Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

David Fojtík

Spelling pronunciation („výslovnost dle pravopisu") v rané moderní a současné angličtině

Spelling Pronunciation in Early Modern and Present-Day English

Poděkování

Čestné prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V **Praze d**ne **29. května 2017**   podpis**:**

Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce ke studijním účelům. I have no objections to the BA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.

Abstract

English

This paper deals with spelling pronunciation, a term coined by Emil Koeppel in 1901. Scholarly discussions provide several implications. Firstly, it is the relationship between phonemes and their graphic representation. In English, the phoneme-grapheme relations are in disbalance. This applies especially to vowels but also to several consonants, where digraphs, for example, are mostly ambiguous and very dependent on surroundings. A typical example of the poor grapheme-phoneme relations is represented by <ch>, which can be either [ʃ], or [tʃ], or even [k]. At the same time, spelling pronunciation is also regarded as a process of language change and it is believed that spelling pronunciation is also governed by analogy. It is generally believed by scholars that spelling pronunciation is more likely to occur in unusual structures or in words which have weaker 'oral tradition'. From the historical perspective, spelling pronunciation is very related to etymological respellings. One of the main premises is that spelling pronunciation is rooted in the notion that pronunciation should reflect spelling, which was most likely introduced and induced by 18th century orthoepists and standardisation of English spelling. Although much has been written about spelling pronunciation and its relations, no paper so far has dealt with spelling pronunciation to sufficient breadth. Aim of this paper is to provide a broader insight into the context of spelling pronunciation and to test the notion that spelling pronunciation is a return to earlier forms of pronunciation.

Czech

Tato práce se zabývá tématem spelling pronunciation, tedy výslovností podle pravopisu, termínu zavedeného Emilem Koeppelem v roce 1901. Mezi lingvisty panuje několik základních premis. Za prvé se jedná o vztah mezi fonémem a jeho grafickou reprezentací, která je v angličtině poněkud problematická. Toto se týká především samohlásek, avšak i mnohých konsonant, které mohou mít mnohdy více realizací, jako například digraf <ch>, který může mít realizaci [ʃ], [tʃ], nebo [k]. Zároveň panuje domněnka, že spelling pronunciation je procesem řízeným principem analogie. Rovněž se má za to, že spelling pronunciation se mnohem pravděpodobněji vyskytuje v méně obvyklých a méně častých slovních strukturách, nebo ve slovech, která mají menší „orální tradici". Z historického hlediska pak spelling pronunciation souvisí velmi úzce s etymologickými přepisy. Jedna z hlavních premis je, že výslovnost podle pravopisu má své kořeny v obecně panujícím

přesvědčení, že „správná" výslovnost se má co nejblíže podobat psanému jazyku, což je s největší pravděpodobností dílem ortoepistů z 18. století a výsledek standardizace anglického psaného jazyka. Ačkoliv se o spelling pronunciation ví poměrně mnoho, žádná vědecká stať z dostupných zdrojů se doposud nezabývala jevem do dostačující hloubky. Cílem této práce je probádat spelling pronunciation a kontextu jevu a dále prověřit tvrzení, že výslovnost dle pravopisu je návratem k dřívějším formám.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations

EModE	Early Modern English
ME	Middle English
NAmE	North American English
OED	Oxford English Dictionary

List of tables:

1. INTRODUCTION

Spelling pronunciation is a relatively new term with its history emerging from the year 1901, when it was first introduced by Emil Koeppel in his treatise *Spelling Pronunciation*. Although it cannot be said that the topic has not been given any attention, it must be marked that the resources provided are rather scanty and it is mostly only through brief mentions that we hear about the existence of spelling pronunciation. So far, scholars like Charles Barber, Joan C. Beal, Philip A. Shaw, and many others mentioned in this paper have dealt with the matter to a certain extent, but their mentioning of this topic is mostly superficial and not broad enough. Outside these rather scarce resources stands only one treatise from Andrew Kerek, providing probably the first broader analysis and summary of data known about spelling pronunciation so far.

The lack of a broader definition of this phenomenon and of a sufficiently broader analysis (except for Kerek's treatise) of this matter with relation to English represents a certain gap in the field of English language studies and it is the aim of this paper to provide a summary of all currently available resources in order to provide some form of foundations for further linguistic discussion.

While some scholars, including Kerek and Josef Vachek, claim that spelling pronunciation, in many instances, returns pronunciation back to 'original' forms previously governed by the phonological principle (Kerek 1976, Vachek 2014), it is more likely that many spelling pronunciations were introduced rather by accommodating one's pronunciation to spelling due to respellings and standardisation, which can be partially proven by the substantial number of respelled words which are spelling-pronounced. This is the hypothesis upon which this paper builds.

The first part of the discussion is a definition of the term and summary of theoretical background of spelling pronunciation. The second part is methodological chapter which also discusses potential problems and problematic areas. The third chapter provides a presentation and analysis of the results of research, and the fourth part is an overall summary and conclusion.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF SPELLING PRONUNCIATION

2.1. Definition of terms

2.1.1. General overview:

To begin with, it is important to define what the term "spelling pronunciation" implies. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary,* the term "spelling pronunciation" refers to "the pronunciation of a word according to its written form" (OED). Similarly, Matthews's *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics* defines spelling pronunciation as a pronunciation "either derived from, or influenced by spelling" (Matthews 1997). According to this definition, however, pronunciation of monosyllabic words like *pit*, *kit*, *wit*, etc. would be automatically spelling pronunciations, but as it turns out, based on other scholars' notes, spelling pronunciation is the change in the original, conventional, or historic pronunciation of a word, which happens to be based on the written form of the particular word: "[spelling pronunciation is] a change in the traditional pronunciation of a word brought about by its spelling." (Millward, Hayes 2012: 451).

The definition provided by Millward and Hayes is shared by Pyles and Algeo, Barber et al. 2012 as well as Scragg, Görlach, and many other scholars including Kerek. Brinton and Arnovick, incidentally, in *The English Language, A Linguistic History*, classified spelling pronunciation as one of mechanisms of language change (Brinton & Arnovick c2011). Hogg and Denison as well as Kerek and Vachek further state that spelling pronunciation often involves the return of previously changed or lost forms (Hogg & Denisson 2008, Kerek 1976, Vachek 2014).

However, it is crucial to note, that although spelling pronunciation reflects the spelling, it is important to delineate that spelling pronunciation and alphabetic principle are two separate phenomena, even though spelling pronunciation may lead towards the alphabetic principle. The main difference is in the application of phonological rules. While the alphabetic principle implies some form of 1:1 (ideally) ratio of phoneme - symbol relations, as in *pit, kit, sit, lit*, spelling pronunciation is rather a mid-step between a form which reflects the spelling only remotely, and a form which is closer to alphabetic principle. As Kerek comments,

spelling pronunciations would be optimal (and hence uninteresting) in a language with a phonetic alphabet for an orthography, for in such a system the correspondence between symbol and sound is by definition one-to-one, and therefore every phonetic event would be a case of spelling pronunciation (Kerek 1976, 334)

A typical example of spelling pronunciation would be pronunciation of *waistcoat*, for example, which has a variant /ˈwɛskət/ (Strictly NAmE) (OED). The form /ˈweɪstkəʊt/ is spelling pronunciation (Algeo & Pyles c2010, 46), however, it is not fully alphabetical. In fact, due to rather uneven distribution of English vowels and their graphic representations, where pronunciation of vowels is often dependent on surrounding phonemes, alphabetical principle is more the ideal than reality in English (further developed in 2.2.1.). In short, spelling pronunciation involves the alphabetic principle in many instances, but in other 'phonological principle' is applied. By phonological principle we mean phonological encoding based on syllables rather than individual letters (see more in 2.2.1.) (Meyer & Wheedon 2006).

Furthermore, we can observe several processes which either motivate or are in play. For instance, we know that much of spelling pronunciation has been introduced during the Modern English period as a result of etymological respellings (see further in 2.2.3.) and standardisation (see 2.2.2.). This is concomitant with the element of 'foreignness' mentioned by Einar Haugen (Haugen 1950) – pronunciation of some words was introduced by written borrowing whose 'original' form may have been known to very little and hence the spelling pronunciation became the preferred one.

2.2. Spelling pronunciation and its contexts

2.2.1. Spelling-sound relations

One element of spelling pronunciation that explains its occurrence is the fact that there is a disproportion between the number of phonemes in English and their graphic representations. As Lehmann comments, spelling pronunciations "occur by phonemes rather than by allophones" (Lehmann, in Kerek 1976). Consequently, Kenyon asserts that "[i]f our ordinary spelling were an accurate and consistent picture of our pronunciation, then spelling would not modify it, and the usual pronunciation of any new word could be learned from its spelling." (Kenyon 1929, 418). Written language, as Trnka describes, turns out to be quite ineffective in its representation of all existent phonemes: "Generally

speaking, every written language is much poorer in terms of availability of means, visual signifiers, than spoken language" (Trnka 2014, 58). We can assume two basic principles asserted by orthographic systems:

> 1) orthography should reflect and denote all phonemes and distinctive features of language; 2) orthography should be as simple as possible: one phoneme or one distinctive feature should be represented by one graphic means, and the vice versa, a particular signifier should represent only one phoneme or one distinctive feature. (Trnka 2014, 58)

No language that uses Latin as their primary graphic representation of phonemes fully reflects these principles of ideal orthography (including even the most phonetic-principle based languages like Czech) (Trnka 2014, 58). Instead, what mostly happens is that a phoneme is represented by a combination, or in some instances a group of letters, such as di- or trigraphs (Trnka 2014, 58). The problem could be deepened by allophones, for which there are very few or zero graphic representations in many languages, including English. This explains why English pronunciation may often be confusing when it comes to reading it aloud, for example, or when learning to read, even for native speakers (Stubbs 1980, 160-165).

> "[English spelling], although highly organized, is, it must be admitted, highly abstract and complex, and some of its features are almost certainly beyond the linguistic competence of young children." (Stubbs 1980, 160-161)

On the other hand,

> [i]t is inadequate to regard [English and its spelling-sound relations] simply as illogical or out of date. Often such views result from trying to see English spelling solely in terms of letter-phoneme correspondences. It is based on more abstract relations between orthographic symbols and morphemes. (Stubbs 1980, 160-161)

Similarly, also Kerek mentions the problematic relationship between spelling and pronunciation, summarising also the secondary effect of the instability – pronunciation respelling: "Spelling pronunciation is one side of the relation between orthographic form

and phonetic form […], or 'eye-dialect'[1], a relation motivated by the tendency in language toward iconicity, i.e., isomorphism between letter and sound." (Kerek 1976, 323)

Notwithstanding, there have been attempts to somehow redress the imbalance, mainly via suggested respellings, but these usually either did not get accepted, or were simply ignored (Millward & Hayes 2012). Among those responsible for these suggestions, were John Cheke, John Hart with his proposal for the disposal of *y*, and *w*, or William Bullokar with his suggestion to introduce diacritics. None of these succeeded except for the already established diacritics or specific symbols used in some French loanwords, such as *fête* or *façade*. Another suggestion was by Sir Thomas Smith who urged for the return of pictographic spelling and the (re)introduction of Futhorc and Greek symbols; but one of the more down-to-earth suggestions was made by Richard Mulcaster who "was ahead of his time in recognizing the inevitability of sound changes" and who preferred to "rely chiefly on current usage" and realised that "the relationship between speech sound and written symbol is arbitrary" (Millward & Hayes 2012, 229). Among all, Mulcaster's approach proved to be the most feasible as he "would even have accepted highly irregular spellings if they were already widely used and familiar" and his reform was therefore not as "sweeping", as those introduced by his contemporaries (Millward 2012, 229). These attempts, however, did not have significant impact. Mainly because if similar reforms had been accepted, it would have caused a collapse of the entire system:

> Ever since the advent of printing, there have been practical arguments against graphic reform[s advocated by Bullokar, etc.]. The introduction of a revised spelling would entail a great deal of relearning by millions of literate adults, would necessitate a complete revision of dictionaries, and would mean that earlier classic of English literature would be rendered inaccessible to current and future generations. If new letter forms were introduced for the miserably represented vowel system of English, then all existing keyboards and fonts would immediately become obsolete. Agreement on whose pronunciation the revised spelling should be based upon would probably be impossible to achieve. Still another factor acting against graphic reform is the fact that the written language is, to a much greater degree than the spoken language, under the control of the highly educated or well-to-do, the most conservative groups in a culture. (Millward & Hayes 2012, 16).

---

[1] (i.e. style of graphic representation of spoken pronunciation, marked by respelling of words, e.g. *kidz* as a graphic representation of the word *kids*, marking the voiced allophone)

What Millward and Hayes demonstrate is how spoken language was very much dependent on written language already during Early Modern period. The excerpt further mentions "miserably represented vowel system of English". This is very much reflected in spelling pronunciation, as vowels are often quite sensitive to spelling and they are very prone to undergo shifting in favour of the spelling, usually via analogy (for further development see analytical chapter).

2.2.2. Linguistic ideologies and hypercorrection

Barber, Beal and Shaw comment on the "commonly held belief" that the written form should be the primary source for pronunciation (Barber et al. 2012; Stubbs 1980). Dr. Samuel Johnson himself declared that "[i]n pronunciation, the best general rule is to consider those as the most elegant speakers who deviate least from the written word" (Johnson in Kerek 1976, 330). This is vastly important, as it is, arguably, one of the several potential triggers for spelling pronunciation, because, logically, if one should "[believe] that written language is primary, then not only does the written language have more prestige (this follows immediately), but also written language then comes to have demonstrable effects on spoken language." (Stubbs 1980, 32). Stubbs's notion that written language affects the spoken is well reflected in the effect of etymological respelling on pronunciation (further developed in analytical chapter). Görlach further comments that

> [t]he tendency towards spelling pronunciation is obviously a consequence of many more people becoming literate, who regarded written English as the proper norm, adapting the sounds to the letters where the two diverged - an opinion sanctioned by the authority of Johnson and Murray. (Görlach 1991, 13)

Stubbs comments on this as well, while partially reflecting upon the element of rather poorly redressed correspondence between spoken and written language:

> Confusion between written and spoken language is widespread. It is evident in commonly heard statements such as: What does this letter/word say? Doubt has a silent b. What does it say in the papers? He drops letters off the ends of words like huntin' and shootin'. English is not a phonetic language. English is an alphabetic language. (Stubbs 1980, 22)

The belief, according to him, is caused by a "strongly institutionalised standard of spellings" where until then, spelling was much more sensitive (then later) to pronunciations (Stubbs, 31). Scragg, and Görlach, furthermore, comment that English orthoepists and grammarians had a reasonable force in 'imposing' the standard forms in Late Modern England and so it is quite expectable that England's primary language will be very likely the written form (Görlach 1991, Scragg 1974). Millward happens to support such claim by explaining one of the potential causes of the belief – that the written form is the only form of preservation of language:

> Not only are graphic systems themselves resistant to change, but combined with a high level of literacy, they act as a brake on change in the spoken language and, occasionally, even reverse changes that have occurred in it. The reintroduction of postvocalic /r/ in some American English dialects would have been impossible without the written language, because speakers would not have known where to put the /r/ without a written model. [...] Hundreds of lexical items survive only because they have been preserved in the written language; examples include not only nouns naming obsolete objects such as *firkin* – an Old English unit of volume used to measure a fourth of a barrel or beer or ale – but even structural words like the conjunction lest. (Millward & Hayes 2012, 16)

The spelling tradition alongside with its 'preserving' nature gave foundation to a form of prestige of the written form. With prestige, however, arises the use of hypercorrection, which is "closely related to those 'spelling pronunciations' which become frequent when there is much reading of a language whose spelling is not accurately phonetic." (Jespersen in OED). However, hypercorrections often bring counterproductive results illustrated by rather paradoxical formations and the restructuring of already generally accepted spoken forms. The paradoxical results gave way to the notion that spelling pronunciation is a result of unnecessary pedantic hypercorrection:

> It has been alluded to by pejorative terms such as 'pedantic', 'grotesque', a form of 'schoolmastering' and of a 'pseudo-cultured or hyperurban style' of 'overcorrection', 'hypercorrection', and a 'simple garden-variety blunder'. [spelling pronunciations are also deemed to] "go above and beyond the standards of normal linguistic decency", for they are a "conspicuously aggressive" and "intimidating form of snobbery [which] few people feel prepared to withstand." (Kerek 1976 324).

The "snobbery" which Kerek cites is related to the general view that spelling pronunciations are the result of hypercorrection, often implying that such is also partially

an indicator of lower degree of linguistic awareness. Stubbs argues, however, that spelling pronunciation should be accepted as a mere fact rather than considered a defect in one's pronunciation:

> One might argue that a speaker who produces spelling pronunciations [...] has misunderstood the relation between spoken and written language. On the other hand, one cannot ignore the fact that spelling pronunciations do occur, and are therefore sociolinguistic facts which have to be taken into account. One might therefore argue, on the contrary, that it is the linguist who believes that spelling pronunciations should not occur who has misunderstood the relation between spoken and written language. It is the linguist's job to describe what speakers do, and not the speaker's job to conform to linguists' expectations. (Stubbs 1980, 32)

On the other hand, the 'superiority' of written language which Stubbs, Millward and Algeo & Pyles mention is very relative, as there are instances of strong 'oral traditions', where spelling pronunciation is less likely to occur (Kerek, 1976). By the 'strong oral tradition', Kerek means spoken forms which have been in use for long enough to become notorious and known by certain group of speakers. For example, some local place names may have strong oral tradition, like *Gloucester*, for example. On the other hand, place names like *Feversham* may not be known by all and hence the word has now also spelling pronunciation with <sh> read as [ʃ]. Consequently, spelling pronunciation is also more likely to occur there where the change in pronunciation is more desired, i.e. it does not jeopardise transparency, and/or serves the principle of clarity.

There are, furthermore, words of either unique use (they are used very rarely or in highly specific contexts), or words with local forms, like place names. At the same time, furthermore, Stubbs also comments that the 'visual form' "lives a life of its own, becomes partly independent of speech and [it is] then often writing which influences speech, rather than the reverse", despite the notion that "[w]riting is parasitic upon speech in that it is simply a way of recording the spoken language in an enduring, visual form." (Stubbs 1980, 23).

2.2.3. Etymological respellings and folk etymologies

Another cause of spelling pronunciations, or rather another explanation for the phenomenon's existence are etymological respellings (discussed deeper in analytical section). Before standardisation, English lexis is marked with massive lexical copiousness,

mainly via borrowing from both French and Latin which gave way to duplicates like *vaute/volutum*, *faucon/falcón*. The confusion provided substantial space for folk etymologies and etymological respellings which then, it is generally understood, led to spelling pronunciations (Millward & Hayes 2012). The problem is, however, that many words kept their 'original', i.e. medieval forms despite the respellings, hence the silent [l] in *vault, falcon*, etc. was legitimate, as it reflected its previous form, and the latter introduction of this phoneme was then spelling-induced. There are even instances where the introduction of a new letter was unetymological (Kerek 1976, 332).

> "changes in distribution of individual consonant phonemes occurred, some systemic, some only sporadic. Most of the systemic changes involved loss of consonants in particular environments, or occasionally, the substitution of one consonant for another. The sporadic changes involved either substitution or spelling pronunciations (or both). (Millward 1999, 17).

Hogg and Denison also mention this, with reference to the 'inkhorn controversy' which gave way to massive influx of borrowings, often even in instances where such was rather unnecessary (Millward & Hayes 2012; Hogg & Denisson 2008). The duplicity of many borrowings then gave foundation to etymologising movement which then caused spelling pronunciation of many words which underwent respelling as in the example of *fault* and *vault* (Hogg & Denisson 2008) (See more in the analytical chapter). On the other hand, in instances like *salmon*, which has apparently 'strong oral tradition', the [l] remains silent (Jespersen 1961) (see more in4.3.4.1 and in 2.2.3).

2.2.4. Principles of operation
2.2.4.1. Spelling pronunciation – analogy?

Another principle element of spelling pronunciation is analogy. As summarised by Kerek, spelling pronunciation "is a form of analogy, and as such it has a regularizing effect on spelling-sound correspondence" (Kerek 1976, 323). There are, however, more coinciding factors which are in play, for the analogy is partially triggered by the often not fully correspondent relationship between the spoken and the written language, and by the generally held belief that the written language must be reflected in pronunciation (further developed in the following entry). The 'poor graphic representation of phonemes', as defined by Trnka, provides space for minimally two possible spoken interpretations of one word, often one being more distant to the original spelling, as in *weskit*, and the other

reflecting the spelling, as in /ˈweɪs(t)kəʊt/ (OED). Such generally occurs "in the absence of a strong oral tradition for a word" (Kerek 1976, 323).

2.2.4.2. The necessity of audible perception

One of the logical implications for spelling pronunciation rests in the necessity for the speaker to be somehow aware of the standard, and/or generally accepted pronunciation of the given word (Algeo & Pyles c2010). If a person was not exposed to the conventional pronunciation, he or she will be left with one sole clue – spelling (Algeo & Pyles c2010; Barber et al. 2012). Skeat comments: "I hold firmly to the belief […] that no one can tell how to pronounce an English word unless he has at some time or other heard it" (Skeat in Algeo & Pyles c2010, 46). Algeo & Pyles expand that "Words that we have never heard spoken we must necessarily pronounce as their spellings seem to indicate, assuming that there is no dictionary handy." (Algeo & Pyles, 1982). This applies also to proper names and place names which may have more than one pronunciation, one being 'local', known by the insiders, and the other one being 'universally' transparent thanks to its spelling-aligned form. "Theobald Street", Algeo & Pyles mention, originally had been /tibald/, but this has gained a spelling pronunciation variant /θɪəʊbɑld/ (Algeo, Pyles 1982). The spelling of the name and its pronunciation is again competition between two forms, as the name is also recorded with ME spelling *Tibald* and *Tebald* (behindthename.com).

2.3. A brief survey of important historical resources and references

The following entry enumerates orthoepists whose works are either directly or at least partially concerned with spelling pronunciation. Among the valuable resources are treatises by John Walker, an 18th century orthoepist and elocutionist. He wrote one of the first treatises on English spoken language and is particularly important for his treatises on pronunciation (Millward, Scragg). His viewpoint, however influenced by the prescriptive notion of 'proper language', provides an accurate map of the contemporary situation. For it is probably thanks to Walker, for example, that words with <oi> are pronounced phonetically, i.e. with the diphthong [oi] (see more in chapter 4).

Charles Hall Grandgent, a 19-20th century scholar, mentions Nathaniel Bailey, who wrote *Introduction to the English Tongue*, D. Fenning, who wrote *A New Grammar of the English Language*, R. Nares and his *Elements of Orthoepy* and James Gough's *Practical Grammar of*

the English Tongue (Grandgent 1899). These works provide some notion upon how the language was viewed, but Grandgent provides yet another source, whose work provides further view on how some words were pronounced in the earlier stages of Modern English, Thomas Tuite, who wrote *The Oxford Spelling-Book* (published 1726) (Grandgent 1899). It reveals, for example, that some words dropped the approximant *w*, as was the case of *awkward*, *athwart*, *boatswain*, etc., which were pronounced, as Grandgent informs, as *aukard*, *athart*, *bosen* (Tuite in Grandgent 1899). In these terms, it can be thus said that pronunciation of *w* is, to a certain extent, also a result of spelling-pronunciation tendency.

A few names are also commented upon by Walker in the preface to his treatise on English pronunciation. Among these belong Dr. Samuel Johnson whose contribution was not only to the field of literary studies, but also by publication of his *A Dictionary of the English Language* (Millward c1996, Scragg 1974,). Johnson is further another important resource for the diachronic studies of English, particularly for his lexicographic efforts, but he is also partially relevant to the topic of spelling pronunciation, as he was one of the first to promote the desirability to respect the reflecting of spelling when pronouncing. An equally important name was also Dr. Lowth, whose importance is marked with one of the first publications on English grammar – *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. Both Johnson and Lowth, as Walker remarks, did not deal as much with pronunciation, however. Notwithstanding, the existence of many spelling-pronunciation treatises would have been made much more difficult without their publications. The first to have dealt with pronunciation and thus to "lay foundation of a just and regular pronunciation" was "Mr. Elphinstone" with his *Principles of the English Language* (Walker). Later, it was Dr. Kenrick with his *Rhetorical Dictionary*, and also Thomas Sheridan, who "not only divided the words into syllables, and placed figures over the vowels as Dr. Kenrick had done, but by spelling those syllables as they are pronounced, seemed to complete the idea of a pronouncing dictionary" (Walker 1796, A2). Sheridan is mentioned not only by Walker, but also further analysed by Raymond Hickey in his treatise on regional pronunciation (Hickey 2010). One last name to be mentioned is Alexander J. Ellis, a successor to Walker, in terms of study of pronunciation, but more importantly, one of the first historical linguists who wrote a treatise *On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakespeare and Chaucer*.

3. METHODOLOGY PART

3.1. Data collection

Since the purpose of this paper was to provide an overview of what has been found or said about spelling pronunciation, the primary resources were publications on history of English, scientific papers as well as historical dictionaries from 18th century, especially the one by John Walker.

3.1.1. Sources for theoretical background

Among the most valuable resources were Jespersen's 'Modern English Grammar', which provided data on the pronunciation of [l], Millward and Hayes's 'A Biography of the English Language', which touched on etymological respellings, alongside with Scragg's 'A History of English Spelling' which provided general overview of theoretical and historical background of spelling pronunciation, and many others. Surprisingly, the OED did not prove to be such a reliable resource for researching words with spelling pronunciation, as it only mentions several cases, these being rather disputable and it often does not provide details why the pronunciation of the given word is spelling pronunciation, nor does it provide historical context. Yet it did prove itself to be a good starting platform for a case study. The OED was additionally found to be most useful in research on etymological respellings, as it provides details on historical forms of given words, including records from OE and ME. A broader overview of spelling pronunciation and its relations, and probably the most important and most valuable resource was Andrew Kerek's treatise 'The Phonological Relevance of Spelling Pronunciation', as the treatise provided foundation for further study and served as an excellent case study.

3.1.2. Sources for research on words with spelling pronunciation
3.1.2.1. Publications

Overall, publications provided altogether approximately 60% of all specimens. Notably, it was Jespersen's 'Sounds and Spelling', Millward & Hayes' publication 'Biography of the English Language', Algeo & Pyles' 'The Origins and Development of the English Language', and Scragg's 'A History of English Spelling'. From historical perspective, the most valuable resources were by Millward & Hayes and Scragg, as they provided more diachronic perspective, while Jespersen etc. dealt with the topic with more Present-Day-English perspective.

3.1.2.2. Historical dictionaries

As for other valuable resources, it was inevitable to use scholarly treatises. Among these, the most valuable resource proved to be the preface to John Walker's 'Pronouncing Dictionary' and 'Rhyming Dictionary'. Partially because it was much cited from by other scholars. The rhyming dictionary served as an illustration for some examples, rather than a main resource, as the main problem here was the pronunciation of vowels. As in many cases, the rhymes could as well be half-rhymes and the data provided would thus be misleading. Other historical resources are rather scanty, but among others, a paper by C.H. Grandgent, 'A Neglected Eighteenth Century Orthoepist' (published in 1899) mentioned other contemporary scholars who had dealt with pronunciation. Thanks to its historical resources and primarily because of its citations from historical resources, also the OED was used.

3.1.3. Dating

All assumptions of dating were based upon the OED's notes on spelling variants and historical forms in combination with examples provided by scholars. In these terms, the most valuable resource was Millward & Hayes, who provides relatively detailed discussion of etymological respellings and their impact on pronunciation. As the dating of the changes in pronunciation is often uncertain and mostly impossible to trace precisely, it was decided to simply enumerate the changes recorded by scholars and in the OED. All the dating mentioned are pure estimates, because none of the given resources provides further detail as to dating of the recorded changes in pronunciation. It could only be assumed that most of the pronunciation shifts leading towards spelling pronunciation began at some point during 18th century as a result of standardisation and prescription, because records of variants of many respelled words up to 17th century still exist. The word *throne*, for example, has recorded variants *trone/troune/trown/tron* that coexist with *throne* up to 17th century (OED), illustrating the competition between [t] and [θ] pronunciations. However, as much as dating would indeed be very important aspect, available resources do not provide more than this knowledge. Unfortunately, dating of the changes given is mostly untraceable and the given dates are pure estimates. The paper thus decided to focus more on division of groups of words and on word origins, which appear to have certain impact on spelling pronunciation.

3.2. Problems encountered

This entry is a summary of problematic areas which need to be mentioned. It is also a certain form of invitation for further investigation.

3.3. Social stratification

There is, however, one big catch, and that is the sociolinguistic perspective. None of the resources mentioned dealt with the social stratification of the usage of spelling pronunciation, even though it is sometimes remarked that spelling pronunciation is often triggered by hypercorrection. None of the resources pose the question, whether spelling pronunciation is more likely to be used by speakers of lower, middle or higher social status. From among the cited resources, only Vachek mentions that spelling pronunciation may often be motivated by hypercorrection triggered by the tendency to sound prestigious in order to gain higher social status[2]. Stubbs comments that spelling pronunciation is very much a matter of linguistic awareness of the individual speaker. No study so far, it appears, has dealt with usage of spelling-pronounced lexis among individual social groups.

3.4. Lack of resources

One of the primary difficulties is the lack of resources and previous studies which would provide a report broad enough to provide at least some foundations for further study and that would mention all basic theoretical implications of spelling pronunciation. None of the resources used, for example, provides statistical data or more structured analysis that would divide the data into groups. In other words, much like this paper had to do, to be able to get at least some basic idea about spelling pronunciation, one must delve into scholarly remarks, which are, however, too brief to provide consistent picture of what spelling pronunciation is. With these segments, it is then possible to create a form of mosaic to get the basic idea about the phenomenon. True, there are many treatises written on the complex nature of spelling-sound relations in English, but not many papers so far have dealt with the spelling pronunciation only – it is usually only through brief mentions in context with other topics that we hear about spelling pronunciation. The only work

---

[2] That spelling pronunciation is partially triggered by hypercorrection is discussed, but no paper so far has dealt with spelling pronunciation motivated by social migration.

which incorporates at least a little more systematic approach is the herein oft-cited paper by Kerek.

3.5. Problematic definitions

Another issue is the definition of the phenomenon itself, for whilst spelling pronunciation is not an alphabetical principle, it may lead towards the alphabetical principle in some words. In other instances, spelling pronunciation incorporates the phonological principle, which becomes apparent especially in the pronunciation of vowels – one letter could have more than one spoken counterpart, such as the letter <i>, which can be represented by [ɪ], or [aɪ], or in weak syllables [ə]. The main problem here is that each scholar understands the term 'spelling pronunciation' differently. Hence this paper decided to deal with spelling pronunciation from both perspectives, that spelling pronunciation is an application of phonological principles in some instances, and in others, it leads towards the alphabetic principle. Kerek, for example, understands vowel shifts from [ʌ] to [ɑ] (in NAmE) in *bomb* as spelling pronunciation, which reflects the phonological principle, while OED mentions pronunciation of *timeous* (now /ˈtʌɪməs/), to have had also /ˈtɪmjəs/ pronunciation, which is closer to the alphabetic principle, especially due to the pronunciation of [i]. The rule of thumb here was to focus more on words where we could form at least a group of several words, rather than building upon individual cases, for these were often too disputable.

3.6. Difficulties defining the timeframe of changes

One of the main problems related to records and resources is the dating of changes in pronunciation. Although there is a number of treatises and resources which provide a certain amount of evidence for the study of lexis, data on pronunciation are very scanty. Furthermore, it is merely impossible to successfully determine an exact time when a particular word gained or lost spelling pronunciation. The key issue here is that it is impossible to discern whether a pair of pronunciation variants occur synchronically or which variant occurred first.

3.7. Competing variants (tug-of-war)

In many words with spelling pronunciations, spelling pronunciation is only a variant, an alternative to a generally accepted form. It is often difficult to determine which form is

more 'desirable' even nowadays, despite all means of recording such data, let alone in previous stages of English. On the other hand, there are also variations where spelling pronunciation took the lead and is the usually preferred.

3.8. Regional varieties

Another great limit to many of the provided resources is that they generally do not deal with regional varieties of certain given pronunciations. OED as well as other resources used for this paper only contrast between American and British standard, but it would be also necessary to check if there are not spelling pronunciations to be found in regional varieties like Scottish or Welsh English, for example. For the sake of accumulation of the biggest number of specimens it was decided not to take into account regional varieties as much and also because it does not block, nor does it limit the purposes of this paper, as both British and American standards reflect the influence of spelling pronunciation caused by respellings. Furthermore, as the purpose of this paper is to provide a general overview of known data, focus is put on the pronunciation, regardless of local usage.

3.9. Classification of data

Another problem which one encounters is the classification of all the found data. Because spelling pronunciation could affect all existent lexis in English, specimens can be found in all parts of speech, although we could say that proper nouns, compounded structures, place names and particularly borrowings are much more prone to gain spelling pronunciation.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. General remarks

The data presented in this analysis can be approached from three main viewpoints: one examines the general nature of the given data, the second deals with processes that have a certain role in the changes, and the third perspective discusses possible motivations which led towards spelling pronunciation.

4.2. A general survey of nature of data

Firstly, we need to provide a basic scheme of the nature of the data. Below are broad categories divided according to their nature. These words will later be discussed in broader context. This section's purpose is to provide a basic picture of the nature of spelling pronunciation.

4.2.1. Foreign imports

receipt, schedule, schism, fault, assault, falcon, vault, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism, absolve, admonish, captive, corpse, describe, elephant, falcon, language, picture, throne, obtuse, obscure, merchant, quant, periwig, comptroller, control, victuals, anthem, author, authority, throne, geoduck, etc[3].

As Kerek suggests, words which were imported from other languages have less tight relations between spelling and pronunciation (Kerek, 1975, 323-336), this was strengthened by the duplicity of many of the borrowed words – French and Latin borrowings for the same word, e.g. *faute* and *fallita*, where one pronunciation reflected the <au>, and other then introduced [l] after <l> was added because of etymological respelling (see more in 4.3.).

On the other hand, as Kerek mentions, some words retain their "foreign" pronunciation for the sake of prestige. Hence words like *chauffeur, champagne*, etc. have [ʃ] pronunciation, which would be normally [tʃ] if one should apply English phonological rules, and which were applied on words like *chef*, *chief*, *chalet*, etc. (Kerek 1976, 329). Kerek illustrates that there are mainly two situations when words are immune to spelling pronunciation: one is when a word has a "strong oral tradition" (Kerek 1976) (see 2.2.2).

---

[3] For a full list of all words according to their groups, please see appendix.

4.2.2. Simplex and compounded proper nouns

Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, McGrath, Windstone, Rotherhithe, Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham, Kathryn, Theobald, Southwark, Greenwich, Woolwich, etc.

Kerek mentions a theory where spelling pronunciation is much more likely to occur in "unusual structures" (Kerek 1976). By this he means words which are formed from morphologically 'unusual' structures or words which were imported and hence their morpho-phonological structure is somehow 'foreign' and thus unusual compared to already anglicized structures. Among the "unusual" structures also belong proper nouns. What is more, they combine two other elements: hypercorrection and foreignness of the word, for they are mostly formed of place names, which have established local form, yet the only clue for pronunciation is the spelling, hence these words have spelling pronunciation variants. There are, however, instances, in which spelling pronunciation is less comprehensible, such as the spelling pronunciation of personal names like *Kathryn*, for example, where one would expect such name to have strong oral tradition and hence be immune to spelling pronunciations. *Thomas*, on the other hand, pertains its [t] (Kerek), much contrary to *Bartholomew* (Jespersen 1961), which has a variant pronunciation with [θ]. Here we can observe influence of the enforced conviction that one should always reflect the spelling and hence the <th> cluster was reanalysed as /θ/. Another aspect is that in *Kathryn* and *Bartholomew* the <h> could have been inserted later and the forms with <th> are thus arguably also etymological respellings (for more on respellings, see 2.2.3).

Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, which are mostly pronounced with their [w] dropped and the long vowel shortened in general present-day British English. *Greenwich* was originally pronounced also with spelling pronunciation, but then it later it changed into /grinitʃ/ (Jespersen 1961, 124), and now it is returning to spelling pronunciation. In many instances, we can observe a certain 'tug-of-war' between the forms. Following in such pattern is the name of the river *Frome* whose local pronunciation is /fru:m/, but again, to the 'unenlightened', this is /frəʊm/, and the same also applies to *Warwick* that to most UK

speakers is /wɒrɪk/, but to speakers from outside UK, as is the case of standard US pronunciation, it is /wɒː(r)wik/ (Kenyon 1929, 419). *Whitehaven* and *Whitelocke* and also *Beaconsfield* whose local pronunciation is /beknsfiːld/ are also pronounced with spelling pronunciation with [ai] (Jespersen 1961, 123); *Windstone*, furthermore, "used to rhyme with *Winston*" (Algeo & Pyles 1982, 62). Similarly, also Maidstone (/medstn/) has non-local pronunciation based on pronunciation of *maid* and *stone* (Jespersen 1961, 124). *Rotherhithe* (generally known as /redrif/), *McGrath* (generally obscured compound /mgraːf/)and *Rotschild* began to be pronounced reflecting the spelling, with a "striking but not extreme example" with pronunciation /rɒθtʃaɪld/ (Shrier 2000, 67-69). Moreover, *Theobald* (/tibald/) has been lately reanalysed as /θɪəʊbald/, and similarly, general nouns like *cupboard, clapboard, forehead, waistcoat,* and *boatswain* have been reanalysed (Algeo & Pyles 1982, 62):

> [With proper names] that we have not heard spoken[,] [o]ur only guide is spelling, and no one […] is to be much blamed for pronouncing *Daventry, Shrewsbury,* and *Cirencester* as their spellings seem to indicate they "should" be pronounced; as a matter of fact, many English people treat in exactly the same way these words, whose traditional pronunciations as /dɛːntri/, /ʃrɔːzbəri/ and /siːsitə/ have become somewhat old-fashioned. A London bus conductor would be baffled at the request to be put down at "Tibbald's" Road; it would be necessary to pronounce *Theobald* as spelled, for the pronunciation indicated by Alexander Pope's spelling "Tibbald" […] is now quite old-fashioned. (Algeo & Pyles 1982, 62)

On the other hand, there is also a completely opposite direction of change – obscuration of compounds. This is caused by reanalysis of the <th> and <sh> clusters. OED and Jespersen mention *Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham* (Jespersen 2007, OED). See more in sections 2 and 3.

4.2.3. Compounded common nouns

Waistcoat, cupboard, clapboard, forehead, boatswain, seamstress, coxswain, lightwood, gunwale

An independent subgroup is formed of compounds. These can be divided into proper nouns and general nouns. Proper nouns are mostly place names, but several are also surnames reanalysed as compounds (for explanation see below and sections 2 and 3).

26

Summary:

Overall, the data with which we are dealing are mostly formed of specific terms, proper names, and words of foreign origin. We record, however, spelling pronunciations also in many words of general everyday use. It is more than apparent that spelling pronunciation is more likely to occur in words with words where spelling was unstable, underwent respellings or was simply imported from other languages. Generally speaking, spelling pronunciation is less likely to occur in structures which are generally known or occur in higher frequency. However, there is also a degree in which this does not apply, and that is the element of 'local colour' (see section 3).

4.3.   Processes and mechanisms

With the basic delineation of formal aspects, we can proceed towards discussion on processes which we can observe. The processes are mainly sociolinguistic, but there are also a few phonological and morpho-phonological processes to be traced (as hinted at in 4.2).

4.3.1. Structural reanalysis

We can observe two antithetical directions of reanalysis in many words with spelling pronunciation. Some of the words given below are generally pronounced as obscured compounds –these words have mostly somewhat simplified pronunciation which does not reflect the two or more forming words, such as the pronunciation of *waistcoat* – also pronounced as *weskit* (OED; Algeo, Pyles c2010) In this group, the spelling pronunciation restores pronunciation of both elements of the compound, hence *waistcoat* begins to be pronounced as *waist-coat*. On the other hand, there is a second group of compounds where we observe completely opposite direction of change – from compounds towards obscure compounds. This occurs generally in case of local place names which are formed of two elements, such as place names ending with *-ham*. Consequently, *-ham* clusters in the names are often preceded with <s> or <t>, which is then reanalysed as digraph <sh> or <th> which is then reflected accordingly in the word's pronunciation, such as in names like *Walsham*, *Waltham, Lewisham, Gotham,* etc.

As for the timing of the given changes, based on given resources (mainly Algeo & Pyles; Jespersen), these changes mostly took place between 1800 and 1900 mostly motivated by

hypercorrection (see 4.3.5). On the other hand, according to Jespersen, *Greenwitch*, for example, was originally pronounced as the word-structure suggests – *green-witch*, but this was later obscured and turned into /griniʤ/ (Jespersen 1961, 124) which now returns to the spelling pronunciation. The next factor which we must also consider is then described in 4.3.5 – all place names have a minimum of two different standard pronunciations – one known by local people of the given area, as is the case of *Warwick* in Britain. This is generally pronounced as /worik/. The other form acknowledged and used by non-locals, as can be described by generally North-American pronunciation /wɒrwɪk/. Yet if we should presuppose that American English tends to be generally more linguistically conservative (Brinton, Arnovick 2012, 436-449; 466-479), we could assume that the spelling-reflecting pronunciation of these place names could have been the earlier form which was then obscured and simplified for the sake of ease of articulation. This is, in fact, commented on by Hogg and Denison: "spelling pronunciations [...] may be reversals of a previous change" (Hogg & Denisson 2008 2006). The element of ease of articulation is, however, not too surprising, as it occurs mostly with words generally known by speakers (or words with strong oral tradition). Local forms, however, are a combination of both, where the 'insiders' use the 'traditional' pronunciation, i.e. local form, and those unaware pronounce according to spelling.

4.3.1.1.   From obscure compounds to compounds

Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, McGrath, Windstone, Rotherhithe, Waistcoat, Theobald cupboard, clapboard, forehead, boatswain, gunwale, coxswain, lightwood, gunwale

Under the influence of ease of articulation, most compounds were obscured, usually by the weakening of syllables which caused shift and often resulted in loss of the entire syllable in pronunciation. However, because of standardisation, the written form remained fixed and did not reflect pronunciation changes. Hence to a certain extent, the claim that spelling pronunciation is a return to original pronunciation would apply. The pronunciation shifts were legitimate, for the words which gained the different form were generally known by all speakers at some point in time. Such was the case of many local place names and common nouns like *waistcoat, clapboard,* etc. The problem occurs when looking at place names which are known only to locals. To the naked eye, *Warwick* is more

likely /wɒ:(r)wik/, rather than /wɒrɪk/. Whoever does not know the generally accepted form is thus only dependent on the spelling. The same applies to the rest of the aforementioned compounded place names as well as to the surnames given. The explanation for such phenomenon is, again, oral tradition which spreads amongst speakers within the particular society, "us", whilst to those from the outside, "them", the only clue is the spelling.

4.3.1.2. From compounds to obscure compounds
Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham

On the other hand, despite being relatively small, there is a group of words where spelling pronunciation causes an obscuration of compounds, much to the opposite of the principle of clarity. Place names *Gotham, Wrentham*, etc., for example, have undergone phonetic reanalysis of the clusters <th> and <sh>. As a result, *Feversham* has variant /ˈfiːvʃəm/ instead of /fiːvəsəm/. To one extent, we could say this is another example of the principle of 'return to the previous form' as mentioned in 4.3.1., because with 'dropping one's aitches' combined with weakening of syllables would speak in favour of the form /fiːvəsəm/.

4.3.2. Phonetic reanalysis
Many words with spelling pronunciation share one common feature – insertion. Paradoxically, the motivation for insertion was not perceptual clarity because the words given obviously do not have any minimum pairs or would be easily confusable with other words. Rather, the motivation is mostly (as in a majority of the cases named in 4.3.5) the belief that pronunciation should reflect spelling (further discussed in 4.3.4. and 4.3.5.), but more importantly, most of the words underwent respelling (see more in 2.2.3, 4.3.4.1)

4.3.2.1. Silent stops and other consonants
(de)fault, assault, falcon, vault, almond, qualm, shalm, palm, psalm, absolve, pulse, emerald, adultery, holm, yolk, balk, stalk, ribald, solder, soldier, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism, often, Christmas, postman, lastly, justly, mostly, shiftless, wristband, ghastly, wristband, hasten, soften, chasten, epistle, pestle, apostle, Christmas, chestnut, hostler, hostile, sword, toward, coxswain, lightwood, gunwale, swoon

In the case of *fault*, etc. one of the causes was also confusion between French and Latinate borrowings, e.g. *faute* vs *fallita*, which resulted in insertion of <l> that triggered the pronunciation of [l]. (see further in 4.3.4.1.). In *Almond, psalm, psalmist, qualm, shalm,* and *palm* the spelling pronunciation was probably triggered by analogy with other words with spelling-pronunciation-induced [l] (but please note that *salmon* pertains [l]-less pronunciation due to its original French form *saumon*) (Jespersen 1961, 297). It is here that we can also observe how certain phonetic constraints affect the pronunciation, as Jespersen comments: the pronunciation of [l] was introduced mostly in immediate position before immediate position before [m]. In *calf*, the [l] remains silent. However, in *valve*, the [l] begins to be pronounced (Jespersen 1961, 297). On the other hand, Kerek mentions, that spelling-pronunciation-initiated [l] also appears in *folk, yolk, balk, holm*, etc. (strictly NAmE) (Kerek, 1976, 332). We can see, however, that in *folk,* etc. the <l> was introduced via folk etymology or etymological respelling. On the other hand, reintroduction of [t] (strictly NAmE) in *epistle, pestle, apostle, Christmas, hostler*, etc. (Kerek, 335), we could argue, was purely spelling-motivated, as there is historical evidence of the <t> being present much earlier and hence the omission of [t] fell victim to the principle of ease of articulation. Moreover, the cluster <tl> allows for assimilation. It must be noted, however, that in *listen* and *glisten*, the [t] remains silent (Jespersen 2007). The same rule as in *Christmas, hostler,* etc. also applies to *often, lastly, shiftless, wristband*, etc., and to pronunciation of [w] in *sword* and *toward* (Kerek, 335).

Regarding dating and chronology, it can be said that in the case of *fault, assault, falcon, vault, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral* and *baptism*, where the spelling pronunciation was most likely triggered by etymological respelling, the changes occurred at some point during the Early Modern or Modern English period. As for the rest of the specimens named by Jespersen or Briggs, and Kerek, we can speak of the Late Modern period or even 20th century and later, but we cannot be quite certain.

4.3.2.2.   Reintroduction of initial <h>
habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic, hospital, *herb, hotel, historic(al), hostile, hostel, hostler, human, humus, humid, huge, homage, heir, ((h)aitch)*

Under Latin influence, some words gained etymological <h> in their spelling, although it was not pronounced (Scragg 1974 Millward 1996). The initial [h] began to be pronounced later, in the 19th century, however, because of spelling pronunciation and of the 'belief' that the written is the primary language (Barber, Beal, Shaw 2009, 214-15). These words are: *habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic,* and *hospital* (Millward, Hayes 2012, 248). Moreover, in BrE, *herb* also has its [h] pronounced, which in U.S. English pertains to be pronounced with the <h> silent (Millward, Hayes 2012, 248). Scragg further on adds pronunciation of *hotel,* and *historical* that used to be pronounced with the [h] silent even quite recently (Scragg 1974, 42). The like applies to *hostler, human, humus* etc. (Kerek 1976). Less common but still existent is the [h]-pronounced variant of *homage* and *heir* (Kerek 1976).

A rather specific case is the one of *(h)aitch*, which appears to be a relatively recent innovation. It was recorded by the BBC and the approximate dating is around 1980's or 1990's (bbc.com). Except for *aitch*, the pronunciation of [h] is a phenomenon which we can trace back to approximately the Late Modern period, as we can find evidence of 19th century scholars disparaging the dropping of one's aitches still during the 19th century (Jones 2005).

4.3.2.3.   Reanalysis of <th>

Katherine, Kathryn, Thomas, Bartholomew, author, anthem, author(ity), throne, orthography, orthoepy, apothecary, Thames, theatre, theme, amethyst, arthritic, authentic, lethargy, Lethe, aether, panther

Another phonological/phonetic change that deserves consideration is the reanalysis of <th>. There are two types of this phonetic change: one is the obscuration of compounds in place names (see 1.2.), and the other is the reanalysis of the consonant cluster in general nouns (borrowings from Greek) such as *author, anthem, authority, throne* (Millward, Hayes 2012), *orthography, orthoepy* (OED), and proper nouns *Katherine, Kathryn, Thomas, Bartholomew* (Shrier 2000, 69). In all named words, the pronunciation was [t], but this later succumbed to spelling pronunciation. In *anthem, authority,* and *throne*, the spelling again competed with two forms, one without the <h> after <t>, as in *trone, antem, autorite,*

and one with it. The insertion of <h> is again via (possibly folk) etymology. In *orthography* and *orthoepy*, the pronunciation was derived from the spelling in general, with the spelling being a direct transcription into Latin from Greek. As with proper names, the pronunciation was most likely facilitated by hypercorrection. It is also important to note here that some pronunciations of borrowings are also dependent on spoken varieties in PDE. In the case of *anthem*, for example, which used to be pronounced as /æntəm/, but later became /ænθəm/, the pronunciation may be dependent on the spoken variety, as speakers of the Irish variety, for example, mostly pronounce the [th] digraph as /t/ because of "fortition" (Hickey, in Nevalainen, 2008, 229-243).

There are several more examples given by Kerek, who also adds that Walker demanded for words which contain the cluster <th> to be pronounced accordingly (with [θ], that is), and disparaged the use of [t] (which would be the traditional use based on the origins of many of the like words) in such instances (Kerek 1976, 326-330). Among words mentioned by Walker were *apothecary, panther,* etc. (Kerek 1976). This definitely shows a certain pattern which can be understood as a possible tendency, where we can then assume that other words with <th> in spelling but with pronunciation with /t/ will be reanalysed in the manner like given above (Kerek 1976). Kerek thus assumes that we can expect that words like *thyme* and *asthma*, or the name *Thomson* may gain spelling pronunciation (Kerek 1976).

Whilst [θ] pronunciation of *panther, lethargy, lethe,* and of *Katherine, Kathryn Thomas*, and *Bartholomew* are relatively new, with approximate dating during late 19th century at the earliest, *author, anthem,* etc., i.e. words which underwent etymological respellings gained their pronunciation during Modern English period at the latest (much like other etymologically respelled words).

4.3.2.4. Reanalysis of <ch>
chef, chic, chalet, chassis, chaise, cache, chasm, chamois, chagrin, challis, chandelier, chant(e), cache, chasm, challis, chandelier, charqui, chibouk

Many words of French origin have undergone reanalysis of the <ch> digraph, which is usually understood as /š/. The [tš]-pronunciation of these words is a spelling

pronunciation. The pronunciation with [tš], however, does not apply to all French borrowings with such cluster, for words like *Chablis, champagne, chateau* are pronounced with [š] (Kerek 1976). This is because of prestige of the words primarily (Kerek 1976). We can see that prestige to a certain degree functions as a preserving feature and brakes spelling pronunciation. Yet in other instances, prestige triggers hypercorrection, which is one of the main motivations for spelling pronunciation (see <u>section 3</u>).

4.3.2.5.   Reanalysis of [s]/[z]

absolve, benison, comparison, orison, resolve, resound

Before a stressed vowel, some words adopted the pronunciation of /s/, instead of a hypothetical /z/ (Jespersen 1961, 204). These pronunciations are rather non-standard, but Jespersen has recorded the spelling pronunciation of words such as *orison* (also in OED), *resound* (has both realisations with /s/ and /z/, (OED)), *benison, garrison.* *Comparison* is even more surprising to have spelling pronunciation (Jespersen 1961, 204). Similarly, *absolve* (OED), and possibly even *resolve*. OED mentions both spellings with –s- and –z- of the last two mentioned, so it is possible that Early Modern pronunciation had also /rɪsɒlv/. Such is, however, disputable. These changes are recorded most likely from the 20th century, although Jespersen did not specify.

4.3.3. Vowel shifts
4.3.3.1.   Pronunciation of <oi>

coin, boil, spoil, point, anoint, alloy, joy, cloy destroy joist, jointure, toilet

Because of French influence, especially amongst members of 18th century's nobility, some speakers pronounced words like *coin, boil, spoil,* etc. with /aɪ/, as in *choir* or *quire*. Jespersen marks this pronunciation in his treatise (Jespersen 1961), as well as Millward (Millward, 1996), and Beal (Barber et al. 2000), but probably the most valuable resource on the pronunciation of this diphthong is Walker (Walker 1791, 35). He mentions that "this double sound is very distinguishable in *boil, toil, spoil, point, anoint,* etc which sound ought to be carefully preserved, as there is a very prevalent practice among the vulgar of dropping the *o*, and pronouncing these words as if written *bile, tile, spile,* etc." (Walker 1791, 35). Such was probably a result of folk etymologies and the belief that this is the

'proper' French pronunciation (which illustrates the element of disparaged "snobbery" Kerek mentions). Walker compares French borrowings *turquoise* and Latinate *tortoise*, whose pronunciation was "as if *turkiz*; and *turkois* with the *oi* broad, as in *boys*" (Walker 1791, 35). Then, the pronunciation of *turquoise* was often influenced by its spelling already during the 17th and 18th century. On the other hand, *choir* was pronounced as its later pronunciation respelling *quire* (OED). With present-day's outlook, it is evident that words like *boil, toil, spoil, point, anoint* and also *tortoise*, (Walker 1971, 35) whose pronunciation was originally, according to Walker, *tortiz*, have spelling pronunciation too (OED). *Coin* was originally pronounced /kaɪn/ or /kwaɪn/, but such had already diminished before publication of Walker's treatise, according to his words (Walker 1971, 35). Following in like manner is the pronunciation of [oy] and hence the word *alloy* was also pronounced with /ai/, but on the other hand, as noted by Walker, poets mostly rhymed *alloy* with *joy, cloy,* and *destroy* (Walker 1791, 38). Interestingly enough, Walker mostly advocates the usage of spelling pronunciation in the case of most words spelled with –oi-, only with a few exceptions that became so commonly used that it would probably be a too extreme solution in their cases, but otherwise most of the pronunciations with/ai/ are considered 'vulgar' by him. Tuite further mentions pronunciation that Walker would consider 'vulgar' in *joist, jointure* and, surprisingly, *toilet*, which were, according to Tuite, pronounced as *jice, jintur* (which could mean either /ai/ or /i/ pronunciation of *oi*), and *twilight* (Grandgent 1899).

Consequently, the 'bad habit' of [ai] pronunciation of <oi> is called 'hyperforeignism'. Hyperforeignism is a sub-type of hypercorrection which involves misinterpretation of a particular cluster of phonemes or graphemes and leads them towards mistaken pronunciation, as in the case of "twilight" pronunciation of *toilet* (Janda 1994, 67-91).

We can further observe influence of the pronunciation of –oi- in *heist*, which is a pronunciation respelling of Modern English pronunciation of *hoist* (OED), which is one of a few examples of pronunciation respellings. Walker's rhyming dictionary further mentions *oroide* to rhyme with *ride, bride,* etc. (Walker 1963, 55). Similarly, also *noise, poise, equipoise, counterpoise, porpoise, toise, tortoise,* rhymes with *despise, rise, surprise,* etc. (Walker 1963, 121). Yet here the problem could also be a contemporary pronunciation of the syllable, wherein the diphthongs /oi/ and /ai/ could have been much

closer in pronunciation, which would still count as a perfect half-rhyme and hence could have still been hovering around /oi/ and /ai/ due to instability caused by phonological processes around the Great Vowel Shift. Still paradoxically, *choir* continues to appear to maintain its /kwaɪr/ pronunciation, as much as *turquoise* although the latter is already being pronounced with spelling pronunciation in the present day (Merriam Webster). As for the dating of these changes, we could assume that most of these changes were fully established by early 19th century at the latest.

4.3.3.2.   Other vowel shifts

Sadist, drama, data, catsup, status, strata, aviation, apricot, pecan, pajamas, ballet, valet, chassis, secretary, military, laboratory, advertisement, bomb, bombast, combat, honest, common, astonish, constable, compass, donkey, comrade, dromedary, grovelling, hover, lexicon, Oregon, etc.

Words such as *sadist, drama, data*, have undergone a vowel shift from [a] to [ae] in US English, where according to Kerek, this is a result of application of phonological principles analogically, based on other clusters and syllables, such as in *sad*, where <a> is represented as [ae] in pronunciation (Kerek 1976). The similar applies to (predominantly NAmE pronunciation of) *secretary, military, laboratory, advertisement*, where the <e> in the originally weak penultimate syllable regained its full pronunciation via slight (but not full) strengthening (Kerek 1976). Hence the pronunciation /ˈmɪləˌtɛri/, /sekretɛri/, (OED) etc. Kerek further mentions that the shift from "[ʌ]" to [ɑ] representing <o> in pronunciation of *bomb, bombast, combat*, (cf. *comb, come, some*) was spelling pronunciation induced, as much as in the case of the rest of the aforementioned words.

4.3.3.3.   Diphthongisation

agile, favorite, docile, juvenile, versatile, genuine

These words underwent reanalysis of pronunciation of the letter <i> which led towards diphthongisation [ai], based on analogy with *wine, swine,* and *fragile*. "What seems to be happening to this rule is a good example of how, as suggested above, spelling pronunciation can ultimately be the prime triggering mechanism for rather profound changes in the phonetic character of a language," according to Kerek (Kerek, 1976, 331).

What Kerek illustrates is the rather ambivalent nature of spelling pronunciation, for while it may function as a brake to several phonological changes, fixing the word's pronunciation based on the spelling, it may also completely change the phonetic character of English via diphthongisation as in this case. Kerek's approach, however, requires a great deal of discussion, for his predictions seem a little far-fetched. It is important to note, furthermore, that Kerek mostly deals with American pronunciation. Another problem with Kerek's proposal is that many of his examples lack evidence – some of the pronunciations Kerek provides are not recorded by other dictionaries, like Merriam-Webster or OED. The variants Kerek enters must then by logic be either rather rare, or non-standard.

4.3.3.4.   Monophthongisation

Direction, directive, directory, redirection, indirect, diversity, diverse, divergence, divesture, divestment, divulgation, director(ate), dissect, dichotomy, digestible, dilacerate, dilatable, dilute, dimension(al)

Similarly, as there are instances of diphthongisation motivated by spelling pronunciation, there are words with two variants, one with [ai], and another with [i]. As we can further notice, the words are all of Latin origin. The monophthongisation occurs in the cluster di+<c>;<g>;<l>;<m>;<r>;<s>;<v> in an unstressed syllable. Stressed syllables appear to be immune to spelling pronunciation. What is more, all of the given words originated in Latin or French and we could hence also argue that this spelling pronunciation shows another return to its original spelling-pronounced form.

4.3.4. Borrowings
4.3.4.1.   (Folk) etymology and respelling:

receipt, schedule, schism, fault, assault, falcon, vault, pulse, emerald, adultery, holm, yolk, balk, stalk, ribald, solder, soldier, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism, absolve, admonish, captive, corpse, elephant, falcon, language, picture, throne, obtuse, obscure, quant, periwig, comptroller, control, victuals, anthem, author, authority, throne

Thanks to respellings, the words mentioned above gained new pronunciation, and since the 'original' pronunciation became obsolete, the only possible clue for correct

pronunciation was the spelling. This is why we have two pronunciations of *schedule* – one is /š/ (mostly BrE standard, OED), and the other is with /sk/ (mostly NAmE standard, OED), where both variants are, in fact, spelling pronunciations, as there was no other variant and in both instances, the pronunciation follows phonological rules of English. Barber, Beal and Shaw name two words with spelling pronunciation that was introduced by etymological respelling: *schedule* (originated from *cedul* and hence its pronunciation was, in fact, /sedul/) nowadays reflects the spelling in two forms: /ʃedʲʊl/ in BRE, and /skedʒʊl/, and schism (Barber et al. 2012) whose original pronunciation was /sizm/, but in PDE, /skizm/ comes to the forefront, although mostly regarded as incorrect (OED). Scragg also mentions *scythe, scissors,* and *receipt* (originally *sithe, sisoures, cisorium*) (Scragg 1974, 57). Yet with *scythe* and *scissors* it is visible that the pronunciation retained the non-spelling-pronunciation variant reflecting the original spelling without <c>. This speaks in favour of the 'strong oral tradition' for these words, as they are both names for generally used everyday objects, are vastly frequent in use. Similarly, *receipt*, gained its spelling pronunciation too, as a result of etymological respelling. (see section 2.3.1). The same applies to *emerald* (emeraude), *balk* (bauk, bawk), etc. (Kerek, 1976, 332).

Whilst in the case of *schism* the spelling pronunciation appears to be quite recent, the pronunciation of *schedule* has been recorded already by Kenrick, Perry and Buchanan (Scragg 1974), which means that the /ʃ/, or /sk/ pronunciation could be possibly dated back to the late 18th century (OED). Other occurrences of etymological respellings are recorded in previous sections: *fault, assault, falcon, vault, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism*. Scragg further mentions, that words like *absolve* (*absolue*), *admonish* (ME *ammoneste*, lME *amonesche*), *captive* (ME *captif/captiue*), *corpse* (ME, *cors*), *elephant* (ME *elephaunte*), *language* (ME langag, hence the pronunciation with /w/ is SP), etc. are also a result of etymological respelling (Scragg 1974, 42, OED).

Words like *fault, assault, falcon, vault,* furthermore, have their [l] pronounced from ca. the Early Modern period (Millward, Hayes 2012, 248) and the explanation rests in the original spelling of these words: *faute, assaut, faucon, vaute*, as spelled in French, or in Vulgar Latin *fallita, assaltus, falcó, volutum* (Millward, Hayes 2012, 248; OED). These two spellings probably interfered and the resulting spelling pronunciation was possibly motivated by the sudden insertion of <l>. Exceptions such as *salmon* and *walk*, maintain their silent [l]

to this day, despite the spelling pronunciation tendency (OED, Jespersen 1961). Kerek explains that the silent [l] can be another example of the 'strong oral tradition' (Kerek 1976). An analogous situation then happens with *adventure* (*aventure*), *perfect(ion)* (*perfeccion*), *admiral* (*admiralis, amirant*) and *baptism* (also *batesme*, *batême*) (OED).

Other evidence of spelling pronunciation introduced by etymological respelling is provided by Shrier: *obtuse* and *obscure* whose [b] was, historically, silent (Shrier 2000, 67-69). Another example of such is *quant* (OED), again from Latin (contus) (OED). Jespersen further mentions a rather curious case of *periwig*, a word introduced in the beginning of 16th century with spelling pronunciation (Jespersen 1961, 105). Originally, this word was borrowed from French*, perruque* or *peruke*, and the *periwig* is probably a "clumsy rendering of the sound /iu/" and it was pronounced as "pereeg", but later it became /periwig/ (Jespersen 1961, 105). The case of *periwig* could as well be a folk etymology, due to which the word was respelled.

Another group is formed of borrowings from Greek, which also underwent etymological respelling, with the forms being originally spelled with <t>. Similar to other words with the cluster <th>, these borrowings underwent reanalysis in pronunciation, where approximately up to 18th century, these words were pronounced with [t], but later, the cluster <th> began to be pronounced according to general English orthographic rules via reanalysis. Thanks to this, we now have the pronunciation /ˈanθəm/ etc. *Control* (from *comptroller*, and therefore /kontrol/ has now become /kənˈtrəʊl/)(OED) as well as *victuals* and have both undergone etymological respelling (from /vitai/ towards /viktjuəls/) (Nevalainen 2006, Kerek 1976). In the case of *victuals*, we have evidence of the spelling *vitaille* and pronunciation /vitai/ of *victuals* (OED). Thus /viktjuəls/ is a spelling pronunciation.

4.3.4.2.   Reintroduction of initial <h>

habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic, hospital, herb, hotel, historic(al), hostile, hostel, hostler, human, humus, humid, huge, (homage, heir) ((h)aitch),

In these words, etymological respelling played a certain role in the reintroduction of the initial <h>, which later led towards spelling pronunciation with the originally silent [h] being pronounced.

Summary:

As previously remarked, spelling pronunciation is more likely to occur with "unusual" structures or words which were imported from other languages. There is also an element of analogy in spelling pronunciation. We can observe the influence of analogy in reanalysis of the clusters <th> <ch> <sh>. To summarise, we can say that spelling pronunciation is not as haphazard as it may appear from first sight, as Kerek suggests (Kerek 1976, 323-326). In fact, as we can observe the aforementioned processes, we can see a certain patterning of the changes. This may serve as a little hint for potential directionality of sound change. As Kerek suggests, it is very likely that words such as *thyme, asthma* and others, which have a <th> cluster in their spelling may be reanalysed in the future and gain spelling pronunciation (Kerek, 1976, 325). Yet such predictions as the ones made by Kerek are disputable. We cannot predict which words will be affected in the future, as the directionality of the change is highly unstable. What this section also reveals is the previously mentioned element of analogy which Kerek describes (Kerek 1976, 326). It also reflects, to a certain degree, the notion of the cyclical nature of spelling pronunciation, as mentioned by Hogg & Denisson 2008 and Vachek.

4.3.5. Causes and motivations

This section describes motivations which led towards spelling pronunciation in given words. The first sub-group is formed of words where the changes in pronunciation were motivated by language ideology, as described by Milroy & Milro(Milroy 2001).

The second sub-group is then formed of words which are either unique or rare, or have particular local forms which are, however, not generally known and where the only clue for pronunciation only lies in the spelling. All words in this category have mostly two pronunciations in play – one is the lesser known which had been standardised in earlier stages of English, and the other is spelling pronunciation.

4.3.5.1.　Language ideologies

This section deals with language ideologies which facilitated changes in pronunciation. By 'language ideologies', we mean a set of beliefs which form the conviction of many speakers, that the only 'proper' or 'acceptable' language form is the standardised one. In connection to spelling pronunciation, language ideologies form and strengthen (usually folk) beliefs in the superiority of written language over spoken forms which leads towards spelling pronunciation (see more in 2) (Milroy & Milroy 1999). Among these ideologies falls the belief that pronunciation must always reflect the written form (see more on prescription and language ideologies in 2.2.2). Partially, it could also have been hypercorrection in many aspects, such as in the case of *often* for which change there was no particular need as the form would be perfectly clear to any speaker. Yet another important aspect was played by prescription, especially in forming and enforcing the belief in superiority of the written form, as well as in influencing pronunciation.

4.3.5.1.1. Hypercorrection and prescription

Prescription goes hand in hand with hypercorrection. It is another product of language ideology, very much strengthened by prescriptivism. Whilst in the case of etymological respellings and borrowings where spelling pronunciation was practically pulled by having no precedent in oral tradition, in some words like *often* etc., we can observe rather unexpected changes which happen to reflect the spelling, even though these structures have already often established and generally accepted forms. Here too belong words whose spelling pronunciation was triggered by the notion that 'proper' pronunciation must reflect the spelling. Such belief is an element of hypercorrection in itself. We know that Walker called for [oi] instead of [ai] pronunciation of the cluster <oi> and despised not using [θ] in words where the cluster <th> appears. Additionally, the [h]-pronunciation was partially motivated by prescription, which we can see in 19th century treatises on pronunciation 'errors' (see section 1 entry on <h>).

4.3.5.1.1.1.　Reintroduction of initial <h>

habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, *humour, heretic, hospital*, *herb*, *hotel, historical, ((h)aitch)*

In this section belong words whose initial <h> used to be silent but due to combination of hypercorrection and the general belief in superiority of written form, the [h] was introduced in pronunciation. Also, due to etymological respelling, some words gained their <h> in initial positions, mostly due to lexical reduplication. However, this is only partially the effect, for as records show, many of the words were still pronounced with their aitches dropped. It was, logically, hypercorrection which reintroduced the [h] in pronunciation of these words (including the rather peculiar case of *(h)aitch*). We could also argue, however, that in some words, as treatises on pronunciation 'errors' describe, pronunciation of [h] in initial positions of words was mostly called for by prescription.

4.3.5.1.1.2. Foreign imports
fault, assault, falcon, vault, receipt, schedule, schism, periwig, comptroller, victuals, baptism, adventure, anthem, author, authority, throne, etc.

Similarly, with foreign imports such as those given above, the situation was similar. There are mostly two main pronunciations recorded among these words: in the case of words from *fault* to *adventure*, the pronunciations were interchangeable with their French duplicates (*aventure, vaute,* etc.), so even after codification of the written form, both pronunciations, one reflecting the French and the other the etymologically respelled form, could have competed. Thus, a large part of formation of pronunciation of the words given above was played by hypercorrection. The same applies to *anthem, author...* where we can see how hypercorrection triggered phonetic reanalysis of the cluster <th>. (also see note on Walker in 4.3.3.1)

4.3.5.2. Rarely used and exoticisms
Here belong less common or even rarely used words and/or which are found purely in textual records and their pronunciation is thus mostly derived from spelling even though they could have other standardised pronunciation (but that one may be often obsolete or generally not known to broader scope of public). A specific subgroup in this section is "Local colour". Here belong words which have a generally accepted and used form, but this form is known only by 'locals', i.e. people who were told how that particular word 'should' be pronounced. Here, spelling pronunciation is more legitimate than in other

instances, for it is completely logical and caused by the extreme rarity or specific nature of the given word (or proper name).

4.3.5.2.1. Exotic/Scientific terms

Aam, Abactinal, Acaulose, nilgai, nilghau, geoduck

This group comprises of lexis that is extremely rare and very specific and mostly comprises of scientific terms or names of rare species and either gained spelling pronunciations, or the pronunciation began to reflect phonological rules later on after being introduced into English. What is interesting here is that some words had been pronounced according to the alphabetical principle in the first instance, but later gained pronunciation that reflected phonological patterns, via analogy, hence pronunciation of these mentioned words is spelling pronunciation. This is mostly because of the extreme rarity of the words. Algeo & Pyles name these words:

> *Aam,* whose pronunciation was recorded also to be, probably a later reintroduction of Dutch or Afrikaans pronunciation /ɔːm/ in the *New English Dictionary*. The newer pronunciation was not introduced, however, until the late 19ᵗʰ century. Until then, it had been /ɑːm/ (OED).
>
> *Abactinal*, in *N.E.D.*(1884), evidenced as /æbæktɪnəl/ standard use: /əˈbaktɪnəl/ (OED)
>
> *Acaulose,* extremely rare, Latin borrowing with spelling pronunciation /(ˌ)eɪˈkɔːləʊs/ (OED)

These words have spelling pronunciation according to Algeo & Pyles (Algeo & Pyles 2010). Here we see spelling pronunciation as a result of Anglicisation of pronunciation of borrowings. The phoneme /ʌ/ which would follow much better the rules of alphabetical principle, which would be the more 'proper' pronunciation in the word *abactinal*, for example, instead of its English /æ/ is thus a result of spelling pronunciation. Similarly, the word *aam*, was originally pronounced as /ɑːm/ (OED) and it was not until later that this word's pronunciation regained its 'original' pronunciation reflecting its origins in Affrikans or Dutch. It is also important to note here, that all of the aforementioned terms occur extremely rarely in spoken discourse. They are primarily written terms, hence the spelling pronunciation. *Geoduck*, furthermore, used to be pronounced as /ˈdʒiːəʊdʌk/ (according to the 'New English Dictionary') (N.E.D. in OED), but later, this term gained its non-spelling-pronunciation variant which is now used primarily - /ˈguːɪdʌk/ (OED).

4.3.5.2.2. General (but less common) lexis

Comptroller, Victuals, orthography, orthoepy, quant

Based on OED these words are less common, but we can expect these to be still more common than the scientific terms mentioned in 3.2.1. The difference is, whilst the words in section 3.2.1. are completely unique terms used in very specific instances, they are more likely to appear in written form than in spoken discourse. The main gauge for measuring the 'commonness' of the words was OED's frequency band.

4.3.5.2.3. 'Local colour'

Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, Windstone, Daventry, Thames, Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham, Southwark, Greenwich, Woolwich, etc.

This section is formed only of local place names. Although some words from the general lexis may have local forms in pronunciation, their spelling pronunciations were not motivated by the uniqueness of the word as they might be more common in use. The main factor here is that the <u>local form</u> is relatively unique and not likely to be known by all. As described before (sections 1 and 2), we can observe the 'oral tradition' in play, with the exception that the oral tradition is only kept in certain local varieties.

Summary:

There are two main motivations for spelling pronunciation. One arises from prescription and the notion that pronunciation should reflect spelling, the other is uniqueness of the word. While in the first group we can find words of everyday use, the latter is formed exclusively of words of lower frequency, most of which are extreme rare use. While in the case of language ideologies the spelling pronunciation is most likely result of social constructs, in the case of 'unique structures', we could argue that the resulting spelling pronunciations were a necessity. For to be able to pronounce a word which as a spoken realisation different to its spelling, one must first hear the spoken realisation. Hence in words which belong exclusively to written register, or words which are extremely rare, spelling pronunciation is often inevitable.

4.4. Result of analysis

These are approximate statistics based on all gathered specimens. The statistical data is rather approximate as statistic margins are possible and there may be more words with spelling pronunciation which only have not been recorded by OED or other resources. This is, however, no limitation to the test of validity of the claim that spelling pronunciation may be a return to previous forms. For if it should be true that majority of the words given were borrowed at some point, it would mean that spelling pronunciation was more likely caused by prescription and by phonetic anglicisation of the borrowed words based on their spelling.

The first table shows general overview of data and the ratios to the total number of all specimens. The second table (on the left below the general overview) shows ratio of etymological respellings represented among borrowings, and the third (on the right) shows ratio of borrowing and compounds as represented in the total number of specimens.

Please continue to tables 1,2,3 on the next page.

Table 1

General overview of data			
Total: 205	Proper nouns: 33 (16,1%)	compounds: 27 (13,2%)	
		simplex: 6 (2,9)	
	common nouns: 172 (83,9%)	compounds: 9 (4,4%)	within EN: 9
			borrowings: 0
		simplex: 163 (79,5%)	other: 19 (9,3%)
			borrowings: 144 (70,2%) respellings: 66 (32,1%)
			other: 78 (38,1%)

Borrowings: 144	Etymological respellings: 66 (45,8%)
	Other: 78 (54,2%)

table 2

Total: 205	Borrowings: 144 (70,2%)
	Compounds: 36 (17,5%)
	Unspecified: 25 (12,1%)

table 3

As the table reveals, over 70% of the given words are borrowings, out of which 45,8% has undergone etymological respelling. Another big group is represented by proper nouns and compounds. Based on these facts we can state that spelling pronunciation is, statistically, most likely to occur in words of foreign origin. The second biggest group is formed of compounds with 17,5% of represented specimens and the third biggest are proper nouns with 16,1% from total number of specimens. As we can see, only 12,1% are 'unspecified'. To this group belong words which may have come originally from English. It is represented partially by simplex words in which the OED did not specify their origin, and from greater part also by compounded structures which were formed within English.

5. CONCLUSION

As was discussed throughout this paper, there are **three main views** shared among scholars:

1) Spelling pronunciation is a return to 'original forms'

It is generally believed that pronunciation and spelling relations were originally governed primarily by the alphabetical principle. From then onward, English pronunciation and spelling have begun to go separate ways, due to combination of phonetic and phonological processes, including the Great Vowel Shift. While spelling remained stable, strengthened by standardisation, spoken language kept evolving. This caused many words to gain different pronunciations and through assimilation, weakening and vowel shifts, the pronunciation of some words may often appear quite remote to its written representation. Based on these factors, some scholars believe that if spelling pronunciation reflects spelling forms, it should logically represent the 'original' form. Yet this is extremely problematic, because if one is to consider the approach as a principle, one would have to accept etymologically respelled words as the 'original' forms. In these terms, as in the case of *fault, vault,* etc., one should consider as the 'original form' that which reflects ME spelling, the one which reflects the form *faute* and *vaute*, which entered English vocabulary earlier. What happened instead was that *faute*, etc. coincided with *fallita* and other Latin forms and thus *faute* gained <l> which then began to be reflected in pronunciation.

On the other hand, the 'return approach' has its legitimate use, as in instances such as *often*, or *waistcoat*, where most likely by the 'ease of articulation' principle the omission of [t] in *often* occurred, and *waistcoat* underwent obscuration, which was even recorded via pronunciation respelling as *weskit* and through spelling pronunciation. Both words are now pronounced according to spelling. Another problem is that pronunciation variants tend to move in a cycle, as we can see illustrated on the case of *geoduck* which was originally pronounced according to English phonological rules - /ˈdʒiːəʊdʌk/, but later gained 'original' (i.e. from Lushotseed language) form /ˈɡuiˌdək/.

2) Spelling pronunciation was triggered by hypercorrection

46

This implication is based on the premise that spelling pronunciation was enforced by the belief that the written form is the 'correct' form, where one's desirable pronunciation should, as Dr. S. Johnson called for, reflect the spelling. The effect of this belief was made even stronger by the tendency to sound educated in order to gain better social status, based on the prestige of written language.

From another perspective, pronunciation requires a certain level of linguistic awareness, mainly in the pronunciation of 'foreign' imports as well as 'unusual structures'. The 'linguistic awareness' can be illustrated on the example of many spelling-pronounced place names, where initiated speakers pronounce the names differently to those speakers who are 'less aware', and hence rely on the spelling, as in pronunciation of *Gotham*, for example. In instances of unique structures or newly introduced lexical borrowings, etc., for which there is no 'standard' pronunciation, spelling pronunciation is rather logical and necessary result.

3) Spelling pronunciation is governed by analogy

This approach mostly draws upon the notion that spelling pronunciation, though being rather irregular (and mostly quite unpredictable) process, may cause regularities. The problem with this approach is the very notion of 'regularity', which is an extremely relative term, especially if we consider the influence of sound change. Though spelling may, to a certain extent, function as a means of preservation of language, spelling pronunciation, being governed by both alphabetical and phonological principles, may often cause irregularities. On the other hand, if we take into account the phonological principle, we could say that the pronunciation of many words was governed by analogy with the pronunciation of other words, as in the case of *diversity*, where we can observe the influence of analogy with *dive* in the [ai] pronunciation of the first syllable. While we can say that spelling pronunciation may function as a form of brake to language change, by tying pronunciation back to the spelling, there are also instances in which spelling pronunciation is prevented, and those are words with 'strong oral tradition'. The presence of 'strong oral tradition' speaks rather against the argument of analogy.

Summary

While spelling pronunciation may be regarded by some as haphazard, this paper illustrates that there are instances which appear to be much more prone to gain spelling pronunciation, where we can observe relatively structured movement which speaks against the notion of the haphazard nature of spelling pronunciation. On the other hand, there is a presence of 'tug-of-war' between forms (as in e.g. *geoduck*), which does speak in favour of the notion of unpredictability of spelling pronunciation, as we cannot predict which of the forms will be used or understood as more desirable. We can argue, however, that spelling pronunciation is less likely to occur in words which have 'strong oral tradition' and more likely to occur in instances which are less known and especially borrowings, which is proven by the fact that borrowings represent profound 70% of all data from the research.

References:

Algeo, J. & Pyles, T., c2010. The origins and development of the English language 6th ed., Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Barber, C., Beal & Shaw, c2000. English language: a historical introduction 5th ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barber, C., Beal, J.C. & Shaw, P.A., 2012. The English language: a historical introduction Second edition; Canto classics edition., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinton, L.J. & Arnovick, L.K., c2011. The English language: a linguistic history 2nd ed., Don Mills, Ont.: OUP Canada.

Görlach, M., 1991. Introduction to early modern English, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grandgent, C.H., 1899. A Neglected Eighteenth Century Orthoepist. Modern Language Notes, 14(3), p.86-. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2917803?origin=crossref.

Haugen, E., 1950. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. Language, 1950, pp.pp. 210-231. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/410058?origin=crossref.

Hickey, R., 2010. Eighteenth-century English: ideology and change, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hogg, R. & Denison, D., 2008. A history of the English language, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hornby, A.S., 2005. Oxford advanced leaner's dictionary of current English Seventh edition. S. Wehmeier et al., eds., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chovanec, J., 2014. Chapters from the history of Czech functional linguistics, Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Jackson, G., 1830. Popular Errors in English Grammar, particularly in Pronunciation 1866 ed., London.

Janda, R.D., Joseph, B.D. & Jacobs, N.G., 1992. Systematic Hyperforeignisms as Maximally External Evidence for Linguistic Rules. p.67. Available at: https://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs.26.08jan.

Jespersen, O., 2007. Sounds and spellings, Abingdon [England]: Routledge.

Kenyon, J.S., 1929. Sources of Pronunciation. American Speech, 4(5), p.416-. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/452112?origin=crossref.

Lass, R. ed., 1999. The Cambridge history of the English language, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kerek, A. (1976). The phonological relevance of spelling pronunciation. Visible Language, 10, 323-338.

Lima, S.D., Corrigan, R.L. & Iverson, G.K., 1994. The Reality of Linguistic Rules, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Matthews, P.H., 2007. The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics 2nd ed., New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, A.S. & Wheeldon, L.R., 2006. Phonological Encoding of Words. Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/0470018860.s00257.

Millward, C.M., c1996. A biography of the English language 2nd ed., Boston: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Milroy, J., 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 5(4), pp.530-555. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1467-9481.00163.
Mugglestone, L., 2006. The Oxford history of English, New York: Oxford University Press.

Nevalainen, T., 2006. An introduction to early modern English, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, electronic online version. www.oed.com

Scragg, D.G., c1974. A history of English spelling, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stubbs, M., 1980. Language and literacy: the sociolinguistics of reading and writing, Boston: Routledge.

Trnka, B., 2014. Rozbor nynější spisovné angličtiny J. Čermák, ed., Praha: Karolinum.

Walker, J., 1997. The rhyming dictionary of the English language: in which the whole language is arranged according to its terminations : with an index of allowable rhymes Rev. and enl., London: Routledge.

Walker, J., 1791. A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sources:

Algeo, J. & Pyles, T., c2010. The origins and development of the English language 6th ed., Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Barber, C., Beal, J.C. & Shaw, P.A., 2012. The English language: a historical introduction Second edition; Canto classics edition., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, O., 2007. Sounds and spellings, Abingdon [England]: Routledge.

Kerek, A. (1976). The phonological relevance of spelling pronunciation. Visible Language, 10, 323-338.

Millward, C.M., c1996. A biography of the English language 2nd ed., Boston: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Nevalainen, T., 2006. An introduction to early modern English, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, electronic online version. www.oed.com

Scragg, D.G., c1974. A history of English spelling, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Walker, J., 1997. The rhyming dictionary of the English language: in which the whole language is arranged according to its terminations: with an index of allowable rhymes Rev. and enl., London: Routledge.

Walker, J., 1791. A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Résumé

1. Úvod

Úvodní kapitola má za úkol stručně přiblížit základní kontext, původ jevu, a stručně nastínit základní problematiku související s tématem výslovnosti podle pravopisu. Cílem této práce je dostatečně popsat jev a poskytnout základní shrnutí doposud zjištěných faktů a související diskuze a tyto dále uvést do souvislostí, neboť je zřejmé, že téma výslovnosti dle pravopisu je doposud nepříliš rozšířené, a ačkoliv může být glosováno i významnými lingvisty, většina z dostupných zdrojů se tématem nezabývá do dostačující hloubky, vyjma vědecké práce Emila Koeppela, který na jev upozorňuje a zavádí název termínu „spelling pronunciation“, a stati od Andrewa Kereka, který jako první (a zdá se, že zároveň doposud jako jediný) nabízí pohled ucelenější a shrnuje dosavadní zjištěné poznatky a upozorňuje na strukturovanost jevu (navzdory do té doby panujícímu přesvědčení, že spelling pronunciation je nepředvídatelné a nahodilé povahy).

2. Teoretická část

Část teoretická je rozdělena do čtyř podkapitol – vymezení pojmu, shrnutí kontextu s přihlédnutím na historický vývoj jazyka a doposud zjištěných dat, shrnutí základních jazykových principů a procesů které s jevem souvisí, a na závěr kapitoly shrnutí historických pramenů a užitečných odkazů.

První část se zabývá vymezením pojmu. Zde se jsme vycházeli z několika stručných definic jazykových slovníků a dále z definic jazykovědců, kteří na téma spále z definic jazykovědců spelling pronunciation publikovali. Všechny se shodují nezávisle na sobě v jednom bodě: výslovnost dle pravopisu je změna výslovnosti odrážející psanou formu jazyka. Ovšem tuto definici lze v případě anglického jazyka chápat minimálně dvěma způsoby; buď z hlediska alfabetického principu, kterým se rozumí výslovnost v níž se odráží vztah mezi fonémem a symbolem (ideálně) v poměru 1:1; nebo z hlediska tendence k tomuto směřující, tzv. fonologický princip, který vychází spíše z okolních fonémů a vnímá písmo z hlediska větších celků – slabik, který je pro anglický jazyk mnohem typičtější.

Na problematiku fonologického přístupu a historický původ slov navazuje druhá sekce – historické a teoretické pozadí jevu. Obecně se má zato, že anglický jazyk byl původně, ve

středověku, zaznamenáván alfabeticky, tedy více méně v poměru 1:1 hlásek a znaků, avšak od raně moderní angličtiny lze mluvit o rozkolu mezi formami, kde forma psaná díky standardizaci se ustálila, zatímco jazyk mluvený se vydal jinou cestou, kde spelling pronunciation má právě výslovnost vracet zpět k jazyku psanému. V této souvislosti panuje přesvědčení, že spelling pronunciation je návratem výslovnosti k původním nebo dřívějším formám. Problém však nastává v bodě etymologických přepisů románských výpůjček, které mnohdy zavádějí zcela nové tvary slov, na což pak přirozeně mluvčí reagují výslovností podle pravopisu. Dalším z aspektů jevu tedy je, že etymologické přepisy zčásti zastínily starší formy, které se pohybovaly před standardizací souběžně, tedy v tomto případě se jedná o případ spelling pronunciation, která vytlačila dřívější formu.

Tato sekce také pojednává o vlivu hyperkorekce na výslovnost dle pravopisu, která nejpravděpodobněji vychází z obecně panujícího přesvědčení mluvčích, že „správná", „korektní", či ideální výslovnost má odrážet psanou formu. Toto zmiňované přesvědčení má pravděpodobně kořeny v preskripci a s ustálením pravopisu. V souvislosti s hyperkorekcí se dále dozvídáme, že výslovnost mnohých také může být otázkou „lingvistického povědomí" (linguistic awareness). S „lingvistickým povědomím" souvisí faktor tzv. „orální tradice", tj. četnost užití daného slova a dále to, jak moc notoricky známé a užívané je dané slovo.

Část třetí shrnuje, jaké procesy a faktory operují při spelling pronunciation. Mezi tyto patří analogie, neboť fonologické rozlišování podobných struktur může mít za následek změnu ve výslovnosti, a dále podmínka, že každý mluvčí musí nejdříve slyšet, jak se dané slovo má vyslovovat. Tento náhled poukazuje právě na problematický vztah mezi psaným a mluveným jazykem a zároveň na problematiku výslovnosti místních jmen, která se vyznačují často dvěma variantami ve výslovnosti, kde jedna forma zohledňuje pravopis, a druhá nikoliv. Ta první je typická pro „outsidery", tedy pro mluvčí mimo okruh „uvědomělých", kterým nezbývá než se řídit pravopisem. Ta druhá forma výslovnosti je užívána především v rámci skupiny mluvčích, kteří již formu někdy slyšeli a tedy vědí, že například jméno *Theobald*, se vyslovuje /tibald/. Zákonitě, aby mluvčí věděl, že se například *Warwick* čte bez [w], musí nejdřív o této výslovnosti vědět.

Závěr kapitoly se věnuje stručně reformátorským hnutím z období raně moderní angličtiny a významným dobovým zdrojům. Mezi ty nejvýznamnější z dobových pramenů patří především „Výslovnostní Slovník" Johna Walkera, v jehož předmluvě se můžeme dočíst o mnohých „neduzích" ve výslovnosti, a kte**rý** posloužila jako hlavní zdroj při čerpání dat o výslovnosti diftongu [oi].

3. Metodologická část

Metodologická část je rozdělena na dvě podkapitoly. Jedna představuje metodiku sběru dat, zatímco druhá část popisuje potenciální limity a celkové problémy, na které jsme při sběru dat narazili. Klíčový problém představuje především fakt, že téma doposud nebylo zpracováno do větší hloubky. Dále je to roztříštěnost zjištěných dat a poněkud nejednotný přístup k jevu**,** kter**ý** ztěžuje práci při sběru dat, a v neposlední řadě představuje zásadní komplikaci problematické datování jednotlivých výslovnostních změn. Zatímco v případě psaného jazyka je možné dohledat a s jistou přesností určit datum změny, v případě mluveného jazyka máme (zvláště v období před 20. stoletím) k dispozici jen psané materiály. Práce se nicméně zaměřuje především na prozkoumání dosud zjištěných faktů. Součástí tohoto zjištění tedy bohužel je i fakt, že datace těchto změn je jen obtížně dohledatelná a žádný z dostupných zdrojů tyto informace neuvádí, což poněkud komplikuje jakoukoli práci s daty.

4. Analytická část

Analytická kapitola je rozdělena podle skupin nasbíraných dat do tří částí: první část shrnuje povahu dat, druhá část popisuje jaké procesy mohly hrát roli ve výsledných změnách směrem k pravopisné formě výslovnosti, část třetí dále diskutuje možné motivace**,** které mohly vést ke spellingové výslovnosti u daných slov.

Z prvního oddílu vyplývá, že nejhojnější skupiny slov jsou především slova cizího původu, a v druhé řadě složeniny a dále vlastní jména. Vesměs se jedná tedy o struktury méně obvyklé, méně časté.

Druhý oddíl vyjmenovává fonologické procesy, které můžeme pozorovat ve změnách ve výslovnosti. Především zde figuruje vložení nových hlásek na základě etymologických přepisů – například výslovnost [h] v románských výpůjčkách, dále výslovnostní posuny

založené na změně chápání struktury slova, jako například u vlastních jmen, kde dochází k reanalýze struktury *Mas+ham* na *Ma*-sh-*am*, kde výslovnost <sh> má za následek posunu k výslovnosti směrem od [s] k [š]. Ke stejnému jevu jako u *Masham* dochází u struktur s <th> a <ch>. Zároveň můžeme pozorovat vliv změny vnímání slovních struktur na typičtějších případech jako *waistcoat* a *boatswain*, kde dochází k „odhalení" dvojsloví.

Třetí pasáž se zabývá motivacemi, které směrovaly ke spellingové výslovnosti. Jedním z hlavních takovýchto motivací je hyperkorektnost. U mnohých vzorků je pravopisná výslovnost poněkud nečekaným zvratem, neboť se mnohdy jedná o slova často užívaná, slova s velkou „orální tradicí", byť se může jednat často o slova přejatá. V mnohých případech se tedy jedná o vliv přesvědčení, že „správná výslovnost" má vždy odrážet pravopis. Dále sem patří slova neobvyklých tvarů a slova zřídkakdy užívaná. Zde je motivace ryze pragmatická – „standardní" výslovnost není obecně známa a tedy nezbývá, než se řídit pravopisem.

V závěru analytické části je shrnutí sběru dat a statistický výpočet poměru jednotlivých slov, z nichž jasně vychází, že kolem 80 % ze slov se spellingovou výslovností, jsou slova ne-germánského původu, tedy (především románské, ale i jiné) výpůjčky, a zhruba kolem 70 % ze všech slov se jedná o slova která prošla etymologickým přepisem.

5. Závěr

Závěr shrnuje všechna poskytnutá data a zjištění. Hlavní konkluzí je, že spellingová výslovnost se vyskytuje především ve výpůjčkách a obecně ve slovních tvarech, které nejsou pro angličtinu tak obvyklé či transparentní. Zároveň lze spellingovou výslovnost očekávat, logicky, ve tvarech unikátních, nebo vědeckých termínech. Spellingová výslovnost je rovněž typická pro některá vlastní jména či jména místní, která mohou často mít silnou orální tradici v daném místě, ale vnější okruh mluvčích může vycházet jen z pravopisné formy. Toto je zároveň typické v případech, kdy se výslovnost posunula od psaného jazyka příliš daleko a třeba vynechává ve výslovnosti určitou hlásku, či rovnou celou slabiku. Na základě zjištěných dat lze zároveň říci, že slova se silnou „orální tradicí" jsou vůči vlivu spelling pronunciation o něco více imunní.

Appendix:

List of data

All specimens:

Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, Windstone, Daventry, Thames, Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham, Southwark, Woolwich, Comptroller, Victuals, orthography, orthoepy, quant, Aam, Abactinal, Acaulose, nilgai, nilghau, fault, assault, falcon, vault, receipt, schedule, schism, periwig, baptism, adventure, anthem, author, authority, throne, Geoduck, habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic, hospital, hotel, historical, receipt, schedule, pulse, emerald, adultery, holm, yolk, balk, stalk, ribald, solder, soldier, perfect(ion), admiral, absolve, admonish, captive, corpse, elephant, language, picture, McGrath, Rotherhithe Rothschild, obtuse, obscure, control, Direction, directive, directory, redirection, indirect, diversity, diverse, divergence, divesture, divestment, divulgation, director(ate), dissect, dichotomy, digestible, dilacerate, dilatable, dilute, dimension(al), agile, favorite, docile, juvenile, versatile, genuine, Sadist, drama, data, catsup, status, strata, aviation, apricot, pecan, pajamas, ballet, valet, chassis, secretary, military, laboratory, advertisement, bomb, bombast, combat, honest, common, astonish, constable, compass, donkey, comrade, dromedary, grovelling, hover, lexicon, Oregon, , benison, comparison, orison, resolve, resound, chef, chic, chalet, chassis, chaise, cache, chasm, chamois, chagrin, challis, chandelier, chant(e), cache, chasm, challis, charqui, chibouk, Katherine, Kathryn, Thomas, Bartholomew, , apothecary, , theatre, theme, amethyst, arthritic, authentic, lethargy, lethe, aether, panther, (de)fault, Waistcoat, cupboard, clapboard, forehead, boatswain, seamstress, coxswain, lightwood, gunwale, Often

Total: 205

common nouns Compounds

Waistcoat, cupboard, clapboard, forehead, boatswain, seamstress, coxswain, lightwood, gunwale

Total: 9

Proper nouns

Oregon, Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, Windstone, Daventry, Thames, Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham, Southwark, Woolwich, McGrath, Rotherhithe, Rothschild, Katherine, Kathryn, Thomas, Bartholomew, Theobald

Total: 33

Compounded proper nouns

Maidstone, Warwick, Norwich, Harwich, Greenwich, Whitehaven, Whitelocke, Cirencister, Beaconsfield, Shrewsbury, Windstone, Daventry, Thames, Gotham, Wrentham, Waltham, Walsham, Lewisham, Feversham, Horsham, Masham, Southwark, Woolwich, McGrath, Rotherhithe, Rothschild

Total: 27

Borrowings

receipt, schedule, schism, fault, assault, falcon, vault, pulse, emerald, adultery, holm, yolk, balk, stalk, ribald, solder, soldier, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism, absolve, admonish, captive, corpse, elephant, falcon, language, picture throne, obtuse, obscure, quant, periwig, comptroller, control, victuals, anthem, author, authority, throne, habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic, hospital, herb, hotel, historic(al), hostile, hostel, hostler, human, humus, humid, huge, (homage, heir) geoduck benison, comparison, orison resolve, resound chef, chic, chalet, chassis, chaise, cache, chasm, chamois, chagrin, challis, chandelier, chant(e), cache, chasm, challis, , charqui, chibouk Comptroller, Victuals, orthography, orthoepy, quant, Aam, Abactinal, Acaulose, nilgai, nilghau, data, Sadist, drama, data, catsup, status, strata, aviation, apricot, pecan, pajamas, ballet, valet, chassis, secretary, military, laboratory, advertisement, bomb, bombast, compass, comrade Direction, directive, directory, redirection, indirect, diversity, diverse, divergence, divesture, divestment, divulgation, director(ate), dissect, dichotomy, digestible, dilacerate, dilatable, dilute, dimension(al), agile, favorite, docile, juvenile, versatile, genuine

total: 144

Etymological Respellings

Advertisement, receipt, schedule, schism, fault, assault, falcon, vault, pulse, emerald, adultery, holm, yolk, balk, stalk, ribald, solder, soldier, adventure, perfect(ion), admiral, baptism, absolve, admonish, captive, corpse, elephant, falcon, language, picture, throne, obtuse, obscure, quant, periwig, comptroller, control, victuals, anthem, author, authority, throne, habit, harmony, hemisphere, herb, heritage, host, humble, humour, heretic, hospital, herb, hotel, historic(al), hostile, hostel, hostler, human, humus, humid, huge, (homage, heir) orthography, orthoepy

Total 66