short E.<sup>197</sup>

Nares' commentary indicates that the pronunciation is still to be heard, but his choice of words, "becomingly pronounced" and "proper sound," in connection with the desirable use of er indicates that he is doing his bit to squeeze it out of "common usage" so that it will be heard "not very frequently" at all.<sup>198</sup>

Walker also provides some interesting notes on the pronunciation at the end of the century:

There is a remarkable exception to the common sound of this letter [E] in the words clerk, sergeant, and a few others, where we find the e pronounced like the a in dark and margin. But this exception, I imagine, was, till within these few years, the general rule of sounding this letter before r, followed by another consonant. Thirty years ago every one pronounced the first syllable of merchant like the mono-syllable march, and as it was anciently written, marchant. Service and servant are still heard among the lower order of speakers, as if written sarvice and sarvant; and even among the better sort, we sometimes hear, Sir, your sarvant; though this pronunciation of the word singly would be looked upon as a mark of the lowest vulgarity. The proper names Derby and Berkeley, still retain the old sound, as if written Darby and Barkeley: but even these, in polite



usage, are getting the common sound, nearly as if written Durby and Burkeley. As this modern pronunciation of the e has a tendency to simplify the language by lessening the number of exceptions, it ought certainly to be indulged.<sup>199</sup>

Walker's commentary, like that of Nares', is full of value judgements -- "the lower order of speakers," "the better sort," "mark of the lowest vulgarity" -- but Walker tells us more about when the common usage began to change as a result of this pressure to speak elegantly. From Walker we may discover that the change from ar to er in acceptable speech preceded the publication of Humphry Clinker by about ten years. Smollett, living as he did in urban society where such change is more quickly made, seized upon this pronunciation as a mark of vulgarity which would be readily recognized. It has come to be used for this purpose in many later novelists, too.<sup>200</sup> Win's use of this pronunciation is as follows:

consarned	71, 155
consarning	42
consarns	155
larning	338
marokin	352
parfeck	337
parquisites	7, 7, 70, 306
parson	306 (for <u>person</u> , not <u>parson</u> )
sarched	71
sarment	155
sartain	7, 306, 306, 307, 338
sartinly	43
sarvant	108, 156, 220, 307, 70, 71, 71, 71
sarvent	44, 307, 352
sarvice	44, 72, 306, 307, 338, 338, 338, 338, 352
Starling	260 (for <u>Stirling</u> , Scotland)
varsal <sup>201</sup>	108 (for <u>universal</u> )

There is a point of interest in the variants for servant. Smollett "errs" by having Win write <servints> (7) and service (7) in her opening letter; but he never makes the mistake of having her not make a mistake after this letter.

Tabitha's use of ar for er is limited by comparison with Win's; she has <sarvents> (44, 45) and <sarvants> (156, 274, 352) and <unsartin> (45) only. Inversely, she has <kergo> for cargo (274), a form which appears correctly in Win's letter from Bath (71). It is possible that this is another misspelling which indicates only that Tabitha can't spell although it is possible that it might represent a kind of hypercorrection; I incline to the former. Tabitha does, for instance, spell perfect (274) and vermin <vermine> (156) with er and these two words, in dialect speech and in vulgar speech, are normally represented as having ar. Win also has the exceptional use of <kerkasses> for carcasses (220).

An isolated variant which would seem to be connected with the change of er to ar is Win's <ars> for ears (338) in "if my own ars may be trusted, the clerk called the banes of marridge betwixt Opaniah Lashmeheygo, and Tapitha Brample." Given the context, however, it seems like another instance of Smollett's whimsical spelling change to make room for a pun, (and another example of Smollett's skill in slipping in the forbidden arse).

#### Raising of [ɛ] to [i]

Win's letters show evidence of the raising of short e [ɛ] to short i [i] in such spellings as <spilling> for spelling (109), <minchioned> for mentioned (261), <Millfart> for Melford (352), <Providinch> for Providence (352), <smill> for smell (338) and <tinder> for tender (262). We also find <mistriss> for mistress (220, 306, 337)

and <servints> for servants (7), but these latter examples are more probably indicators of alternate spelling of unstressed syllables. It is also a point of interest that mentioned is spelled also as <menchioned>, retaining the short e (221).

Although this raising of short e [ɛ] to short i [ɪ] was a characteristic of early Middle English (e. g. ME henge became hinge, ME sprenkle became sprinkle), later raising is on the whole less common.<sup>202</sup> But it does occur in present day English in nib, limpet, and trivet,<sup>203</sup> and it is a prominent feature of educated Southern speech in the United States where short e and short i are merged as short i before the front consonants, especially n.<sup>204</sup> The raising of [ɛ] to [ɪ] was a feature in dialect pronunciation in certain words<sup>205</sup> and a common practice in Cockney speech, even from earliest times.<sup>206</sup> This pronunciation is yet another indication of vulgarity in British speech which could be exploited in literature. Fielding uses it in a letter from Jonathan Wild to Miss Tishy, "I am konvinced you must be sinsibel of my violent passion for you . . ." <sup>207</sup> as one of many linguistic means to unmask Jonathan. How widespread the condemnation of this pronunciation was in the eighteenth century it is hard to say. Walker has some comment upon it:

This letter [E] falls into an irregular sound, but still a sound which is its nearest relation in the words, England, yes, and pretty, where the e is heard like short i. Vulgar speakers are guilty of the same irregularity in engine, as if written ingine; but this cannot be too carefully avoided.<sup>208</sup>

It is difficult to tell from this, however, whether Walker is warning more against a general [ɪ] for [ɛ] pronunciation or primarily against the vulgar pronunciation of engine.

The [ɪ] for [ɛ] pronunciation was observed by Pegge in Kinsington (Kensington) and by Mayhew in ivver (ever), riglar (regular), gits (gets), Siven (Seven), depinds (depends) and cimetry (cemetery), and Thackeray used this Cockney characteristic in The Yellowplush Papers.<sup>209</sup> Smollett appears, once again, to have begun early to characterize vulgarity by this spelling in the literary representation of a substandard pronunciation.

Tabitha has one isolated use of this change, in <blissing> for blissing (274) when it appears in the phrase "with the blissing of haven." It seems that Smollett is parodying Tabitha's use of stock religious phrases and making a sly dig at her hopes that Lismahago will be the excuse for keeping "the father-bed and matrosses well haired, because, perhaps, with the blissing of haven, they may be yoosed."

#### Raising of [æ] to [ɛ]

Win's letters have many examples of short e [ɛ] for short a [æ], possibly indicating a characteristic Cockney pronunciation.<sup>210</sup> "The raised pronunciation of short a, which resembles the ordinary sound of short e, has always been a feature of the dialect . . . even the later [i. e. later than the 17th century] orthoepists and novelists regard this vowel as a Cockneyism."<sup>211</sup> Walker records ketch as a corrupt but widely used London form for catch<sup>212</sup> as does Mayhew in the nineteenth century. Win has the following examples:

checket	jacket	352
edmiral	admiral	261, 261
excepted	accepted	155, 338
fect	fact	70
ketched	catched (caught)	70, 71

kettle	cattle	306
selvidges	savages	261, 352

While the spellings do represent this pronunciation, they are, in addition, used for malapropisms with intent to pun (e. g. <excepted>, <kettle>, <selvidges>).

#### Lowering of [ɛ] to [æ]

The reverse, short a [æ] for short e [ɛ], is more frequent in Win's letters. This vowel change is a feature of the dialects of southern Scotland, south-east Kent and the south-west Country<sup>213</sup> but it is not, like e for a, a Cockney feature. Win has the following examples:

Addinburgh	Edinburgh	221
assings	essence	207
axercise	exercise	43
Crashit	Crescent	42
fackins	feckins	108
Haddingborough	Edinburgh	220, 220, 220
Matthewmurphy'd	metamorphosed	337
Matthewsullin	Methuselah	306
mattrash	mattress	307
a nubjack	an object	306
refrash	refresh	44
sat	set	262
than	then	338
taster	tester	261
squintasense	quintessence	43
yallow*	yellow	42, 42, 353

\*There is a strong possibility that yallow was the standard pronunciation for yellow in the period (cf. Jones, Practical Phonography).

Many of these spellings represent more than a simple pronunciation variant since the words in which they appear may have additional pronunciation variants (e. g. <Haddingborough> aspiration, [n] becomes [ŋ]) or may be puns (e. g. <assings>, <Adding-borough>, <cras-shit>) constructed by the spelling changes.

Lengthening of [o] indicated by ou spelling

Win and Tabitha have many words spelled with ou which have under normal circumstances the long sound of o. This pronunciation is a feature of most Scottish dialects. Examples from the letters are as follows:

Win

coom*	comb	109*length indicated by <u>oo</u>
could	cold	307, 307
gould	gold	155, 352
mould	mold	261
ould	old	7, 155, 220, 261, 306
ould Scratch	Old Scratch	155
scoulded	scolded	43, 220
tould	told	42

Tabitha

ould	old	6, 274
sould	sold	6

Walker, speaking of "the third sound of o as in prove, move, womb, &c." notes that "Gold is pronounced like gould in familiar conversation; but in verse and solemn language, especially that of the scripture, ought always to rhyme with old, fold, &c." Tuite notes that "o sounds o long in these words, bold, hold, cold, old, scold, sold, told, except gold" (p. 29). With the exception of the "familiar" pronunciation of gold, Tabitha's and Win's spellings indicate variants not acceptable in correct usage.

Unrounding of [ʊ], [ɔ]

If we compare tea and too we will see that the second of these vowels is accompanied by a puckering or forward rounding of the lips

which enables us to distinguish unrounded and rounded vowels. Of the back vowels [u], [ʊ], [o], [ɒ], [ɔ], and [ɑ], all are rounded with the exception of [ɒ]. Win has several examples of spellings which possibly indicate an unrounded vowel [ʌ] as in nut, come; e. g. <buck> (109, 338), <cuck> (70, 71), <futt> (108), <hornbuck> (155, 201), <luck> (44), <lucking> (109), <stud> (155), and <tuck> (155, 337, 307), while Tabitha has none. This pronunciation is common in dialect speech<sup>214</sup> and it is a significant feature of Cockney; Matthews gives futt, bucks, stud, tuk, and hudd for foot, books, stood, took, and hood.<sup>215</sup> This is also a feature in many American dialects.

Win also seems to have many examples of the unrounding of [ɔ] in words such as <bumtaffy>, <compliments>, etc. (see pp. 29, 30 above under o/u spelling variations), and we may note the same process of unrounding. This change is characteristic of many Scottish dialects, but not in such a wide variety of words.<sup>216</sup> It is possible that this change may not be significant as a pronunciation change but primarily as an o/u spelling variant as discussed above.

### Miscellaneous Vowel Changes

There are in addition to the vowel changes discussed above many which are isolated, that is to say, there are one or two changes of one vowel for another (e. g. <bear> (71) and <hare> (72) for beer and hear) rather than many examples of a specific vowel change such as the lowering of [ɛ] to [æ] discussed above. Most of these isolated vowel changes seem designed entirely for their values as puns. For

instance, <Ballfart> for Bullford (307) is probably developed to combine ball and fart for purely humorous association. The devoicing of [d] to [t] is consistently used by Smollett to suggest Welsh pronunciation, but the lowering of Bull to Ball is the only example of [ɔ] for [ʊ] or [ɑ] for [ɔ] in the whole text. We may assume that Smollett wants to alter the name to raise a laugh.

Double-entendres are happily created through singular vowel alterations. <Chined> for joined (352) may suggest an instance of Cockney diphthong pronunciation of [æɪ] or [aɪ] (i. e. schwa) for [ɔɪ], but the thrust of the change comes from the suggestion that the couples are chained like beasts in harness rather than as loving human beings joined in marriage.

<Paleass> for palace (108) uses long a [e] for short a [æ] as another excuse to get ass into the text. In the same way, the isolated lowering of long e [i] to short i [ɪ] produces <piss> (307) and <shits> (307) for piece and sheets in Win's letters, while Tabitha produces <bitchmast> (156) for beechmast [a kind of fodder for pigs] to get bitch into the text in an unexpected position. By altering short u [ʌ] to short i [ɪ], Tabitha creates two more taboo words, <shit> (6) and <slit> (274) out of shut and slut.<sup>217</sup> All of these changes are a rather left-handed way of getting taboo words into print while having them pour naively from the mouths of two seemingly innocent women.

Not all of Smollett's minor vowel changes are designed to introduce especially off-colour puns, of course. He is also interested to play on situations via word changes and to juggle familiar phrases. The



only other example of short i for long e is in Win's statement that she wishes to "live upon dissent terms of civility" with Mrs. Gwyllim after she has returned to the Brambleton estate. Win's decision to turn over a new leaf and have decent relations with Mrs. Gwyllim is, of course, shown up for the pure paper sentiment it is. And the only other example of short i for short u occurs in Tabitha's letter when she garbles a proverbial phrase, "the refuse and scum of the earth," to produce "the refuge and skim of the hearth" (78) instead. The changes in this phrase are distinctive; not only is scum changed to skim, but earth is aspirated to hearth and the change of refuse to refuge is a common dialectal confusion especially associated with Cockney speech.<sup>218</sup> If we may judge from the ways in which Smollett has changed isolated vowels in these few examples, we may see that his changes are usually not randomly selected but are, instead, determined by an intent to make a specific word play in the letters.

#### IV

#### CONCLUSION

Once we have investigated the ways in which Smollett manipulates the spellings in Win's and Tabitha's letters to produce language variants through systematic processes or changes, we are alerted to the possibilities for language variety in Humphry Clinker. Our awareness of the ways in which Smollett uses the spellings in Win's and Tabitha's letters to indicate pronunciation variants and to indicate semi-literate states of education allows us to enjoy more fully the deviant features of the women's letters. Our understanding also of eighteenth century spelling conventions and pronunciation variants insofar as they differ from our modern practices also helps us appreciate the possible effects Smollett wished to create.

If we return now to the passages with which we began this study and apply the principles of language change discussed in this paper, we will see that there is little need for the elaborate etymological explanations which have been used to "translate" puzzling words in Smollett's text.

O voman! voman! if thou had'st but the least consumption of what pleasures we scullers have, when we can cunster the crabbidst buck off hand, and spell the ethnitch vords without lucking at the primmer. (109)

O! that ever a gentlewoman of years and discretion should tare her air, and disporridge herself for such a nubjack! (306)

The captain himself had a huge hassock of air, with three tails, and a tumtawdry coat, boddered with sulfur. -- Wan said he was a monkey-bank; and the ould bottler swore he was the born imich of Titidall. (352)

The first time I was mortally afraid and flustered all day; and afterwards made believe that I had got the heddick; but mistress said, if I didn't go, I should take a dose of bumtaffy . . . (43).

That she mought do me no harm, I crossed her hand with a taster, and bid her tell my fortune . . . (261).

Of the underlined words which have puzzled Arthur Boggs into calling them "coinages," let us look first at the common vowel feature in <scullers>, <conster>, <nobjack>, <tumtawdry>, and <bumtaffy>. These words are all examples of the u/o spelling variation which possibly reflects the unrounding of [ɔ], or [ɔ̃] to [ʌ]. With this one change we would have scollers, conster, nobjack, tomtawdry, and bomtaffy. Of these "new" spellings, conster is a standard variant pronunciation (and spelling) for construe while tomtawdry is a dialect version of tawdry, a common word for "vulgar finery."<sup>219</sup>

Scollers, bomtaffy and nobjack require a few more changes, however, before they are "translated" into standard forms. Scollers, however, needs only the substitution of ch for the simplified spelling of c before it emerges as schollers and, from the context, as scholars. The final stages of altering the spelling of e to a in the unstressed syllable and dropping out an unnecessary l follow naturally. It is important to emphasize, however, that once the initial change of u to o has been made (with the obvious change in pronunciation to schollers) the actual word, scholars, is self-evident because the spelling is

essentially phonetic before further changes are made in line with spelling conventions.

Bomtaffy requires only one change after the initial change of u to o and that is the change resulting from the principle of devoicing.<sup>220</sup> When Win's bomtaffy is compared with Tabitha's similar bom-daffee (assuming the o for u change) and voiced to bomdavvy (cf. Tabitha's bom-davvee), a reader familiar with the period's quack medicines and restoratives would recognize baume de vie and the simplification of the French au spelling.

Nobjack is more complex, but only in the visual sense, because it is quite clear in its context once we have ascertained that "such a nobjack" is "such an objack" because of faulty word division. To the reader who can "hear" the phrase there is no real difficulty because the actual written phrase, "such an object," is not hidden at all. However, to the reader perplexed by the visual form of the word, there is a further challenge in requiring the transformation of a to e (so obvious in other words like Addingborough for Edinburgh) and the addition of final t which Win, in common with many speakers, seems to lose in so many words.

Two other words underlined above, Titidall and taster, are subject to several of the same changes used for the words discussed. By applying the principles of devoicing and the alternate spellings for unstressed syllables Titidall becomes Tiddidoll or Tididol. For the modern reader this name has no significance, but for the readers enjoying the novel as a new work it would have a great deal of significance.

Tididoll was the nickname of Richard Grenville, Lord Temple, a powerful political figure in the court of George III and an enemy of Smollett. The nickname is very apt in its application to Lismahago, especially as he is described by Jery. Tididoll was a very current joke since several political pasquinades had appeared between 1760 and 1770<sup>221</sup> and in the Morning Chronicle of 1770 an ill-natured writer described Temple in the following manner:

. . . the external form of his nobleman discovers nothing to his advantage . . . . Length, without shape or proportion, and a countenance in which the most penetrating eye perceives no expression . . . . Nature seems to have thrown him into existence in one of her moods of frolic, and to make him more conspicuous, she has given him rank.

By making Lismahago appear so badly dressed in his ungainly figure and then saying that he is the "born imich of Titidall," Smollett is able to make a jab at Temple which would be recognized quite readily.

Tidydoll is a dialect word which means "an over-dressed old woman" and it may be the original for the nickname.

Taster is merely another change of e to a like that in objack for objeck / object, and the resulting word is tester, a slang term for sixpence. Tester has a long history; it dates from the days of Henry VIII and was still in use in the nineteenth century, recorded by Hotten in his Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant and Vulgar Words (London: J. C. Hotten, 1860). Smollett used tester in its usual form in his novels and, in addition, he has Timothy Crabshaw of Sir Launcelot Greaves use it. Interestingly, Crabshaw also speaks in vestiges of dialect and his words are subject to some vowel changes; he uses teaster instead of tester as he says "I'se wager a teaster, the foul fiend has left the seaman, and got into Gilbert, that he has . . ." (SLG,

Chapt. VIII). I suspect that Boggs was easily distracted by the fact that taster seems to conform to the spelling rules for long a predicted by a final e as if the word derived from taste; instead, it seems to follow the pattern of test / tester as if formed from "tast" (with short a).

The last word <ethnitch> is, of all the variants in Humphry Clinker, the most difficult to explain satisfactorily. While I cannot put forward a completely convincing explanation for its formation, I feel quite convinced that it is not very likely another coinage since there seems no concrete evidence for other coinages in the letters. Ethnick may be what Win means to say but its normal meaning according to Johnson's Dictionary was "heathen, pagan, not Jewish, not Christian," and this sense would put a strain upon the context. Heathenish, according to Johnson, meant "wild, savage, rapacious and cruel" and there seems to be no evidence for the colloquial usage of heathenish as "abominable" at the time. Heathenish in the slang sense of very difficult (i. e. "it was a heathenish hard thing to do") would be appropriate but this usage is not recorded in the period. In terms of the principles of word change which Smollett employed with some degree of consistency it might be explained as follows: (a) h is lacking in Win's word because of faulty aspiration; (b) the middle syllable of heathenish is lost by syllabic reduction (e. g. Parades becomes <Prades>); and (c) the change in the final consonant cluster is from [s] to [c]. While this possible explanation is not quite satisfactory, I would argue that it is more sensible in the context and more probable in terms of

Smollett's normal practice of making systematic rather than arbitrary changes. Further, it is a more likely application of meaning than Boggs' etymological explanation which ultimately suggests the opposite of what the context seems to imply if we understand Win to say "you can have no conception of the pleasure we scholars (i. e. those who can read and write) have when we can construe the most difficult book off hand and spell the [hardest, cruelly hard, foreign] words without looking at the primer." The context suggests something like this. Further, I assume from Smollett's usual practice that he is making some joke of Win's pretension to spell correctly the hard word which she has specifically chosen as an illustration for boasting about her spelling powers and that it must be similar (e. g. ethnick, heathenish) to what she does write.

If we look at the other variants in the brief passages cited and identify the processes or changes, omitting from discussion the variants <scullers>, <unster>, <ethnitch>, <nubjack>, <tumtawdry>, <Titidall>, <bumtaffy>, and <taster>, they may be analyzed as follows:

voman, voman	[v] for [w]
consumption	malapropism
buck, lucking	[ʌ] for [ʊ]
primer	eye dialect
tare	homonym, malapropism
air, air	faulty aspiration, <u>h</u> -less spelling
disporridge	word approximation
boddered	vocalization of [r]
wan	eye dialect
monkey-bank	[k] for [t], alternate spelling of unstressed syllable
ould	[u:] for [o:]
imich	devoicing, [ç] for [j]
heddick	eye dialect
mought	dialect verb form

Applying the principles discussed in this paper, the interested reader might do the same with the following passage:

O woman, what chuckling and changing have I seen! -- Well, there's nothing sartain in this world -- Who would have thought that mistriss, after all the pains taken for the good of her prusias sole, would go for to throw away her poor body? that she would cast the heys of infection upon such a carrying-crow as Lashmihago! as old as Matthewsullin, as dry as a red herring, and as pore as a starved veezel -- O, Molly! hadst thou seen him come down the ladder, in a shurt so scanty, that it could not kiver his nakedness! -- The young 'squire called him Dunquickset; but he looked for all the world like Cradoc-ap Morgan, the ould tinker that suffered at Abergany for steeling of kettle -- Then he's a profane scuffle, and, as Mr. Clinker says, no better than an impfiddle continually playing upon the pye-bill and the new-burth . . . (306).



## Notes

<sup>1</sup> All references to Humphry Clinker, unless otherwise stated, are to The Expedition of Humphry Clinker edited with an introduction by Lewis M. Knapp (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966).

<sup>2</sup> At the same time that Smollett is enjoying his allusions to the writers of the Grand Tour, he is also employing the mock introduction, a popular convention for explaining how a series of letters or set of memoirs happens to come into the hands of the seller. This technique was popular in the eighteenth century; it was used, for example, by Defoe in Moll Flanders (1722), by Swift in Gulliver's Travels (1726), and by Charles Johnstone in Chrysal (1760) and it was parodied by Sterne in A Sentimental Journey (1768).

<sup>3</sup> Jery pointlessly Latinizes "pointed out by the fingers of passers-by" and, in so doing misquotes Horace: "monstror digito praetereuntium" from Carmina, IV, iii, 22. Jery produces "praetereuntium digito monstratus" (p. 185).

<sup>4</sup> See p. 19. Smollett is wryly attacking false learning through the medium of language in the doctor's speech and, at the same time, exposing Jery's vanity of learning. Latin expressions are scattered about Jery's letters as well as Bramble's. Bramble's usages are often unobtrusive and when they are not, they usually add a range of associations. Jery's usages seem strained for the most part.

<sup>5</sup> Jane Austen, Northanger Abbey, Vol. V of The Novels of Jane Austen, 3rd ed. (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933), pp. 27-8.

<sup>6</sup> W. Arthur Boggs, "Dialectal Ingenuity in Humphry Clinker," Papers on Language and Literature, I (1965), 327-37. Boggs is referring to an earlier article, "Smollett's Coinages in the Win Jenkins' Letters," Language Quarterly, II (1963), 2-4.

<sup>7</sup> The variants which Boggs discusses as coinages are not newly created words. They may be more simply explained; scullers = scholars, cunster = construe, taster = tester (a slang term for sixpence), tumtawdry = tomtawdry (a dialect term for vulgar finery), ethnitch - ethnick or heathenish (synonymous terms in the eighteenth century), nubjack = an object, bumtaffy = baume de vie, and titidall = Tiddidoll or Tididoll

(the nickname for Lord Temple current in the 1760's and 1770's). All of these variants are produced by normal language processes to be discussed in this paper.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of the difficulty of representing dialects in written form, see Sumner Ives', "A Theory of Literary Dialect," A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects, ed. Juanita V. Williamson and Virginia M. Burke (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp. 145-78.

<sup>9</sup> See also W. Arthur Boggs', "Win Jenkins' Archaisms and Proverbial Phrases," Language Quarterly IV (1965), pp. 33-6 and "Some Standard Eighteenth-Century English Usages," The Quarterly Journal of Speech LI (1965), pp. 304-6. The only other scholar to give any attention to Smollett's language in Humphry Clinker is Paul-Gabriel Bouce in Les Romans de Smollett: Etude Critique (Paris: Didier, 1971).

<sup>10</sup> See Constance Davies, English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1934), pp. 144-5.

<sup>11</sup> I have attempted to use source materials which are as close to the publication date of Humphry Clinker as possible, but there are some obvious difficulties, not with books on spelling and grammar as much as with books on pronunciation. Johnson's Dictionary (1755) would seem the logical source for definitions and conventional spellings, but it does not include a pronunciation guide. It has been necessary, therefore, to rely upon Sheridan's General Dictionary (1780) and Walker's Critical Pronouncing Dictionary (1791) as they were the most widely used and respected of the pronouncing dictionaries of the late eighteenth century.

Material on dialect presents more problems because dialect dictionaries or glossaries were non-existent. Bailey's Universal Etymological Dictionary (1721), however, did include some dialect words. But the major reference works date from the turn of our century, well over a hundred years later than Humphry Clinker. But Wright's English Dialect Dictionary (1898) boasts "the complete vocabulary of all English dialect words which are still in use or are known to have been in use at any time during the last two hundred years in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales." Wright's English Dialect Grammar (1905) provides the most reliable information on dialect phonology (and is closest in point of time to Smollett's date of writing) until the publication of The Leeds Survey of English Dialects in the 1960's.

For slang terms I have used Grose's Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue (1796), also later in the period, and the large work by Farmer and Henley, Slang and Its Analogues (1890). Eric Partridge's A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional Usage (1966) has also been useful.

<sup>12</sup> For a discussion of spelling pronunciations, see Thomas Pyles, The Origins and Development of the English Language (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964), pp. 46-9.

13 For an exhaustive bibliography of such works see R. C. Alston, A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800 (Leeds: E. J. Arnold and Son, 1965). For a detailed examination of early English pronunciation, see J. J. Dobson, English Pronunciation 1500-1700, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957).

14 "We are not surprised, then, to find Johnson, whose main efforts in orthographic reform were directed toward establishing analogy, basing his pronunciation as much as possible on analogy. Boswell says that Johnson pronounced heard with a double e, heerd, instead of pronouncing it herd, as it is usually done, because, Johnson explained if it were pronounced herd, there would be a single exception from the English pronunciation of the syllable, -ear, and he thought it better not to have that exception. And this in spite of the fact that such a pronunciation was never supported by any grammarian." Esther K. Sheldon, Standards of English Pronunciation According to the Grammarians and Orthoepists of the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries, (Manuscript thesis). Univ. of Wisconsin Library. Cited by Börje Holmberg, On the Concept of Standard English and the History of Modern English Pronunciation. (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), p. 25.

15 John Jones, Practical Phonography (1701; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1969), Preface [p. 2, unnumbered].

16 Stephen Jones, A Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language (1796; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1969).

17 The epistolary novel was essentially finished in the nineteenth century although there were exceptions (e. g. Swinburne's Love's Crosscurrents). For a discussion of the vogue of the epistolary novel, see J. M. S. Tompkins, The Popular Novel in England 1770-1800 (London: Methuen and Co., 1932), pp. 333-7.

18 James Elphinston's A Minniature Ov Inglish Orthoggraphy (1795; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1967) provides an excellent example.

19 This form of bracketing, < >, followed by a number indicating page reference, will signal a misspelling transcribed from the text. Standard forms will be underlined.

20 See below for a discussion of this word as a typical example of Welsh devoicing.

21 See Joseph Wright, The English Dialect Grammar (Oxford: Henry Frowde, 1905), pp. 140-5. Hereafter cited as EDG.

22 See following discussion of Win's other fractured French words and folk etymologies.

23 In the review of Humphry Clinker in The Gentleman's Magazine for 1771, the following remarks appear (pp. 317-21):

The stile of this work is frequently stercoraceous, and some times it is also prurient. The prurient, however, is as harmless as the stercoraceous, as it tends much more to chill than to enflame every imagination, except perhaps those of the thieves and bunters in Broad St. Giles, to whom the coarsest terms being familiar, they convey sensual ideas without the antidote of disgust.

The reviewer clearly recognizes Smollett's intent to use language in this way but is not alarmed. The Victorian reaction to this feature of Smollett's work was not so tolerant; it may be typified by the following comment from A. G. L. L'Estranges' History of English Humour (1878; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), pp. 123-4.

It has generally been the custom to couple the name of Smollett with that of Fielding, but the former has scarcely any claim to be regarded as a humorist, except such as is largely due to the use of gross indelicacy and coarse caricature.

Even Sir Walter Scott could not resist commenting "There is a tone of vulgarity about all his productions."

24 Cf. Wycherley's Country Wife, Hamlet's allusion to "country pleasures;" and Katherine's response to "Le foot . . . et le count," Henry V, III, iv. Farmer provides many examples from Elizabethan literature in Slang and Its Analogues (printed for private subscribers, 1890).

25 This is still a phenomenon in certain dialects in England; see Peter Trudgill, The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974), pp. 834. Note also the map on p. 83 indicating "h-less" areas.

26 See below for discussion of aspiration / non-aspiration as possible variant pronunciations.

27 Thomas Tuite, The Oxford Spelling Book (1726; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1967), p. 54:

"H has its proper sound in the beginning of a word, as in hand, hair, hid, hope, hurt, yet h is mute in the beginning of several words, as herb, heir, heiress, honest, honour, hour, hospital, humble, Humphry."

For additional information from the period on aspiration see also Robert Nares, Elements of Orthoepy (1784; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968), pp. 108-10.

28 Anonymous, The Irish Spelling Book or, Instruction for the Reading of English, Fitted for the Youth of Ireland (1740; rpt. Menston, The Scolar Press, 1969), p. 148: "Of words commonly spoken shorter than they are written."

29 Elphinston, English Orthoggraphy, p. 26.

30 See Jery's letter of September 12, p. 267.

31 Joseph Wright, English Dialect Dictionary, 6 vols. (1898; rpt. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1962) indicates that the term may be seen in many advertisements for the sale of stock; "Three very fresh beast, . . . the beast are all fresh, well-haired"; see entry BEAST. Wright's dictionary will be cited hereafter as EDD.

32 Identified in William Axon's English Dialect Words of the Eighteenth Century [from Bailey's Dictionary]. (London: Published For the English Dialect Society, 1883), p. 41:

"Devil's Arse a Peak

. . . a peak = in the Peak District . . . a great unfathomable Hole in Derbyshire, having a great many corners like so many apartments, of which there are several strange Accounts given."

33 Hoyden's Hole has not been annotated in any editions of Humphry Clinker to date. But once a method of understanding Win's and Tabitha's aspiration is clear, it is logical to look for a name beginning not with h but with a vowel. Francis Grose supplies the answer in A Provincial Glossary (1787; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1968) in his section on proverbs. He quotes a proverb from Derbyshire:

#### Elden-Hole Wants Filling

A saying commonly used to great boasters, who vaunt they can do wonderful feats; pointing out to them one worthy of their undertaking; that is, the filling up Elden-hole, a fissure in the earth, vulgarly deemed bottomless. Cotton, in his description of the Peak, relates some fruitless attempts to measure its depth.

Smollett has again manipulated a familiar name (at least to the eighteenth century reader who went on jaunts to Buxton Spa) to produce an off-colour pun.

34 A possible alternate explanation is provided by Eric Partridge in his Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English (1937; rpt. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1961) who notes "arse . . . Ca. 1700-1930, rarely printed in full; even B. E. [Dictionary of the Canting Crew] (1690) on one occasion prints as 'ar\_\_'; and Grose often omits the r". Perhaps this usage was as close as Smollett wished to come to offending

in print with this particular word. Partridge hereafter cited as Dict. of Slang and Unc.

35 Like the Grand Tour, travel within Britain became very popular in the eighteenth century and there are many accounts. See George Watson, ed., The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 1395-1410 for listings of British travel from general works (e. g. Defoe's A Tour Thro' The Whole Island of Great Britain 1724, -25, -26) to the specific (e. g. Reverend William Bray's Sketch of a Tour into Derbyshire and Yorkshire, etc. 1777).

36 When <hearth> appears for earth in Win's letters, it too has a diminishing effect; Win declares that "Ould Scratch has not a greater enemy upon hearth than Mr. Clinker, who is, indeed a very powerfull labourer in the Lord's vineyard" (155) and unwittingly reduces her praise of Clinker. He is not the glorious Christian, striving mightily against the devil out in the wide world; instead, he is the hero of the hearth, working against the devil with the women and servants of Bramble's household. This is one facet of Smollett's satirical criticism of the Methodist calling, a feature which he shares with other writers of the period, and most notably with Christopher Anstey, The New Bath Guide: or Memoirs of the B-N-D Family (Dublin, 1766), an obvious source for Humphry Clinker.

37 See pronunciation guide below for devoicing, aspiration, and assimilation in these words. In these and other lexical items with obviously variant phonological features, discussion of pronunciation will usually follow.

38 Walker voices this attitude succinctly (Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, p. 23):

. . . It may indeed be observed that there is scarcely any thing more distinguishes a person of mean and good education than the pronunciation of the unaccented vowels. When vowels are under the accent, the prince and the lowest of the people, with very few exceptions, pronounce them in the same manner; but the unaccented vowels in the mouth of the former have a distinct, open, and specific sound, while the latter often totally sink them, or change them, into some other sound. Those therefore, who wish to pronounce elegantly must be particularly attentive to the unaccented vowels; as a neat pronunciation of these, forms one of the greatest beauties of speaking.

39 Misspellings of initial, unstressed vowels are few; <unclose> for enclose (306) and <excepted> for accepted (155, 338) appear, at first glance, to fit this pattern, but the actual comic reversals in meaning which the words provide incline me to regard the words as deliberate malapropisms instead of unstressed spellings. The other words with misspelled initial vowels are <edmiral> for admiral (261),

<operation> for apparition (261), and <iminent> for eminent (109), but these words (or their hybrid forms) would all receive initial stress.

40 R. E. Zachrisson, "Four Hundred Years of English Spelling Reform," Studia Neophilologica, IV (1931-2), pp. 1-70.

41 A kind of lace headdress popular in the 1760's. See C. Willett Cunnington, Phillis Cunnington and Charles Beard, A Dictionary of English Costume (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 23.

42 Lowe (The Critical Spelling Book, 1755) advocates the old spelling oeconomy, p. 45. Smollett normally spells it oeconomy elsewhere in Humphry Clinker, cf. pp. 85, 207, 241, 296, 350.

43 The final v of laxative has been devoiced in typical Welsh fashion; see devoicing below.

44 Jery reports Matthew's speech to Liddy and Tabitha announcing that Humphry is his illegitimate son:

'Sister, (said my uncle) there is a poor relation that recommends himself to your good graces -- The quondam Humphry Clinker is metamorphosed into Matthew Loyd; and claims the honour being your carnal kinsman -- in short, the rogue proves to be a crab of my own planting in the days of hot blood and unrestrained libertinism.' (pp. 318-9)

45 For a different view, compare Jery's account of the "painted Jezebel" incident, p. 209.

46 See Einar Haugen, "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," Language, 26 (1950), pp. 210-31.

47 See OED.

48 James D. Gordon, The English Language: An Historical Introduction (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972), p. 20.

49 This incident may also contain a sexual allusion since Jezebel was another slang term for pudendum; its conjunction with whore would suggest a possibility.

50 The Octagon Chapel in Milsom Street was opened in 1767; it would have been a "new" sight for the Bramble entourage. For a description of the Octagon, and other sights, and for a contemporary map of Bath, see The New Bath Guide; or Useful Pocket Companion, a new edition, corrected and much enlarged (Bath: R. Cruttwell, 1780).

51 See below for a discussion of the obvious pronunciation changes indicated by these spellings.

52 This is a "spelling joke" rather than a "pronunciation joke" since Win would not write Lough as <Loff> on the basis of pronunciation; she might logically write <Lock> (or something akin to it). The spelling of <Loff> -- ff for gh -- is analogous with laff / laugh, enuff / enough, forms which also appear in Win's letters.

53 Paul-Gabriel Bouce comments on the obvious sexual play of Coon: "L'intention palliarde -- à la maniere polyglotte de Shakespeare dans Henry V (III, 4), où Katharine s'indigne d'entendre prononcer «de foot et de coun» -- est encore plus nette, vu le contexte dévêtu, quand Win fait de Sir George Colquhoun «Sir George Coon»." Le Romans de Smollett, pp. 383-4.

54 Smollett executes a satiric thrust at the hypocritical Methodist minister, <Mr. Macrocodile>

55 See parallel form <numplush> for non plus in Smollett's The Life and Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), Chapt. IX and discussion of [ʃ] for [s] in pronunciation section below.

56 See pronunciation guide for discussion of Welsh devoicing of [b] to [p]; compare also the Cockney version of habeas corpus, 'hap'orth of Copperas", recorded by Samuel Pegge, Anecdotes of the English Language (London: J. Nichols, 1814), p. 75.

57 See earlier discussion of Jery's report of Tabitha's conversation with James Quin.

58 John Jones, Practical Phonography (1701) comments on the pronunciations of mayor in his preface. He remarks that it is sounded very differently from the way in which "the visible Letters positively inform Beginners that it is to be sounded," and notes that the "customary and fashionable sound" is mair -- like Win's mare. The anonymous Vocabulary of Such Words in the English Language as are of dubious and Unsettled Accentuation (1797, rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1967) includes mayor and indicates the pronunciation mā r but the author adds, "I have marked this word like Mr. Sheridan; Mr. Walker pronounces it mā-ur."

59 Thomas Tuite, The Oxford Spelling Book.

60 The Irish Spelling Book.

61 Vails were very often a good reason for choosing a lower paying job. See references in Win's letters to vails and perquisites parquisites, pp. 7, 70, 306.

62 The absurd height of ladies' hair fashions was caricatured by Rowlandson and others; see Thomas Wright's A Caricature History of the Georges (London: John Camden Hotten, 1868) for examples.



63 The joke of Win's pretensions to being a gentlewoman is something like the young Moll Flander's notion that a "gentlewoman" is any independent lady who can, like Moll's governess, support herself by her needlework.

64 The exceptions, of course, are the homonyms which have initial consonants misspelled through Smollett's attempt to represent dialect pronunciation as well (e. g. <Vales> for Wales).

65 Although comprehensive studies of literary dialect are lacking, there are many isolated studies of individual authors (e. g. Joel Chandler Harris, Bret Harte, Charles Dickens, George Eliot, Thomas Hardy). For a list of writings on British Novelists, see Norman Page, Speech in the English Novel (London: Longman, 1973), pp. 87-9 and for a selection on American novelists, see Williamson and Burke, A Various Language, cited above.

66 Sumner Ives, "A Theory of Literary Dialect," reprinted in A Various Language, p. 154.

67 Tuite gives Win's spelling as a guide to pronunciation; ". . . I sounds ee short, in the end of a syllable, if the following syllable begins with a consonant that sounds double, as city, pity, . . . which are pronounc'd as if written cit-ty, pit-ty."

68 The ur spelling seems to have been thought a vulgar error. Nares Orthoepy (p. 26), discussing "u short" notes: ". . . the letter r produces this effect upon an I as upon an E immediately preceding it in the same syllable. Ex. bird, circle, firm, virgin, &c. so that it is not easy, in these circumstances, to trace the orthography from the sound. Vergin, virgin, and vurgin, would be pronounced exactly alike. . . . It seems that our ancestors distinguished these sounds more correctly. Bishop Gardiner, in his first letter to Cheke, mentions a witticism of Nicholas Rowley, a fellow Cantab. with him, to this effect: "Let handsome girls be called virgins, plain ones vurgins."

The discrimination of sounds indicated by the earlier spellings disappeared as those sounds began to merge (see. Butler 1634, Hodges 1644, and Cooper 1685 and 1687 for documentation). The idea that only the vulgar could make such errors as not to distinguish in pronunciation these sounds seems to have been transferred to vulgar errors in spelling.

69 Fizzog is a common dialect word; EDD notes its use in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire, Nottinghamshire, and Lincolnshire. Win combines it with many by a metathesis (i. e. reversal of m and n), since she has no familiarity with physiognamy. Fizzog is also common in present day American slang; it even appears as the title for a Carl Sandburg poem.

70 Spelling books warn against this misspelling, and it is noted that even "the writer of the age" could err. Pope is quoted as misspelling it in The Art of Sinking in Poetry (89, 1727 edition), "the substance of many a fair volume, might be reduced to the size of a primer."

71 This is the verb and not the noun form which was treated above in the homonym sequence of tear (in the eye) and tare (in the corn).

72 <Dunquickset> is a favourite spelling of Smollett's. He uses it in Sir Launcelot Greaves, with a variation in <Dunquicksot> (the knight) and in the name of one of the novel's characters, Sir Valentine Quickset. In the latter case, quickset is humorously relevant since a quickset is a hedge and Sir Valentine is an avid fox-hunter. The phonetic spelling <Dunquickset> more closely approximates the usual eighteenth century pronunciation since the tendency to pronounce it in the Spanish manner is a somewhat modern development. See The Life and Adventures of Sir Launcelot Greaves, edited with an introduction by David Evans (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973).

73 Sumner Ives, "A Theory of Literary Dialect" (p. 147), commenting on the control of a variety of dialect features in the literary representation of dialect observes: "Nearly all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete; the author is an artist, not a linguist or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific. In working out his compromise between art and linguistics, each author has made his own decision as to how many of the peculiarities in his character's speech he can profitably represent . . . . From the total linguistic material available, he selects those features that seem to be typical, to be most representative of the sort of person he is portraying."

74 This word provides a blatant example of Boggs missing the obvious. In his article, "A Win Jenkins' Lexicon," Bulletin of the New York Public Library, LXVIII (1964), pp. 323-30, he says of this word:

"marokin. a variant of maroquin obsolete by Win's time. Since maroquin is a leather, and Win obviously uses the word in reference to an American fur, marokin is probably a malapropism for martin. In either event, no linguistic explanation has been found for the change of kw to k, or of t to k."

It is unlikely that Smollett would attribute to Win, of all people, the use of an obsolete word and further, Boggs' difficulty in making an explanation only involves two false assumptions of his own making.

75 <Nows> is one of Smollett's few errors in creating eye dialect; the pronunciation is naturally [naus] instead of [noz].

76 Service appears in this form only once. It is otherwise altered to <sarvice> to indicate vulgar pronunciation; see a discussion of this pronunciation feature below.

77 Solomon Lowe, The Critical Spelling Book (1755; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1967), p. 75. See also James Adams, The Pronunciation of the English Language (1799; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968), p. 123.

78 Lowe, p. 80.

79 See also ⟨pyebill⟩ (155), another twist to ⟨byebill⟩. The main interest here is the devoicing of [b] to [p]; see devoicing below.

80 Even a comparison of Win's eye dialect spellings with the selection of variants Boggs lists in "A Win Jenkins' Lexicon," Bulletin of the New York Public Library, LXVIII (1964), 323-30 and in "Dialectal Ingenuity in Humphry Clinker," Papers on Language and Literature, I (1965), 327-37 will serve to illustrate.

81 Some of these variants have been discussed above, others are to follow. Variants include o/u spellings, homonyms, vulgarisms, word substitutions, malapropisms, metathesis of r, and variant spellings representing normal eighteenth century pronunciations (e. g. potticary).

82 See pronunciation guide below.

83 See also treatment of ⟨marokin⟩ as eye dialect in preceding section. Partridge's Dict. of Slang and Unc. has the following entry:

"Merrika (or -er); Merrican, -kan, kin, America; American: sotecism ( -- 1887) Baumann [Londonismen]."

84 For a clear, documented discussion of misdivision, see Dobson, II, pp. 1005-6.

85 Pyles (p. 185), notes that a similar process has applied to pronouns:

Rather important changes are to be noted in the pronouns. In the personal ones the historical forms of the first person remained as I, me, and mine and my, with the older distinction between the n-less form of the possessive and the older form with n being for a long time maintained as it had been in Middle English from the thirteenth century on -- that is, mine before a vowel or h, and my before consonants. This distinction continued to be made down to the eighteenth century, when my came to be the only regular first persona possessive modifier. The Fool's nuncle in King Lear is due to his misunderstanding of mine uncle as my nuncle; and it is likely that Ned, Nelly, and Noll (a nickname usually associated with Oliver Goldsmith) have the same origin from mine Edward, mine Eleanor, mine Oliver.

86 William Matthews, Cockney Past and Present (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1938), p. 191. Hereafter cited as Matthews, CPP.

87 Dobson notes that the absence of these features in most of the homophone lists (i. e. apart from Cooper) is a "clear indication of the vulgar or dialectal status of the development"; Dobson, II, p. 1006.

<sup>88</sup> Note here Win's use of "ever a gentlewoman" and compare with uses of <arrow> which follows (e. g. "arrow private gentlewoman"). Compare also Win's use of "arrow private gentlewoman" with "arrow privet squire" and the alternation of private / privet. Usages such as this are sprinkled throughout: Smollett does not confine himself to one spelling (i. e. <privet> for private) because he often uses his misspellings for different purposes. For example, he uses "privet" with squire to make an allusion to typical country squires (punning on their concerns with privet hedges and other country matters), but has no such use for this misspelling when Win writes "arrow private gentlewoman". This very well illustrates Sumner Ives' point, quoted earlier, that the chief intention of the novelist is artistic, not linguistic or sociological.

<sup>89</sup> Boggs, "Smollett's Coinages in the Win Jenkins Letters" [cf. note 74] (p. 3) makes the following assertions: "In addition to bum-taffy [sic], two more of Smollett's best coinages are nubjack . . . and ethnitch, both of which reveal a talent for linguistic ingenuity. Only in Win's reference to Lismahago are nub and jack used in combination: "such a nubjack." However, Grose defines nub as a cant term for "neck," nubbing as hanging," and a nubbing cheat as "the gallows." Grose does not give Jack as a common appellation for fellow, but he does give thirteen examples of its use in combination as Jack Tar, etc., and the O.E.D. reveals that Jack was still used in the eighteenth century as a term for "a lad, fellow, chap; esp. a low-bred or an ill-mannered fellow, 'a knave'." Thus a nubjack must be a common fellow or ill-mannered person fit only for hanging. Again, the salacious may be present in that Grose also defines nub as "coition."

Interestingly, what Boggs adds as an afterthought is probably the real source of the reason for variation; Grose does list nub as a verb for copulate (1785) and it is listed in Slang and Its Analogues, as is also Jack for penis erectio, along with Roger, Peter etc. as other generic slang terms. Boggs presumably did not check slang dictionaries for sexual terms.

<sup>90</sup> Smollett, The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle edited with an introduction by James L. Clifford (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964), p. 676.

<sup>91</sup> Wright's EDD: OBJECT; it is listed in use in Sc., Irel., Nhb., Wm., Yks., Lin., Dor., Cor., "Also written objekd Sh. I. and in forms objeck Abd. objick Sh. I., Cor." Wright's listing of objeck and objick confirms the natural process of consonant cluster simplification in dialect speech. Slang and Its Analogues; "object. subs. (colloq.) 1. A laughing (or gazing) stock 2. A sweetheart (i. e. the OBJECT of one's affections)."

<sup>92</sup> See pronunciation <sup>discussion</sup> below.

<sup>93</sup> Matthews, CPP, pp. 156-7; 225.

94 Börje Holmberg, On the Concept, p. 19.

95 This is not to say that "purity" was not assumed and "vulgarity" was not condemned before the eighteenth century. For example, Owen Price, a Welsh schoolmaster, writes in his Vocal Organ, 1665: "I have not been guided by our vulgar pronunciation, but by that of London and our universities where the language is purely spoken," and Christopher Cooper condemned isolated examples of variants as "barbarous speaking".

96 George Campbell's definition of good usage, The Philosophy of Rhetoric, 1776.

97 Lowe, pp. 12-3.

98 For discussion of these and other examples see Pyles, pp. 282-4 and Otto Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1961) 7 Vols., I, pp. 281-4. Hereafter cited as Jespersen: all references are to Vol. I, Sounds and Spellings.

99 See above for discussion of "h-less" spellings and the standard eighteenth century form, "ospital".

100 Note that Smollett's spelling of potticary with t for th is like that in The Irish Spelling Book. The th pronunciation in present day English is, like the reversion to the whole-word spelling, the result of spelling pronunciation.

101 'Squire (with the apostrophe) was the standard usage but Smollett's self-consciousness in using a shortened form without the apostrophe is evident because he does use the normal form in Win's letters on several occasions (72, 107, 219).

102 See previous discussion of <marokin> as eye dialect and as a misdivided word.

103 Wright, EDD. Also, this omission of the initial unstressed syllable was characteristic of Cockney; see Matthews, CPP, p. 172.

104 See Dobson, II, pp. 906-10, 1005 for discussion of metathesis and the history of words which have changed as a result of it, both in spelling and pronunciation. For example, Middle English brid, thridde, gaers-graes, clapsen and drit have become Modern English bird, third, grass, clasp, and dirt.

105 See Wright, EDG, pp. 219-20, for discussion of the metathesis of [r] as a feature of dialect speech, especially in the south-west. He gives many examples, some of which retain the middle English forms, as in brid, (bird), gars (grass), etc.

106 Smollett is obviously interested in the malapropism here.

107 Thomas Wright, A Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English, 2 Vols. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1893). Hereafter cited as A Provincial Glossary.

108 Wright, EDG, p. 250.

109 Pegge, Anecdotes of the English Language (London: J. Nichols, 1814), p. 61.

110 Andrew MacLeish, A Glossary of Grammar and Linguistics (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, Universal Library Edition, 1972), pp. 40-1. Hereafter cited as MacLeish.

111 Wright, EDG, p. 215 notes that "flail has become frail by dissimilation in Sc. Dur. Yks. Chs. Not. Lie. Nhp. Brks. e.An. Ken. Sus. I.W. Wil. Som."

112 This characteristic difficulty has become an old chestnut in comic routines in which the phrases, "rotsa ruck" and "flied lice" occur to give the impression of oriental speakers trying English.

113 MacLeish, pp. 15-6.

114 This, of course, is the standard pronunciation of horseshoe and Win's spelling, while documenting the assimilation as a normal feature, does little more than tell us that Win can't spell it conventionally.

115 See earlier discussions of folk etymology in word formation.

116 Historically this confusion is well documented. See Frederick Theodore Visser, A Historical Syntax of the English Language (Leyden: Brill, 1936).

117 We may note, for instance, that [n] remains in Vancouver when it stands alone and the stress is on -cou-; but when it is joined with another word (e. g. Vancouver Island) the stress moves to Van- and the palatal [n] becomes a velar [ŋ] by assimilation to the velar [k], becoming thus "Vancouver".

118 Dobson II, pp. 952-3.

119 Jespersen I, p. 357, refers to the satirical purpose of such pronunciations in later novelists' work; Thackeray's ribbing for ribbon (The Newcomes), ruing for ruin and linning for linen (Vanity Fair) and Dickens' orfiging for orphan (David Copperfield).

120 Pyles, p. 177.

121 The essence referred to -- Dr. Hill's essence of dockwater -- was a well-known patent medicine of the eighteenth century. John Hill,

or "Sir John" as he pompously styled himself, was neither a recognized doctor nor a "Sir". Smollett disapproved of Hill as a notorious quack and it is not accident that his name should be coupled with dung and ass in something written by Dr. Smollett.

122 Many of our silent letter words (e. g. lamb, womb, comb, damn, solemn) lost their final sounds by assimilation to the preceding consonant in the simplification of pronunciation.

123 Loss of [p] after [m] (temptation, consumption) and loss of [b] after [m] (dumbness).

124 See Dobson II, pp. 960-5 for discussion and examples.

125 Dobson II, p. 962.

126 Smollett combines a malapropism with the assimilation. He has Tabitha write partected (45) elsewhere, and in so doing focuses on the metathesis of [r] instead of the malapropism.

127 The vulgarity of Win's speech is underscored by the fact that a variant, acceptable eighteenth century pronunciation for perfect was perfet, omitting not the [t] but the [k]. Tuite's Oxford Spelling Book, p. 49 notes "C is lost in verdict, indictment, perfect, victuals, etc." This is, of course, based on the original pronunciation as the word was borrowed from the French cf. Chaucer's "parfit". The c was later restored from the Latin form.

128 See earlier discussion of <nubjack> under word misdivision.

129 Dobson II, p. 962.

130 Dobson II, p. 969. While [d] is not normally lost after [r], it is often lost after the other liquid, [l] (e. g. wile for wild, chile for child, shiel for shield). After [r] however, quite the reverse is likely to happen with [d] being developed (as after [l] and [n] too) to produce such vulgar pronunciations as scholard for scholar. See also Wright, EDG, pp. 234-6 for documentation of excrescent [d], and see Win's examples of excrescent [d] below.

131 Dobson II, p. 965.

132 An environment of [l] or [r] provides exceptions. In dumbness, etc., the same loss occurs as in dumb, but before [l] and [r] (as in bramble, mumble, assembled, resemblance, amber, embrace, encumbrance.) the [b] is normally kept; see Dobson II, pp. 967-8.

133 See also discussion of <Hottogon> under aspiration.

134 This form of brand-new is commonly dialectal (cf. Wright's EDD and Thomas Wright's Provincial Glossary); also of interest is the OED's citation of this use in Gay's Beggar's Opera, II, v, 28.

135 Standard dialect form, EDD. Also, grindstone was commonly pronounced without the [d] in previous centuries. Spelling pronunciation has brought back the full pronunciation in Standard English.

136 Dobson II, p. 1002.

137 Wright EDG, p. 230, notes that "few, if any, dialects have added a t in ancient (Fr. ancien), pheasant (O. Fr. faisan).

138 See Dobson II, pp. 914-5 for explanation of these exceptions.

139 Wright, EDG, p. 219.

140 Dobson II, pp. 979-80.

141 See Wright, EDG, p. 207. <OwI> also involves the interchange of o and w. Smollett is probably interested in the incongruity of the malapropism, but his spelling very likely represents a lengthening of the o and not the low back vowel [ɔ].

142 It is difficult to tell whether Win's spelling reflects the conventional pronunciation with [r]. Although Johnson does not give the short form of pennyworth, it seems to have been commonly pronounced. Tuite's Oxford Spelling Book notes that "Y is lost in pennyworth which is pronounc'd penn'orth" (p. 33) and elsewhere that w is not sounded "when the foregoing syllable does not end in r, as in Ed-ward, Green-wich, back-ward, penny-worth, which is pronounc'd pennorth" (p. 64). Tuite does not suggest that the r is deleted in acceptable pronunciation. See also Wright, EDG p. 211 on the disappearance of medial w in pennyworth and other examples.

143 Intrusive r is also a prominent Cockney feature; see Matthews, CPP, p. 177.

144 Jespersen I, p. 372.

145 Win's pronunciations of <windore> and <fellow> are singled out as vulgar by several "authorities":

Elphinston, Principles of English Grammar, 1787: "febel vocallity [i. e. in the end of a word] haz made Grocenes [i. e. vulgarity] assume r in dhe colloquial idear and windowr, for idea and window."

Enfield, The Speaker, 1790: "Other provincial improprieties . . . the changing of ow into er, or of aw into or, as in fellow, window, the law of the land."

Walker, The Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, 1791: "The vulgar shorten this sound [ow] and pronounce the o obscurely, and sometimes as if followed by r, as winder, feller, for window, and fellow; but this is almost too despicable for notice."



146 Jespersen I, p. 360. For a discussion of the uses of the ar spelling device in the representation of r-less dialects in literature, see Sumner Ives, "A Theory of Literary Dialect," pp. 150-63.

147 Jespersen I, pp. 375-81.

148 Wright, EDG, p. 254.

149 Peter Trudgill, The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974) notes that "in most parts of England and particularly in urban areas, [h] indices are likely to be in direct and straightforward relation to the education and social class of the speaker" although this situation is not true for Norwich today for other reasons connected with an older h-pronouncing area surrounding Norwich. See pp. 83-4.

150 Matthews, CPP, pp. 163-4.

151 Jespersen I, pp. 378-9.

152 Dobson has very little on the loss of [h] beyond the historical loss in initial position before [l], [n], [r], and [w] from the Old English groups hl, hn, hr, and hw. As his study is confined to the period 1500-1700, this is not surprising in light of Jespersen's difficulty in finding evidence.

153 Walker, Preface, p. xiii.

154 Jespersen observes that Elizabethan (and even eighteenth century) authors who represent vulgarisms so frequently, do not seem to use omissions and misspellings of h's as a characteristic of low class speech. Possibly no one pronounced [h], so no one inserted it as a hypercorrection. It would seem that Smollett is an exception, using it in Win's letters; in Clarinda's letter in Roderick Random, and in Deborah Hornbeck's in Peregrine Pickle.

155 Boggs, "A Win Jenkins Lexicon," omits discussion of <hays> (307), but observes for <heys> (306): "a Winism for gaze. In Welsh, under certain circumstances initial g mutates to - (is lost) which would give a resultant aze (ez), a form which, since she often misuses aspiration, she might pronounce heys (hez)." Mr. Boggs is at some pains to make the matter more difficult than it need be. The assumption of aspiration difficulties and the interpretation of the spellings as eyes (rhyming with eyes) seems clear enough. But we are also provided with the exact phrase in Sir Launcelot Greaves, Chapt. I; ". . . But Tom Clarke, who seemed to have cast the eyes of affection upon the landlady's eldest daughter, Dolly, objected."

156 See also <art>, <Apias>, <exhaltations> in context. See also discussion under h spellings of Tabitha's <haired> (274), <Hoyden> (274), <Harse> (274) and <hearth> (78).

157 Matthews, CPP, 226 f. The first of these was the anonymous work, The Writing Scholar's Companion, 1695.

158 Note that he sticks strictly to the spelling; we never have sounded an [h] after [w] but Old English hwaet had its spelling changed to what with no change in the pronunciation of the consonants.

159 Matthews remarks "The Cockney dialogue in eighteenth and nineteenth century novels was conventional. The novelist was content to represent a yokel's dialect by a few odd spellings like wool (will) or Zunday, no matter where he was supposed to come from, and he thought it sufficient to represent a Cockney by misplacing a few h's or by interchanging v and w, consistently or inconsistently. This convention also served to represent general vulgarism. Dickens, for example, uses this "Cockney" dialect as the speech of several country characters, Peggoty for example." CPP, pp. 156-7.

160 Thomas Sheridan, A Course of Lectures on Elocution (1762; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968), provides references to this Cockney interchange which suggest a simplified view.

161 Dobson, II, 948, comments on the use of [v] for [w]: "insofar as it is not merely an inverted spelling, it is due to confusion in speech on the part of Cockneys endeavouring to use the StE [v]." He also notes that the sound-change in the South-east was from [v] to [w] (and this would help to explain the more frequent production of [w] for [v]), while in the North the reverse applied."

162 Vindore was obviously pronounced with a schwa [ə] and not with door/dore ending (i. e. Win's pronunciation would be [vɪndə]). She doesn't pronounce [r] after vowels and doesn't know when to put them in, so she hypercorrects the spelling. This spelling, however, is a common provincial spelling of a word formed on the principles of a "door for wind" -- a kind of folk etymology.

163 Wright, EDG, p. 208.

164 Smollett's life in Scotland, years of living in Bath, and experiences as a ship's surgeon meeting sailors from the south coast may account for his awareness of the forms.

165 Matthews, CPP, p. 174.

166 Walker, Preface, p. xii.

167 Gary Underwood, "Linguistic Realism in Roderick Random," Journal of English and Germanic Philology LXIX (1970), p. 36. Boggs also accepts this and in his article, "Dialectal Ingenuity in Humphry Clinker" [see note 80 above], Boggs is particularly concerned because he feels that Smollett's use of [ɔ] is inconsistent with the interpretation of Win's variants as Welsh phonemic changes -- but only as Boggs himself views them.

168 Matthews, CPP, p. 174.

169 In Lowe's Critical Spelling Book we find the following guide to pronunciation under V: "A pretty vagary (fig-a-ry) Mr. vaughan said so. Wine in the vault. At vaux-hall (fox-hawl) near Lambeth. A vehement north wind." He seems to indicate that the standard pronunciation is devoiced.

170 <Viol> may present a problem for interpretation. Smollett is clearly indicating a different pronunciation while enjoying a malapropism since he normally spelled the word as phial (e. g. Sir Launcelot Greaves, chapt. 10, paragraph 1, ". . . satchel hanging round his neck, and a phial displayed in his right hand.") But the word is spelled vial by Wesley in his Sermons (1747) and by Nugent in The Grand Tour (1756) who agree with the usage of Sheridan and Stephen Jones, who write "vi-el" as correct in their pronunciation guides. Smollett's usual spelling is endorsed by Walker with the pronunciation, "fi-al".

171 See A Provincial Glossary for disgrade, disnated, etc.

172 See Pegge's Anecdotes for discommode, unpossible, etc.

173 This pronunciation is also a feature of the speech of Concordance, the Scottish schoolteacher in Roderick Random; Gary Underwood, "Linguistic Realism in Roderick Random" [see note 167 above] is unfamiliar with the dialect variant, and assumes that it "may be a 'continental' affectation, since he teaches Latin, French, and Italian as well as English."

174 Wright, EDG, pp. 208-9.

175 The analysis of this sound change provides an example of Boggs' typical approach to Smollett's variants; he treats each as if it were a unique example instead of applying a principle, even after he has discovered it, to the variants which have features in common. A brief look at the [f] for [wh] spellings will illustrate.

The meaning of each of the variant words is quite clear from context:

. . . but the got's-fey has sat her on her legs again. --  
You nows got's fey is mother's milk to a Velchvoman. (262)

. . . I was going into a fit of astericks, when this fiff,  
saving your presence, took me by the nose so powerfully that  
I sneezed three times, and found myself wonderfully refreshed  
. . . (220).

. . . Mr. Klinker wa'n't long in his debt -- with a good oaken  
sapling he dusted his doublet, for all his golden cheese-  
toaster; and fipping me under his arm, carried me huom, I nose  
not how, being I was in such a flustration . . . (108-9).

and Tabitha's

. . . I hope, Docter, you will not go to put any more such phims in my brother's head, to the prejudice of my pocket . . . (78).

Boggs, commenting on this spelling states, "fiff. a Winism for whiff. The substitution of f for wh is not characteristic of Welsh speech, but this exchange is found in certain areas of Scotland" and, omitting to list either fey or phims, goes on to list "fipping. A Winism for slipping for which no linguistic explanation has been found for the use of f for sl." It seems a pity that Mr. Boggs should have found the linguistic explanation of the change without perceiving the regularity of the application. Had he done so, the "translation" of fipping (even if he were unfamiliar with the colloquial use of whipping and had neglected to check it) might have occurred to him. See Boggs's article "A Win Jenkins' Lexicon", cited above [note 80].

176 See Dobson II, pp. 947-8 and Wright EDG, pp. 24-, 245.

177 Matthews CPP, p. 184.

178 Pegge, p. 66.

179 Boggs' "Dialectal Ingenuity in Humphry Clinker," p. 330, explains <sillings> as an "archaism peculiar to Welsh or Irish" but does not cite a source. He does not make any comment upon <seeps>, <distinkson>, etc.

180 Wright, EDG, pp. 248-9.

181 Matthews, CPP, p. 184.

182 Wright, EDG, p. 238. Dobson II, p. 948, cites this change as a vulgar pronunciation recognized as such as early as the seventeenth century.

183 Matthews, CPC, p. 188.

184 Matthews, CPP, pp. 162-3; also v for th. He cites specifically the use of oaf as one of the prominent Cockneyisms in Humphry Clinker; see p. 229.

185 Notes that Win also has <Matthewmurphy'd> (337) and <Matthewsullin> (306).

186 Matthew, CPP, p. 177; farthing also appears as <varthing> (43) when Smollett is more interested in interchanging [v] for [f] than in using [ʔ] for [ʃ].

187 A caricature of Lord Bute and Smollett appeared in The North Briton in 1762 with a speech, out of Smollett's mouth, underneath. He is caricatured by his general accent and we find such words as mak (make), geud (good), fra' (from), Hauld (hold), gowden (golden), etc. Thomas Wright's Caricature History of the Georges, p. 273.

188 Wright, EDG, p. 198; also, Wright indicates that the pronunciation of crisis in Aberdeenshire was Creeze.

189 See Pyles for examples, pp. 61 and 176; see Wright, EDG, p. 206, for a discussion of this phenomenon (svarabhakti, from the Sanskrit) as it relates to dialect pronunciation and for examples from a variety of dialects.

190 Peregrine Pickle, p. 214.

191 Matthews, CPP, p. 173.

192 EDD.

193 James O. Halliwell, A Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words (London: n. p., 1901), 5th ed. 2 vols.

194 Jespersen I, pp. 197-9; this pronunciation of sergeant has survived into present English.

195 Wright, EDG, p. 182; Matthews, CPP, p. 181.

196 Jones, p. 24.

197 Nares, pp. 20-1.

198 There was, of course, earlier censure of the ar pronunciation. Coote in 1597 described it as "the barbarous speech of your country people" as noted in Dobson II, pp. 56-62.

199 Walker, p. 13.

200 Jespersen I, p. 198, gives examples from Goldsmith, Byron, and Dickens. Fielding also used it (e. g. desarts in Tom Jones, Book II).

201 This truncated form of universal is a standard dialect word in such phrases as "in the whole varsal world"; EDD.

202 Gill criticized the raising of e to i as a Mopsae or dialectal pronunciation. See P. Wolfe, Linguistic Change and the Great Vowel Shift in English (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1972), pp. 53-4.

203 Dobson II, pp. 567-9; Jespersen I, pp. 64-6 also discusses this.

204 Gordon, p. 290; see also Lucia C. Morgan, "North Carolina Accents," A Various Language, pp. 271-2.

205 Wright, EDG, pp. 54-5.

206 Matthews, CPP, pp. 169-70. He notes evidence for this pronunciation from churchwardens' entries as follows; chistes 1553, erickting 1581, Inquist 1621, Riddy 1630, spicified 1641, pibbles 1683.

207 Henry Fielding, Jonathan Wild (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1853), p. 140.

208 Walker, p. 14.

209 See Matthews, CPP, pp. 169-70. It is of interest that the inverse, e for i, does not appear in Win's letters although it is an equally significant feature of Cockney speech and of dialect; Coote (1597) recorded it as "the barabarous speech of your country people."

210 This is also a feature in many Scots dialects; see Wright, EDG, p. 51.

211 Matthews, CPP, p. 162. He gives several examples of pre-eighteenth century words affected: messe (mass), then (than), Crenmer (Cranmer), gellon (gallon), wex (wax).

212 Walker, p. 12.

213 Wright, EDG, p. 51.

214 Wright, EDG, pp. 140-41.

215 Wright, EDG, pp. 79-80.

216 Wright, EDG, pp. 199-200.

217 Slit appears in Tabitha's command "and let Roger search into, and make a general clearance of the slit holes which the maids have in secret . . ." Slit was [is?] a slang term for the female pudendum and Roger for the male member according to Farmer's Slang and Its Analogues. Slit was also widely understood in the same sense in northern dialects according to Wright's Provincial Glossary.

218 Pegge, p. 70.

219 Wright's EDD lists tawdry as "cheap finery" but two English Dialect Society Publications, A Glossary of Words Used in the Neighbourhood Of Whitby, Vol. IV, and A Glossary of Words Used in Manley and Corringham, Lincolnshire, Vol. VI, give Tom-tawdry, (the whole form as it appears in Humphry Clinker) with the one minor change. The first

glossary gives "Tom Tawdry, a ragged individual, a sloven," and the second gives "Tom-tawdry, vulgar finery." We find tawdry used in this sense in Jery's letter, p. 209, in his description of his valet, Dutton who is wearing "a silk coat . . . with a tawdry waistcoat of tarnished brocade." It also appears in the description of Aurelia Darnel's wedding ensemble in Sir Launcelot Greaves, the final chapter: "The bride, instead of being disguised in tawdry stuffs of gold and silver, and sweating under a harness of diamonds," according to the elegant taste of the times, appeared in a negligee of plain blue sattin, without any other jewels than her eyes."

220 Baume de vie must have been pronounced in Standard English at this time as [ba:m] -- that is, a long unrounded vowel. However, earlier such words had had [ɔ] like talk, bald, etc. -- that is, only before labials had it changed. Before velars and dentals [ɔ] is retained. But we cannot explain a change of [a:] to [ʌ] (at least, not so well). So it seems possible that Win and Tabitha were familiar with and used a rustic archaic pronunciation of [bɔ:m]. Wright records in the English Dialect Dictionary under BALM such pronunciations as indicated by bauɫm (Essex), baum (Cumberland, north Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Hertfordshire), and bawm (Yorkshire, Cheshire, Shropshire).

221 See A. S. Turberville, The House of Lords in the XVIIIth Century (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1927), p. 290; also The Dictionary of National Biography, and The Grenville Correspondence (London: n. p., 1853), Vol. IV, p. 514.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, James. The Pronunciation of the English Language. 1799; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1968.
- Alston, R. C. A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800. Leeds: E. J. Arnold and Son, 1965.
- Anderson, Howard, Philip B. Daghljan and Irvin Ehreppreis. The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century. Lawrence, Kansas: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1966.
- Anonymous. The Irish Spelling Book. 1740; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Bath Guide; or Useful Pocket Companion. Bath: R. Cruttwell, 1780.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Vocabulary of Such Words in the English Language as are of Dubious or Unsettled Pronunciation. 1797; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1967.
- Anstey, Christopher. The New Bath Guide or, Memoirs of the B-R-D Family, 8th ed. London: J. Dodsley, 1772.
- Austen, Jane. Northanger Abbey, Vol. V of The Novels of Jane Austen, 3rd ed. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933.
- Axon, William E. A., ed. English Dialect Words of the Eighteenth Century: as shown in the "Universal Etymological Dictionary" of Nathaniel Bailey. Vol. 41. London: Published for the English Dialect Society, 1883.
- Barbeau, A. Life and Letters at Bath in the XVIIIth Century. London: William Heinemann, 1904.
- Barriere, Albert. A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant. London: the Ballantine Press, 1889.



- Boggs, W. Arthur. "'Birthday Suit' and 'Cheese-Toaster,'" Notes and Queries, n. s. XIII (1966), 465.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dialectal Ingenuity in Humphry Clinker," Papers on English Language and Literature, I (1965), 327-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hassock of Hair," Notes and Queries, n. s. VII (1960), 72-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Smollett's Coinages in the Win Jenkins' Letters," Language Quarterly, II (1963), 2-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Standard Eighteenth-Century English Usages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (1965), 304-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Win Jenkins' Addenda to Mr. Murray's Dictionary," Discourse, IX (1966), 83-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Win Jenkins' Archaisms and Proverbial Phrases," Language Quarterly, IV (1965), 33-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Win Jenkins' Lexicon," Bulletin of the New York Public Library, LXVIII (1964), 323-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Win Jenkins' Malapropisms," The Jammu and Kashmir University Review, IV (1961), 130-40.
- Bouce, Paul-Gabriel. Les Romans de Smollett: Etude Critique. Paris: Didier, 1971.
- Brewer, Ebenezer Cobham. The Reader's Handbook of Allusions, References, Plots. London: Chatto and Windus, 1895.
- Brook, G. L. English Dialects. London: Andre Deutsch, 1963.
- Bruce, Donald. Radical Doctor Smollett. London: Victor Gollancz, 1964.
- Chambers, R. W. and Marjorie Daunt. A Book of London English 1384-1425. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931.
- Coles, Elisha. The Compleat English Schoolmaster. 1674; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1969.
- Cunnington, C. Willett, Phillis Cunnington and Charles Beard. A Dictionary of English Costume. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Cunnington, Phillis and Catherine Lucas. Occupational Costume in England, From the 11th Century. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967.
- Dalrymple, Hugh. "Rodondo, or the State Jugglers," 1761; rpt. in A Collection of Scarce, Curious and Valuable Pieces Both in Verse and Prose. Edinburgh: Walter Riddiman, 1773.

- Davies, Constance. English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1934.
- Dawson, Lawrence Hawkins. A Dictionary of Nicknames and Pseudonyms. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1909.
- Dobson, E. J. English Pronunciation 1500-1700. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Duncan, Jeffrey L. "The Rural Ideal in Eighteenth-Century Fiction," Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, Vol. VIII (1968), 517-35.
- Elphinston, James. A Minniature Ov English Orthogography. 1795; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1967.
- Evans, David L. "Humphry Clinker: Smollett's Tempered Augustanism," Criticism, Vol. IX (1967), 257-74.
- Everitt, Graham. Doctors and Doctors: Some Curious Chapters in Medical History and Quackery. London: Swann, Sonnenschein Lowrey and Co., 1888.
- Farmer, John S. Slang and Its Analogues: Past and Present. 7 vols. London: Printed For Subscribers Only, 1890.
- Fielding, Henry. The History of the Life of the Late Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1853.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling. New York: The Modern Library, 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Joseph Andrews. Ed. Martin C. Battestin. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1967.
- Franklyn, Julian. The Cockney: A Survey of London Life and Language. London: Andre Deutsch, 1953.
- Freeman, William. A Concise Dictionary of English Slang. London: English Universities Press, 1955.
- Gadd, David. Georgian Summer: Bath in the Eighteenth Century. Bath: Adams and Dart, 1971.
- Geeson, Cecil. A Northumberland and Durham Word Book: The Living Dialect. Newcastle upon Tyne: Harold Hill, 1969.
- Gleason, H. A. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956.
- Gordon, James D. The English Language: An Historical Introduction. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972.

- Grose, Francis. A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue. London: S. Hooper, 1785.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Olio: being a collection of essays, dialogues, letters, biographical sketches, anecdotes, pieces of poetry, parodies, bon mots, epigrams, epitaphs, &c. chiefly original, 2nd ed. London: Hooper and Wigstead, 1796.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Provincial Glossary. 1787; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968.
- Halliwell, James Orchard. A Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words. London: J. R. Smith, 1847.
- Hannay, David. The Life of Tobias George Smollett. London: Walter Scott, 1887.
- Haugen, Einar. "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," Language, 26 (1950), 210-31.
- Hibbert, Christopher. The Grand Tour. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.
- Holmberg, Börje. James Douglas on English Pronunciation C. 1740. Lund Studies in English XXVI (1956), 1-354. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. On the Concept of Standard English and The History of Modern English Pronunciation. Lund: ~~C.W.K.~~ Gleerup, 1964.
- [Hotten, John Camden.] A Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant and Vulgar Words, 2nd ed. London: J. C. Hotten, 1860.
- Ives, Sumner. "A Theory of Literary Dialect," A Various Language. Eds. Juanita V. Williamson and Virginia M. Burke. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
- Jespersen, Otto. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. 7 vols. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1961.
- Jones, Daniel. An English Pronouncing Dictionary. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1956.
- Jones, John. Practical Phonography. 1701; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1969.
- Jones, Stephen. A Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language. 1796; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1969.
- Kahr1, George M. Tobias Smollett: Traveller-Novelist. New York: Octagon Books Inc., 1968.

- Kenrick, William. A New Dictionary of the English Language. London: J. Dodsley, 1773. Microprint.
- Knapp, Lewis Mansfield. Tobias Smollett: Doctor of Men and Manners. New York: Russell and Russell, 1953.
- Kokeritz, Helge. "English Pronunciation as Described in Shorthand Systems of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," Studia Neophilologica, VII (1935), 73-146.
- Korte, Donald M. An Annotated Bibliography of Smollett Scholarship 1946-68. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Latham, Edward. A Dictionary of Names, Nicknames and Surnames of Persons, Places and Things. London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1904.
- L'Estrange, A. G. L. A History of English Humour. 1878; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- Lowe, Soloman. The Critical Spelling Book. 1755; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1967.
- McIntosh, Angus. An Introductory Survey of Scottish Dialects. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1952.
- MacLeish, Andrew. A Glossary of Grammar and Linguistics. New York: Grosset and Dunlap Inc., 1971.
- Machyn, Henry. The Diary of Henry Machyn. Ed. J. G. Nichols. London: The Camden Society, 1848.
- Mackay, Charles. Lost Beauties of the English Language. London: Chatto and Windus [no date].
- Matthews, William. Cockney Past and Present: A Short History of the Dialect of London. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "English Pronunciations and Shorthand in the Early Modern Period," Univ. of California Publications in English, IX (1943), 133-214.
- Mead, William Edward. The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1914.
- Melville, Lewis. The Life and Letters of Tobias Smollett. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1926.
- Morgan, Lucia C. "North Carolina Accents," A Various Language. Eds. Juanita V. Williamson and Virginia M. Burke. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

- Morris-Jones, John. An Elementary Welsh Grammar. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Welsh Grammar, Historical and Comparative: Phonology and Accidence. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Mosse, Fernand. A Handbook of Middle English. Translated by James A. Walker. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1952.
- Nares, Robert. Elements of Orthoepy. 1784; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968.
- Nelson, Francis W. "Some Dialectal Verb Forms in England," Orbis, 10 (1961), 1-14.
- Noyes, Edward S. The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M.D. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1926.
- Orton, Harold. The Phonology of a South Durham Dialect. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, 1933.
- Orton, Harold and Wilfred J. Halliday. A Survey of English Dialects. 8 vols. Leeds: Leeds Univ. Press, 1962.
- Osselton, N. E. "Formal and Informal Spelling in the Eighteenth Century: error, honour, and related words," English Studies, 44 (1963), 267-75.
- Page, Norman. Speech in the English Novel. London: Longman Group, 1973.
- Partridge, Eric. A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional Usage. 1937; rpt. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Slang Today and Yesterday, 2nd ed. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1935.
- Peacock, Edward. A Glossary of Words Used in the Wapentakes of Manley and Corringham, Lincolnshire. Vol. VI. London: English Dialect Society Publications, 1876.
- Pegge, Samuel. Anecdotes of the English Language: Chiefly Regarding the Local Dialect of London and Its Environs. London: J. Nichols, 1814.
- Planche, James Robinson. Cyclopedia of Costume. London: Chatto and Windus, 1876.
- Price, John Vladimir. Tobias Smollett: The Expedition of Humphry Clinker. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

- Price, Martin. To the Palace of Wisdom: Studies in order and energy from Dryden to Blake. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1965.
- Pyles, Thomas. The Origins and Development of the English Language. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1964.
- Ray, John. A Collection of English Words. 1691; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1969.
- Robinson, Francis Kildale. A Glossary of Words Used in the Neighbourhood of Whitby. Vol. IV. London: English Dialect Society Publications, 1873.
- Rudd, Sayer. Prodomos: or Observations on the English Letters. 1755; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1967.
- Shakespeare, William. King Henry V. Ed. J. H. Walter. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1961.
- Sheldon, Esther K. "Pronouncing Systems in Eighteenth Century Dictionaries," Language, 22 (1946), 27-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Standards of English Pronunciation according to the Grammarians and Orthoepists of the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries (Manuscript Thesis, 1938). University of Wisconsin Library. [Cited by Börje Holmberg in On the Concept of Standard English and the History of Modern English Pronunciation. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964.]
- Sheridan, Thomas. A Course of Lectures on Elocution. 1762; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Elements of English. 1786; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A General Dictionary of the English Language. 2 vols. London: J. Dodsley, 1780.
- Sivertsen, Eva. Cockney Phonology. New York: Humanities Press, 1960.
- Skeat, Walter W. English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day. 1896; rpt. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965.
- Smith, W. J., ed. The Grenville Papers. 4 vols. London: [no publisher], 1852-3.
- Smith, William. An Attempt To Render the Pronunciation of the English Language More Easy. 1795; rpt. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1969.
- Smollett, Tobias. The Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom. Ed. with an introduction by Damian Grant. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle. Edited with an introduction by James L. Clifford. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Expedition of Humphry Clinker. Edited with an introduction by Lewis M. Knapp. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life and Adventures of Sir Launcelot Greaves. Edited with an introduction by David Evans. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973.
- Spector, Robert Donald. Tobias George Smollett. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968.
- Sundby, Bertil, ed. Christopher Cooper's English Teacher (1687). Lund Studies in English XXII (1953), 1-120b. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1953.
- Tompkins, J. M. S. The Popular Novel in England 1770-1800. London: Methuen and Co., 1932.
- Trudgill, Peter. The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sociolinguistics: An Introduction. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Tucker, Susie I. Protean Shape: A Study in Eighteenth Century Vocabulary and Usage. London: Athlone Press, 1967.
- Tuite, Thomas. The Oxford Spelling Book. 1726; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1967.
- Turberville, A. S. The House of Lords in the XVIIIth Century. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1927.
- Underwood, Gary. "Linguistic Realism in Roderick Random," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LXIX (1970), 32-40.
- Urban, Sylvanus, ed. The Gentleman's Magazine: and Historical Chronicle. London, 1771.
- Visser, Frederick Theodore. A Historical Syntax of the English Language. Leyden: Brill, 1936.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the English Novel. 1943; rpt. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Walker, John. A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary. 1791; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968.

- Warrack, Alexander and William Grant. A Scots Dialect Dictionary.  
Edinburgh: [no publisher], 1911.
- Watson, George, ed. The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature,  
II. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971.
- Williamson, Juanita V. and Virginia M. Burke, eds. A Various Language:  
Perspectives on American Dialects. New York: Holt, Rinehart  
and Winston, 1971.
- Wolfe, Patricia M. Linguistic Change and the Great Vowel Shift in  
English. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1972.
- Wrenn, C. L. Word and Symbol: Studies in English Language. London:  
Longmans Green and Co., 1967.
- Wright, Joseph. The English Dialect Dictionary. 6 vols. 1898; rpt.  
New York: Hacker Art Books, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The English Dialect Grammar. Oxford: Henry Frowde, 1905.
- Wright, Thomas. A Caricature History of the Georges. London: John  
Camden Hotten, 1868.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English. 2 vols.  
London: George Bell and Sons, 1893.
- Wyld, Henry C. A History of Modern Colloquial English. London:  
T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1920.
- Zachrisson, R. E. "Four Hundred Years of English Spelling Reform,"  
Studia Neophilologica, IV (1931-2), 1-70.