University of Glasgow

Campbell, Molly (2021) *The relationship between sound and spelling in Alexander Hume's Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue.* MPhil(R) thesis.

https://theses.gla.ac.uk/82623/

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses
https://theses.gla.ac.uk/
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

The relationship between sound and spelling in Alexander Hume's *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue*

Molly Campbell

MA(Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Philosophy

School of Critical Studies
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

September 2021

Abstract

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century orthoepy has received a considerable amount of attention over the past several decades in the study of Early Modern English. One scholar who has received much less attention is Scottish schoolmaster Alexander Hume, whose c.1617 text *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* presents an unusual form of orthoepic text; Hume was not simply making use of the London-based educated standard form of language, but was instead formulating an interaction between Scots and English at the level of both spelling and pronunciation, without favouring one side or the other arbitrarily. This study affords the *Orthographie* the attention it deserves, examining Hume's handling of spellings, sounds, and the relationship between them as he manoeuvres between Scots and English usages, and indeed Latin. This study also places his work in a larger context, offering a fuller biographical account of his career than has yet appeared and positioning his work in relation to other contemporary discussions on language issues.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments 4
List of Tables 5
List of Abbreviations 6

1. Introduction 7
2. On the *Orthographie* 9
   - 2.1. An introduction to the text 9
   - 2.2. Modern scholarship on the *Orthographie* 11
     - 2.2.1. Henry B. Wheatley 11
     - 2.2.2. Eric J. Dobson 12
     - 2.2.3. Veronika Kniezsa 14
     - 2.2.4. Other discussions 15
   - 2.3. Outline of the rest of this study 16
3. Contexts 20
   - 3.1. Alexander Hume’s life 20
     - 3.1.1. Hume’s education and early teaching years 21
     - 3.1.2. Hume at Edinburgh High School 26
     - 3.1.3. Later years at Prestonpans and Dunbar 30
   - 3.2. Scotland and England during Hume’s lifetime 35
     - 3.2.1. Scotland’s relationship with England during Hume’s lifetime 35
     - 3.2.2. The English view of Scotland 36
     - 3.2.3. The King 37
       - 3.2.3.1. James VI and I and his kingdoms 38
       - 3.2.3.2. James VI and I, the Kirk, and the Church 39
       - 3.2.3.3. James VI and I’s writings and his views on language 40
   - 3.3. General directions of linguistic scholarship around Hume 42
     - 3.3.1. The doctrine of *littera* 42
     - 3.3.2. Other orthoepists around Hume’s time 43
     - 3.3.3. Orthoepy in Scotland 51
4. The contents of the *Orthographie* 52
   - 4.1. Chapter analysis of the *Orthographie* 52
   - 4.2. Hume’s rules 68
   - 4.3. Comparative transcriptions 72
5. Case studies and discussion 81
   - 5.1. Case study – <quh-> spellings and <wh-> spellings 81
   - 5.2. Case study – Hume and the pronunciation of <u> 85
   - 5.3. Internal successes or failures 87
     - 5.3.1. Quality of descriptions and terminology 87
     - 5.3.2. Internal consistency of spelling 89
     - 5.3.3. Coverage and gaps 90
   - 5.4. External successes or failures: intentions and impact 92
   - 5.5. Hume’s overall idea of the relationship between spelling and sound 94
6. Conclusion 95

Bibliography 96

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to my supervisors, Professor Jeremy Smith and Dr Joanna Kopaczyk, for whose guidance and support I am profoundly grateful.

I also owe countless thanks to my flatmate Sophie Young, who has been endlessly patient with me throughout this project, which I imagine was a difficult task at times.

List of Tables

Table 1 – Table of Hume’s spelling rules 70-72

Table 2 – Comparative transcriptions 77-78

List of Abbreviations

DSL – *Dictionaries of the Scots Language / Dictionars o the Scots Leid*

EETS – Early English Text Society

ODNB – *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

OED – *Oxford English Dictionary*

1. Introduction

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century orthoepy has received a considerable amount of attention over the past several decades in the study of Early Modern English. Orthoepy is described by the OED as 'That branch of linguistics which deals with pronunciation, phonology; spec. the study of the relationship between pronunciation and a system of writing or spelling.' Figures such as William Bullokar, Sir Thomas Smith, John Hart, and Richard Mulcaster have been studied in depth by historical linguists for years (Dobson 1968, Lass 1999, and Salmon 1999 to name a few), who have provided analyses of these authors' orthographic systems and commentaries on the evidence they supply for early modern pronunciation, and how these two systems interacted. These orthoepists were usually Englishmen who focused in many cases on the speech of the educated London-based classes. This focus was the general basis for linguistic thought, relating to the contemporary drive for standardised forms of speech and writing.

There are other early modern writers on pronunciation and spelling who have been less studied by modern scholars. One such is Alexander Hume, a Scottish schoolmaster. Though he has received some attention sporadically in the past, most extensively in Dobson's *English Pronunciation 1500-1700* (1968) and Veronika Kniezsa's (1997) article about his spelling habits, Hume's c.1617 text, *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue*, is comparatively unexamined by present-day linguists. Hume deviates from the norm in early modern orthoepy, in that he was a Scottish writer who did not take educated London speech as a preferable standard usage. He was also unusual in his intention to align the use of vernacular in England and Scotland with each other, both in speech and writing, and in not automatically taking the English usage as superior to the Scottish usage. Though Hume spent most of his life in Scotland, he also lived and taught for sixteen years in England before he took up a schoolmaster's position in Edinburgh, hence his unusual approach. His background is, therefore, as unusual as his ideology.

The lack of attention previously given to the *Orthographie* is disappointing, given its distinctive position in the world of orthoepy. What work has been done on this text has left comparatively unexamined Hume's ideas about the relationship between sound and spelling, which is one of the fundamental features of his text. Previous study has focused on either sound or spelling, but little has been done on the relationship between them.

It is the intention of this study to carry out an in-depth examination of the relationship

between spellings and sounds in Hume’s work in its own terms, rather than as a flawed piece of evidence for the evolution of standard English speech and writing.

As already flagged, the *Orthographie* receives merely brief discussions in recent scholarship, with Dobson (1968) and Kniezsa (1997) studying it in more depth. The work of these latter scholars, however, does not give much of a description of what it is that Hume is trying to do, or why the *Orthographie* exists. They focus on specific aspects of Hume’s work: in Dobson’s case, evidence about the pronunciation of standard English, and in Kniezsa’s the anglicisation of spelling in Scotland. It does not appear that a ‘bigger picture’ assessment of Hume’s work has been carried out. It is held in this thesis that it is important to take into account what Hume was trying to do with this work in order to understand what has been said within it, i.e. how the treatise’s design relates to its goals: the function of the text must inform our assessment of it, to ensure relevance and accuracy in our judgements. Hume’s intentions are made clear in the *Orthographie*, and the present work will account for his aims when assessing the treatise’s qualities.

Dobson and Kniezsa also only deal with the sociocultural aspects in a very limited way. They both give a very brief biography of Hume, but the only aspect that they really focus on in relation to the linguistic aspects is the time that he spent in England. This is undeniably an important factor to take into consideration, but so many other events and individuals could have affected Hume’s work. Additionally, the doctrine of *littera*, a fundamental feature of linguistic study in Hume’s time, must be considered when working with such a text. Dobson and Kniezsa attach a lot of importance to whether or not a particular form in the *Orthographie* is Scots or English, without considering the external factors which could have led to Hume making those choices, or whether or not he even made those choices based on their Scottishness or Englishness. In both of these studies of the *Orthographie*, what is lacking is attention to both internal and external contexts in order to inform the judgements being made. The aim of this study is to examine the *Orthographie* on the basis of Hume’s intentions.

2. On the *Orthographie*

2.1. An introduction to the text

Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue is an early seventeenth-century orthoepic treatise in which Alexander Hume, a Scottish schoolmaster who had worked in grammar schools in England and Scotland (see Chapter 3), addresses the state of spelling, pronunciation, and grammar in Scotland and England. He takes the novel approach of trying to align Scottish and English forms of the vernacular with each other, as well as trying to regularise Latin pronunciation across the two countries.

The original version of the treatise is found in one surviving manuscript: Royal MS 17 A XI, in the British Library. According to the British Library Catalogue, this manuscript is bound together with two other unrelated items: Royal MS 17 A IX and Royal MS 17 A X. It does not appear that the text was published in print until Wheatley's edition. [1]

The British Library's record of the manuscript places its creation between 1603 and 1625, notes the dedication to King James VI and I, and states that the dedication and closing verse of the treatise are 'probably [written] in the hand of the author'. This author was identified by Henry B. Wheatley as Alexander Hume, former master of the Edinburgh High School and author of the *Grammatica Nova* (British Library Catalogue). Wheatley gives more detail on some of these points. He states that there are no means of ascertaining the exact date of the manuscript's creation, but that the dedication suggests that it was written shortly after James' visit to Scotland in 1617 (Wheatley 1870: iv). In that dedication, Hume states that he 'set my-selfe, about a yeer syne, to seek a remedie for that maladie' (of 'uncertentie' in people's writing), and later mentions the King's visit to Scotland (Wheatley 1870: 1-2). If we are looking at the space of about a year around the King's Scottish progress, then that would place the writing of the dedication at no later than 1618. Further evidence for this dating is supplied by the rhyming couplet that closes the *Congruitie*, which refers to 'Our king, *and* Queen' (Wheatley 1870: 34); James' wife Queen Anne died in 1619, so we must infer that this text was written before her death. The dedication suggests that the contents of the tract were written before the dedication itself, as Hume notes that he had finished the treatise before coming across Baret's *Alvearie* and

[1] The *Orthographie* will be henceforth referred to under Wheatley's name, due to the use of his edition.

the work of Sir Thomas Smith, and after that point came James' visit (Wheatley 1870: 1-2). In which case, Wheatley would not be quite right in his assertion, and the treatise would have been written shortly before James' progress, likely late 1616 to early 1617. The dedication would have been written after, around the latter end of 1617 and the earlier part of 1618.

Wheatley also notes that the dedication, titles, and the last two lines (the verse mentioned in the British Library's record) are all written in a different colour of ink to that of the body of the manuscript, and that they also appear to be in a different hand. Wheatley does not state that the dedication and closing verse are likely in the hand of the author, as the British Library's record does, but if we were to work on the assumption that this is the case, then it is perhaps important to keep in mind that the body of the manuscript may have been copied by someone else.

Henry B. Wheatley's edition of the *Orthographie and Congruitie* is the first and only publication of the treatise. Wheatley initially published it in 1865, with a second edition in 1870. It is this second edition which is used in the present study. Wheatley's editorial approach was limited to presenting a text with little information, although he does note a couple of small modifications to remedy perceived errors made in the manuscript (Wheatley 1870: 15, 19, 21, 22, 37). He also, as he indicates in a footnote, dispenses with punctuation used in the manuscript if he considers it to confuse the meaning for modern readers (Wheatley 1870: 37).

The treatise is split into two sections. The first is *Of the Orthographie of the Britan tongue; a treates noe shorter then necessarie, for the schooles*. This section (Wheatley 1870: 7-23) makes up a larger portion of the full tract than its counterpart, and is focused on the pronunciation of Latin and the vernacular in both England and Scotland, as well as the spelling system of English/Scots. The second section, which is considerably smaller than the *Orthographie*, is *Of the Congruitie of the Britan tongue*. In this latter section (Wheatley 1870: 27-34) Hume describes grammatical features in English/Scots; it is generally not relevant to the present study, which is primarily focused on the *Orthographie*.

The *Orthographie*'s central goal is to regularise spelling and pronunciation across Scotland and England on the basis of Hume's belief that the two nations use the same

vernacular language: an interesting perspective. Hume's discussions of pronunciation and spelling make up the majority of the *Orthographie*, with the rest of this section made up of an opening chapter on the 'Groundes of Orthographie' and two chapters at the end concerning 'accent' (stress patterns) and the use of apostrophes and hyphens. An analysis of the contents of the *Orthographie* is given in Chapter 4 of this study.

The obsequious dedication to King James VI and I at the beginning of the treatise describes Hume's intention to produce an English grammar which could, with the King's approval, be used to regularise language use across Scotland and England. He notes that the King, upon his return to Scotland in 1617, was displeased with how his courtiers used the vernacular, and had declared his aim to have the universities create an English grammar to prevent his subjects (the educated ones, at least) from misusing the language. Hume claims that he had already identified the same issues and begun to write on the subject 'about a yeer syne' (Wheatley 1870: 1). His focus also falls upon the education system, and he addresses educators throughout the *Orthographie* – both to instruct them and occasionally to implore aid. His aim is to use a logical system to improve linguistic education across the two kingdoms.

2.2. Modern scholarship on the *Orthographie*

2.2.1. Henry B. Wheatley

Wheatley does not include much discussion on the tract in his edition, as he has no intention to provide analysis of the text, but he does make a few comments. He states that the treatise is 'of great interest' both for 'its intrinsic merit' and Hume's 'racy' writing style (Wheatley 1870: 35). He says little to explain his opinions about the treatise's 'intrinsic merit', however.

Wheatley first published an edition of the *Orthographie* in 1865 for the Early English Text Society (EETS), of which he was a founding member. Wheatley was primarily an antiquarian and a distinguished bibliographer, who at the time was clerk-librarian to the Royal Society (ODNB[2]). The *Orthographie* was EETS's fifth volume, published only one year after the society's foundation (EETS). This early appearance in EETS's programme suggests at least an awareness of the *Orthographie*'s existence in previous years, but it had

[2] For fuller details on all ODNB entries used, see the ODNB reference in the bibliography.

not been mentioned by any of the nineteenth-century authors from whom we can take information about Hume's life, and Wheatley's preface to the second edition briefly discusses the authorship of the text without any reference to other discussions (1870: v), implying that it had largely been overlooked until the 1860s.

In his brief commentary on the particulars of the text, Wheatley picks up on Hume's tendency to spell a given word in multiple ways, even though he had expressed his disapproval of uncertain spellings in the dedication: a fault which cannot be blamed on printers' errors (Wheatley 1870: 35). Of these variable spellings, Wheatley says that there are 'numberless […] instances that it would be tedious to enumerate' (1870: 35). He also notes the mixing of English and Scots forms, for example 'ane' and 'one', or 'nae' and 'noe' (Wheatley 1870: 35). Hume's awareness of the differences between English and Scots is also noted by Wheatley, who describes Hume's favouring of Scots forms in words derived from Latin as opposed to the English forms of the same, and also asserts that Hume is 'by no means partial, and gives us [the English] praise when he thinks we deserve it' (Wheatley 1870: 36). Wheatley seems to come the closest to acknowledging Hume's approach in his choices; he favoured the options he deemed most logical and having the most merit.

2.2.2. Eric J. Dobson

E.J. Dobson's authoritative study *English Pronunciation 1500-1700* includes a few pages on Hume and the *Orthographie* (1968: I, 316-321), focusing primarily on the vowel qualities implied by Hume's comments on pronunciation. Dobson is, overall, unimpressed by Hume, but a number of his criticisms are perhaps less justifiable in the light of later scholarship. It should be noted that Dobson was specifically focusing on a London-centric 'standard' form of English, which Hume himself did not use, though he would likely have been reasonably familiar with such a form during his years in England. Furthermore, Dobson does not account for Hume's intentions with this text. Hume intends to align Scottish and English vernacular usages with each other – without favouring one form or the other arbitrarily. Dobson, however, seems to approach this text under the impression that Hume should be treating the English of the south as automatically superior, and judges Hume's merit accordingly. We have already flagged that Hume's aim was to align English and Scottish usage (see Chapter 1). The offerings of the *Orthographie* regarding a standard form of the language, then, do not quite align with Dobson's teleological approach.

Dobson's focus is on the speech-sound aspect of Hume's work, and skips over the orthographical aspects in many cases as these are not relevant to his study (in particular Hume's aim towards spelling reform). Given the subject of Dobson's study this makes sense, but it does somewhat limit the understanding of the text in general. It also, perhaps, limits what Dobson can take away regarding the phonological aspects, as he does not engage in a serious way with the Scots element in Hume's discussion; Dobson gives an account of Hume's life, after which he notes that Hume's language use would be 'marked with Scotticisms' (1968: I, 317). This statement underplays the importance of Scots in the *Orthographie*.

Dobson criticises Hume on a number of fronts, one of which being that the *Orthographie* is 'confused' and that Hume is an 'inattentive' observer (Dobson 1968: I, 137, 319). Undoubtedly this text is confusing and has a number of failings, but Dobson's selection of criticisms is rather peculiar. He criticises some of Hume's choices of examples on the grounds of their Middle English values rather than their contemporary values (Dobson 1968: I, 319-320). He also allows Hume very little credit as a phonetician, claiming that he cannot distinguish sound from symbol (Dobson 1968: I, 317, 320) and he criticises Hume's point of view concerning the spelling of <wh-> or <quh-> words (e.g. <what>/<quhat>), claiming that Hume's perspective illustrates 'how deplorable an ear he must have had' (Dobson 1968: I, 321). We will contend with some of the finer points of Dobson's comments on Hume, particularly this last point, in Chapter 5.

Dobson's closing remarks on Hume's work are that it is 'amusing rather than useful', that he generally does not deal with standard English, and that 'his treatment is haphazard, and his descriptions are unusually difficult to interpret' (1968: I, 321). He allows that this work 'give[s] an impression of the nature of Scottish speech at the beginning of the seventeenth century and its differences from English', as well as its ability to resist the influence of English pronunciation (Dobson 1968: I, 321). Dobson in general is highly critical of Hume's work – in several places, I will argue, unjustly so. Certainly, the *Orthographie* is of little use for Dobson's discussion, given that he was focusing on southern standard English, and many of his less justifiable criticisms appear to stem from this focus. In general, as I will argue later in this study, Dobson does not seem to have taken into consideration what it was that Hume was trying to do, nor does he give much in

the way of credit for Hume's merits. It will be the aim of following discussion to approach the *Orthographie* differently.

2.2.3. Veronika Kniezsa

Like Dobson, Kniezsa limits her 1997 article on Hume's *Orthographie* primarily to one aspect of language: spelling. As in Dobson's case, this narrower approach limits her overall understanding of the text, since the speech-sound aspects have a significant impact on Hume's orthographic system. Kniezsa, moreover, does not study Hume's 'rules'. Early on in her discussion, Kniezsa asserts that in the *Orthographie*, Hume is found 'frequently promoting the southern orthographic traditions over his native Scottish ones' (1997: 52). She states that 'textual analysis of the treatise should be based on two aspects: a) what Alexander Hume wrote on Scottish and English orthography, and b) what his own spelling conventions were' (Kniezsa 1997: 52-53). Certainly, these two aspects are both useful and interesting, but there is another important element missing: Hume's logic for his eventual rules. To overlook Hume's selection process for spellings is to overlook the point of the whole text. Kniezsa states that point b) will be carried out by a statistical analysis (1997: 53), which becomes the main focus of her study, so we miss out somewhat on Hume's reasoning in this article. She also observes that the manuscript is unique, and so 'can be presumed to represent Hume's own writing habits, without the admixture of printers' conventions' (Kniezsa 1997: 53). However the manuscript is possibly written in two hands, suggesting that there was potential for scribal intervention. Kniezsa's orthographic analysis, however, does demonstrate that the spelling habits are consistent throughout the text (1997: 52). This finding suggests that the spelling system in use is Hume's 'own'.

Kniezsa (1997: 53-54) briefly places Hume within the broader context of orthoepy at the time and points out the impact that classical learning had on Hume and his contemporaries, also noting that – relatively speaking – his orthographic system is quite conservative. Though she has noted that Hume is proposing a reformed orthographic system, she does not refer to this system when she discusses her statistical analysis of his spellings in the text. Her statistical analysis is focused on whether a particular form from within the text is Scots, English, or 'neutral' (i.e. it appears in both English and Scots). The focus is on the vowels mainly, though some consonants are also discussed, as well as specific words (Kniezsa 1997: 54-57). Kniezsa numbers the frequencies of specifically Scots usages and of specifically English usages, and then calculates the percentage of

Scots, English, or neutral forms used by Hume (Kniezsa 1997: 56-57). The majority are neutral, she notes, but there are many more English forms than Scots forms (Kniezsa 1997: 57). She then makes several comments on his choices of particular forms, for example Scots <quh-> instead of English <wh-> (which she notes fits with his commentary on this matter), or the English <sh-> instead of Scots <sch->. We will discuss some of the finer points of Kniezsa's comments on Hume in Chapter 5 of this study.

Kniezsa concludes that Hume has not been 'an influential author' (1997: 59), which is undeniable. She points out that his suggestions were 'unheeded' and that the work was never publicised (Kniezsa 1997: 59). She is of the opinion that few people would have been interested in following his ideas, as 'they were entirely counter to any existing spelling tradition, Scots or English' (Kniezsa 1997: 59). This is a likelihood, if not a near-certainty, though Hume will have at least been in good company in this neglect; ultimately, what spelling reformer did meet with far-reaching success? She also asserts that he misidentified certain spelling forms as identical, e.g. <hal>. She calls him 'a very Anglicised writer' and reiterates her percentages of Scots, English, and neutral forms to back this (Kniezsa 1997: 60). Kniezsa's view is that the lack of familiarity in the orthographic forms Hume uses, both Scottish and English, would not have allowed his orthography to become influential (1997: 60).

Kniezsa also wonders whether Hume tried his theories in his own school (Kniezsa 1997: 60). Given that grammar schools focused on Latin and sometimes other classical languages rather than the vernacular, it seems unlikely that he did, although some orthoepists may have taught their systems to pupils; it has been proposed that Alexander Gil, schoolmaster and author of the *Logonomia Anglica* (1621) might have imposed some of his usages on his best-known pupil at St Paul's school in London, the poet John Milton, though Dobson warns against attributing too much to Gil's influence (Dobson 1968: I, 154-155). Kniezsa's final word on this treatise is that it is an 'interesting piece of seventeenth-century writing' demonstrating the differences in pronunciation between Scots and English (1997: 60). She gives Hume more credit than Dobson does, probably in part because she does not focus, as Dobson does, solely on the southern standard.

2.2.4. Other discussions

Hume's *Orthographie* is also mentioned in a few other places, with less detailed discussion taking place. Lass (1999: 85) very briefly mentions him as the earliest source of ME [a] being raised to [æ]. Salmon (1999: 34-35) also briefly discusses Hume's *Orthographie*, stating that he 'might have been influential, had his work been printed at the time', and that he 'seems to have aimed […] at a consistent orthography, rather than a totally phonetic one'. A third instance is found in Smith's *Older Scots: A linguistic reader* (2012: 133-137). Smith notes Dobson's treatment of Hume, as well as Hume's awareness of others in his field and his reliance on 'the classical distinctions between *figura* […] and *potestas* […] which he sees as linked by mental congruence' (Smith 2012: 133). These elements are part of the traditional doctrine of *littera*, the keystone of linguistic study at the level of symbols and sounds, which we will discuss in section 3.3.1. In Smith's work, parts of the *Orthographie* are used as part of the reader, and a few of Hume's distinctively Scots and English forms are noted (Smith 2012: 133).

Hume also appears in Venezky's *The Structure of English Orthography* (1970: 18-21), where he is granted the position of a prominent grammarian. Though it appears that Hume is not afforded many references in this work besides an account of the *Orthographie* (a search within this book only shows Hume's name in the few pages given to recording some of the content of his work and once elsewhere to note that he had commented on graphemic variation in homophones), he is credited by Venezky as being significant in this field (Venezky 1970: 18-21). Venezky's discussion of Hume's *Orthographie* is generally limited to describing some of its proposed rules, but he does note Hume's description of <j> and <v>, which he says was not widely adopted for another century (Venezky 1970: 20), and states that 'Hume's notes are valuable for what they reveal about the development of orthographic practices' (Venezky 1970: 21).

Hume is also referred to by David Abercrombie (1949), who describes how the relationship between spelling and sound was perceived from antiquity into the early modern period. Abercrombie's work on what is known as 'the doctrine of *littera*' (and subsequent modern recuperations of the doctrine, notably by Lass & Laing 2013) will be discussed further in section 3.3.1 below.

2.3. Outline of the rest of this study

The study of historical English and Scots has progressed considerably since the work of Dobson and Kniezsa, and historical linguistic enquiry has been 'refocused' away from the evolution of a 'standard' form. It seems, therefore, that Hume's *Orthographie* deserves reassessment. Our first steps will be to establish, in as much depth as possible, the details of Hume's life, and then give some notable information about certain aspects of the world around him. The next chapter of this study, Chapter 3, will begin with a detailed biography of Alexander Hume. This will include as much information as possible about his education and work, the people around him, and his interests. This biographical study is key to understanding Hume as a person and his way of thinking. It will provide us with a background against which to consider the *Orthographie* by demonstrating potential influences on his thinking and possible motives behind his work. Who was around him? What were they doing? How did he respond to them? What was he taught? What did he teach others? What influences might he have exerted upon others, and they upon him?

Following this biographical sketch, we will branch out into relevant aspects of the broader situation in Scotland and England during Hume's life (section 3.2). Specifically, we will examine (briefly) the relationship between the two countries (sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2), and King James' relationships with his two kingdoms, their religious institutions, and their languages (section 3.2.3). As the text is dedicated to the King, it is important to understand the impact that royal views on England, Scotland, authority, and language may have had on Hume. These factors are all important for helping us to understand the context in which Hume was producing this text. This chapter ends with a description of the important doctrine of *littera* (section 3.3.1), a brief account of a number of prominent orthoepists who preceded Hume or whose work was contemporary with the *Orthographie* (section 3.3.2), and a short discussion of orthoepy in Scotland (section 3.3.3), all providing a background of linguistic study against which Hume was working.

Chapter 4 will deal with the contents of the *Orthographie*. (For the most part, we will not concern ourselves too much with the *Congruitie*, the shorter second part of the work which discusses grammar, as that falls outside of the focus of this study.) This chapter will begin with a detailed descriptive analysis of the contents of the *Orthographie* (section 4.1). The reason for undertaking this task is that the *Orthographie*, though short, is dense and at times confusing. This in-depth discussion of the contents of the text, which does not appear to have been done in other examinations of the *Orthographie*, is intended to aid

understanding of the work and offer a revaluation of its worth as evidence for the history of English and Scots, and for contemporary attitudes to these varieties. It will discuss some of the more complex and confusing aspects of the text, with a view to their resolution. The basic intention of this part of the study is to ensure as thorough an understanding as possible of what the *Orthographie* says, and following this undertaking there will be a much more brief, streamlined version of his rules, which will lay out the details which we are mainly interested in: what spellings Hume associates with what sounds, some of his example words, and any criteria Hume sets for these sounds or spellings to be used (section 4.2; Table 1).

Following this section, we will examine Hume's spelling system in practice (section 4.3). We will begin with a part of the original text as taken from Wheatley's (1870) edition. This piece of text will be part of Chapter 7 Section 8, the '*quh-* story', which is possibly the most noted part of this work. This text will be replicated in the original spelling as recorded by Wheatley (1870: 18), and it will be set against three different transcriptions of this particular piece, using the IPA. The first will be a transcription of this piece in an approximation of the Scots pronunciation of the day. The second will be a transcription of the same section in an approximation of the English pronunciation of the day, focusing generally on the southern, London-centred pronunciation. The basis on which these transcriptions were produced will precede the transcriptions themselves. The third and final transcription will make use of our table of spelling-to-sound rules taken from Hume's text (Table 1), to demonstrate what Hume's rules might produce in terms of speech. This last transcription will, of course, be rather experimental, but it should offer something of a view of what Hume's work would have resulted in, and where there are gaps in the *Orthographie*. These transcriptions will provide points of discussion for the final part of this study by allowing comparisons to be made between the Scots and English pronunciations of the day, and what the *Orthographie* would tell us about speech.

Chapter 5 will analyse a number of points regarding Hume's treatment of spelling and sound, and the general merit of the text. We will begin with two case studies, in which we will examine the particulars of Hume's discussion concerning one consonant and one vowel (sections 5.1 and 5.2). We will then discuss the *Orthographie* in broader terms, starting with the internal successes or failures of the work: the qualities of his descriptions and terminology; the internal consistency of his spelling; and the extent of the coverage of the *Orthographie* and where it has gaps (section 5.3). These conclusions will be followed

by a discussion on the external successes or failures of the text (section 5.4): what were Hume's intentions and ambitions, and what was the impact of the text over time? Finally, the overall approach to the relationship between spelling and sound will be summarised (section 5.5).

It must be noted that this study has a potential limitation: it has not been possible to view the original manuscript. As the COVID-19 pandemic stretched throughout the entirety of the undertaking of this project, it was not possible to work from the manuscript, either in person or in digital form. Instead, this study makes use of Wheatley's 1870 edition of the text. There is, therefore, the potential for inaccuracies in the text used, which may perhaps impact the analysis at times. However, the Wheatley edition appears to generally be deemed a good representation of the manuscript text, so we may hope that any inaccuracies that do exist in the 1870 text have a very limited impact on this study. Wheatley, though highly productive, was by all accounts a careful and thorough person: 'his writing was not dashed off and his research was usually thorough' (ODNB).

3. Contexts

Before we address the contents of the *Orthographie*, it is important to take the time to understand the author and the world he lived in. The following chapter will bring together information about Alexander Hume's life, details about the people he was associated with, his education and his work, as well as relevant information about Scotland and England at the time. Understanding Hume's life and world is key to understanding what may have influenced his work. It will help to shed light on the choices he made within the *Orthographie* and why he made them. This chapter will also include a discussion of the context of linguistic study within which Hume was working.

3.1. Alexander Hume's life

The story of Hume's life has been pieced together by a number of scholars, in varying degrees of detail. These biographies date back to the nineteenth century at their earliest, and are often produced as part of a study about something or someone else.

Hume's life has been discussed in Steven's *History of the High School, Edinburgh* (1849) and McCrie's *Life of Andrew Melville* (of which there are various editions; the present study uses the 1899 edition). These two texts are the main sources used by Wheatley in his short biography of Hume (1870). More recently, Durkan's *Scottish Schools and Schoolmasters, 1560-1633* (2013) incorporated a fairly lengthy biography of Hume, and Kniezsa's article on the *Orthographie* (1997) involves a much shorter description of his life. This latter biography appears to be a streamlined, easily-digestible version of Wheatley's work. Hume does not appear in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hence ODNB), though a number of his associates do. Hume's name also appears in published collections of university records: the *Early Records of the University of St Andrews* (Anderson 1926), the *Register of the University of Oxford* (Clark 1887), and *Alumni Oxoniensis* (Foster 1891).

The aim of this section is to use these sources and a selection of others to produce as in-depth an account of Hume's life as possible, building up an image of the world he lived in and the people around him, to understand how he thought (or may have thought) and how this might have affected his work. A clearer idea of Hume's mindset will, it is hoped, aid us in our understanding of the text in question. What were his priorities? What were his

thoughts on language and education? How might his work have impacted the angle he took with the *Orthographie*?

3.1.1. Hume's education and early teaching years

The year of Hume's birth is only mentioned in one source: the Scottish History Society's *Scottish Schools and Schoolmasters, 1560-1633* (Durkan 2013), which places his birth in 1550, 'presumably in Dunbar' (Durkan 2013: 112). In other sources, his birth year is deemed unknown. Dunbar, it may be assumed, is taken as the likeliest place of his birth due to his attendance at Dunbar Grammar School under Andrew Simson (Durkan 2013: 112; Wheatley 1870: vi; see also ODNB for the following information on Simson). Simson was a graduate of King's College in Aberdeen, and had formerly been master of the Perth Grammar School. He was named to a committee of grammarians in 1575 – long after Hume had left Dunbar – and produced part of an intended national Latin grammar by 1580, which would be known as the *Dunbar Rudiments*. It is possible that Hume's Latin education would have shown some very early echoes of the *Dunbar Rudiments*. He was also educated in his early years by a man who held an interest in how 'correctly' Latin was being taught: an interest Hume would come to share.

From Dunbar Grammar School, Hume went to St Andrews University, attending St Mary's College (Wheatley 1870: vi; Durkan 2013: 112). As some sources point out, there were several men by the name of Alexander Hume (or Home) living around the same time, and indeed there were a number of them attending St Mary's College at St Andrews in the late 1560s and early 1570s. In the *Early Records of the University of St Andrews* (Anderson 1926), the index of student names groups the page references for individuals, and this system shows three Alexander Humes in attendance around the right time. The first was incorporated in 1567-8 (Anderson 1926: 275-276) and graduated with an MA in 1572 (Anderson 1926: 167). The second was incorporated in 1568-9 (Anderson 1926: 277), graduated with a BA in 1571 (Anderson 1926: 166), and then graduated with an MA in 1572 (Anderson 1926: 169). The third was incorporated in 1571-2 (Anderson 1926: 281), graduated with a BA in 1574 (Anderson 1926: 171-172), and was named as an Intrant in 1575-6 (Anderson 1926: 175-6). Wheatley (1870: vi) and (following Wheatley) Kniezsa (1997: 52) are both of the opinion that the Alexander Hume in question was the 1574 graduate. McCrie mentions all three Humes, but does not select one as the most likely (McCrie 1899: 472), and Durkan likewise does not select one, but does also add

1575-6 as a possible graduation date (2013: 112). This 1575-6 date given by Durkan is taken from the St Andrews *Acta Facultatis* (Dunlop 1964: 460), which does match the *Early Records* (Anderson 1926: 176). In both cases, an Alexander Hume is listed as an Intrant, which – according to Anderson (1926: viii) – is different to being a graduate, so the 1575-6 date can be dismissed. It also appears that the Hume who graduated with a BA in 1574 was in fact Alexander Hume the poet, minister of Logie; the ODNB credits him with this degree and graduation date from the same college. As shall be demonstrated later, Hume the grammarian had graduated with an MA from St Andrews, not a BA (or not *solely* a BA). Hume the grammarian, then, will probably be either the first or second of our St Andrews students; so it seems at least possible that Alexander Hume was incorporated between the end of 1567 and the beginning of 1569, possibly graduated with a BA in 1571, and graduated with an MA at some point in 1572. If, as is stated by Durkan (2013: 112), we take 1550 as his year of birth, he would have matriculated at the University between the ages of 17 and 19, and graduated with his MA at the age of about 22.

Hume was studying at St Andrews shortly after the reformation, which – according to Steven Reid – actually affected the arts curriculum very little. Reid (2011: 15) notes that at all three of the Scottish universities which existed at the time, ‘the overriding impression is one of paralysis followed by stasis […] and the vast majority of their pre-reformation academic framework (particularly at St Andrews) was retained wholesale or modified with the minimum of effort’. In the arts, this curriculum consisted of a heavy focus on Aristotle in Latin translation (Reid 2011: 7). There had, in the initial foundation of St Mary’s College, been a recommendation to form a multilingual institution which would teach not only Latin but the ‘original source languages’ of the bible (Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Chaldaic) but this did not come to fruition (Reid 2011: 18-19).

Prospective students on the arts course at St Andrews at this time had to have some Latin ability upon entry (Reid 2011: 38). Reid states that arts students in the 1560s would be taught all of Aristotle’s *Organon* and at least two books of the *Ethics* before achieving their BA, and fourth-year students would study some Aristotelian natural philosophy texts and some mathematics, with the possible addition of some ‘pure philosophy’ texts in Latin or Greek at the discretion of the college principal (Reid 2011: 38-39); the fourth year of study was undertaken for the degree of MA.

Reid also notes the account that James Melville gave of his education at St Andrews,

where he attended St Leonard's College between 1571 and 1574 (Reid 2011: 39; see also ODNB). Though he attended a different college to Hume, his education will have been very similar to Hume's:

> '…his first-year tuition comprised his regent's own primer on philosophical definitions, the *Rhetoric* of Cassander and Aristotle's *Organon*. His final three years focussed on other works of Aristotle, parts of Sacrobosco's *De Sphaera* and passages from Samuel and Kings, with tuition under William Skene in Cicero's *De Legibus* and Justinian's *Institutes* […] Most telling of all, no language tuition in Hebrew or Greek was given to Melville, emphasising the moribund nature of the curriculum.' (Reid 2011: 39).

Hume's own education will have varied only in anything which was left to the discretion of the college principal, and most likely in Skene's tuition (who will presumably have been attached to St Leonard's College specifically). Perhaps Hume may have picked up a little bit of Greek at St Mary's, if the principal had given the students Greek philosophy to study, but the chances are that he will have studied Greek in depth elsewhere. Hume's university education, then, will have been the traditional arts education, heavily focused on Latin, which would be the case for Hume's entire career. This is made apparent in his preoccupation with Latin within the *Orthographie*.

Hume's matriculating cohort at St Mary's was either eighteen people (Anderson 1926: 276-277) or thirteen people (Anderson 1926: 281), depending on which of the two years given above he matriculated in. His graduating cohort for his MA was of either five people (Anderson 1926: 167-168) or fourteen people (Anderson 1926: 169-170). The community there seems, therefore, to have been quite small.

Though the reformation was quite readily accepted at St Andrews (Reid 2011: 36), St Mary's College was heavily under the influence of the Hamilton family, who generally remained sympathetic to Catholicism (Reid 2011: 42). Reid (2011: 42) points out that the Hamilton family made up just under 15% of the student body at St Mary's between 1560 and 1574, and supplied 'the majority of teaching masters in the early 1570s'. Hume's education, then, featured a large number of Hamiltons, who were at the forefront of

accusations of 'sedition and Catholic recusancy' at St Mary's in the late 1560s and early 1570s (Reid 2011: 40). John Hamilton and Archibald Hamilton were both regents at St Mary's in the early 1570s, and both were Catholic controversialists (Reid 2011: 44-45). John Hamilton is believed to have been the writer of the Catholic text *Ane Catholik and Facile Traictise to Confirme the Real and Corporell Praesence of Chrystis Pretious Bodie and Blude* (Reid 2011: 44), a text which Hume himself seems to have directly criticised in one of his own works: *A Diduction of the true and Catholik meaning of our Sauiour his words,* this is my bodie, *in the institution of his laste Supper through the ages of the Church from Christ to our owne dayis. Whereunto is annexed a Reply to M. William Reynolds in defence of M. Robert Bruce his arguments on this subject: displaying M. John Hammilton's ignorance and contradictions: with sundry absurdities following upon the Romane interpretation of these words*, published by Robert Waldegrave in 1602 (Wheatley 1870: ix). There were further issues with the Hamiltons at St Mary's between 1571 and 1572, when John Knox took up a preaching post in St Andrews due to his lack of popularity in Edinburgh; there were a number of heated disputes between the two parties during this time (Reid 2011: 43-45). The difference in religious opinion between Knox and the Hamiltons will almost definitely have played a significant part in their disputes, and in such a small community as St Andrews (particularly with the Hamiltons being so prominent in his own college), Hume will have been well aware of this series of spats, which perhaps had some influence on his later religious writings.

Hume's education at St Andrews, then, was fairly typical of university education as far as the curriculum went. He was exposed to a considerable amount of religious controversy, and from his later religious writings we may infer that this exposure had its influences over him. His criticism of one of Hamilton's Catholic texts, as mentioned above, demonstrates Hume's resolute following of the Protestant faith. According to its title, this criticism focuses on the interpretation of a handful of words, and though of course the focus on religious text is explanation in and of itself, the fact that Hume seems to have been particularly interested in the language and meaning is interesting.

There is no information to be found of Hume's life in the eight years after his graduation, and the next that is heard of him is his incorporation at the University of Oxford in 1580/1581 (Clark 1887: 372; Foster 1891: 766). *Alumni Oxoniensis* records his incorporation: 'Hume, Alexander, schoolmaster of Dunbar; M.A. ST ANDREWS UNIVERSITY, incorporated 26 June 1580' (Foster 1891: 766). This record gives the month

of his incorporation as June, however the *Register of the University of Oxford* places his incorporation in the following January: '1. Graduates of St Andrews – 26 Jan. 158^{0}_{1}, (suppl.) Hume, Alexander, M.A.' (Clark 1887: 372). This January date has been used in records of Hume's life (Wheatley 1870: vi; Durkan 2013: 112). His incorporation appears to be the only mention of Hume which is available from Oxford records. There does not seem to be an official record of what he did there. He is said to have spent two years in Oxford as the tutor of 'a noble youth' (Durkan 2013: 112), and in his sixteen-year stay in England he was 'partly engaged in studying and partly in teaching' (Wheatley 1870: vi). Given that, as far as we know, Hume's education up until this point had included no Greek (though of course we cannot guarantee that he did not already have at least a grounding in it), we might suppose that it was at Oxford that he learned the language. At least some of Oxford's colleges had had Greek lectureships since 1535 (Brockliss 2016: 132), and the University's Regius professorship in Greek had been established in the 1540s (Brockliss 2016: 185). We know that Hume had at least some ability in Greek; the *Orthographie* contains a handful of Greek phrases throughout (Wheatley 1870), and Hume also notes in the *Orthographie* that he heard Dr Laurence, the Oxford Professor of Greek, give a lecture (Wheatley 1870: 14). The grammar school at Prestonpans, where Hume would later teach, included Greek in its curriculum (Durkan 2013: 114), so we might assume that he was at least partially responsible for teaching the language. Prestonpans also taught Hebrew (Durkan 2013: 114), and though there does not seem to be any outright evidence that Hume knew any of the language, if we apply the same principle that he would have been at least partially responsible for teaching it, we might suppose that he also learned Hebrew at Oxford. As far as can be seen, he did not learn the language at either Dunbar or St Andrews, but Oxford's Regius professorship in Hebrew had also been established in the 1540s (Brockliss 2016: 185).

Besides his time at Oxford, Hume taught in Bath (Durkan 2013: 112). In February 1590, he was presumably present at – or at least heard or read the contents of – a sermon in Chippenham by Dr Hill, to which he published a response in May of that year (Durkan 2013: 112). Hill responded to Hume in 1592 (Wheatley 1870: vi; Durkan 2013: 113), and Hume responded again afterwards (Durkan 2013: 113). The result of this interaction was *A Reioynder to Doctor Hil concerning the Descense of Christ into Hell*. The *Reioynder* is believed to have been published in the 1590s by Robert Waldegrave, the printer to King James VI in Scotland. Durkan puts the publishing date as 1594 (Durkan 2013: 113), though Wheatley (1870: x) and Dickson & Edmond (1890: 467-468) favour 1592-3. In this

exchange, we can see again that Hume was very opinionated and engaged heavily in contemporary religious thought. As for the printer of the *Reioynder*, Waldegrave was an Englishman, born and raised in Worcestershire, who had worked as a printer in London for ten years (ODNB; Dickson & Edmond 1890: 394-395). He was driven out of England in the 1580s for his involvement in the printing of the Puritan 'Martin Marprelate' texts (ODNB; Dickson & Edmond 1890: 396-397). In Scotland, however, he was appointed as the King's printer in 1590 (Dickson & Edmond 1890: 400), and would print the 1599 and 1603 editions of James' *Basilikon Doron* (Dickson & Edmond 1890: 445, 460). In 1603 he returned to London following the King, but died a few months later (ODNB). Of his printing practices, the ODNB says: 'In general Waldegrave introduced a measure of Anglicisation to the Scottish press, both in language and manners, such as the greater incidence of printed dedications'. His position as a fairly prolific printer, and specifically as the King's printer, perhaps raised at least something of an awareness of anglicisation amongst Scottish writers at the time. Hume evidently interacted with Waldegrave's practice, and this coupled with Waldegrave's considerable presence in Scottish printing might have influenced Hume's interest in the vernacular of the south.

3.1.2. Hume at Edinburgh High School

It is not known exactly when Hume left England, but it is known that he was appointed as the principal master of Edinburgh High School in May 1596 (Wheatley 1870: vii; McCrie 1899: 383; Durkan 2013: 112). We cannot be sure of the date of his return to Scotland, but his activity in Bath in the early 1590s, as mentioned above, imply that it would have been no more than a few years before his entrance to the High School. William Steven's *The History of the High School of Edinburgh* (1849) gives quite a lot of detail about Hume's time at the school.

The Edinburgh High School's track record with its masters was not particularly promising in the few decades before Hume's appointment. In the forty years before he became master, all of his predecessors left on bad terms with the Edinburgh town council. Hume's immediate predecessor was Hercules Rollock, who had previously been a regent of King's College in Aberdeen, and had held a number of prominent roles in Scotland (Steven 1849: 16-17). During Rollock's superintendence of the school, which lasted for twelve years, the town council imposed penalties on those who sent their sons to other institutions in a bid to promote the High School (Steven 1849: 17).

Though Rollock's reputation gained the school scholars from all over the country (which, combined with the potential penalties imposed on parents sending their sons to rival institutions in the area, would presumably have led to Hume later teaching a number of high-profile students), he suffered from their misbehaviour considerably (Steven 1849: 18). Steven reports two notable 'barring-outs' under Rollock, one in 1587, and one in 1595 (Steven 1849: 18-19, 22-27). The second of these resulted in one death and the temporary imprisonment of several of the students, and ultimately in Rollock's dismissal from the school in 1596 at the hands of the town council, who blamed him for not keeping order (Steven 1849: 22-27). Alexander Hume was appointed principal master of the school that year (Steven 1849: 29). Hume, then, was entering a school which had a reputation for poorly-behaved students, and for the eventual souring of the schoolmaster's relationship with the town council. Hume would therefore have to take on a teaching style which would be suited to keeping such unruly students in line.

The year following Hume's appointment to the school saw the town council, with help from law-men and church-men, overhauling the system upon which the school operated (Steven 1849: 33-34). There is little detail given about the system of education prior to Hume's appointment given in Steven's work, but it can be said that Latin was the main focus, with penmanship a recent addition for those students who chose to learn (Steven 1849: 22). It also appears that the system Hume inherited consisted of one master and one usher teaching all of the students together (Steven 1849: 40-41). In 1597, however, the course of study was revised and the staffing system changed. Steven records the information concerning this that is preserved in the town council's records, which are quite detailed (Steven 1849: 33-36).

The new system introduced in 1597 resulted in the creation of four classes, each under its own master (Steven 1849: 34). The first class was placed under the tutelage of George Hastie, and the boys' education consisted of Simson's elementary textbook on Latin (the *Dunbar Rudiments*), Corderie's *Colloquies*, and on Sundays the *Catechesis Palatinus* (Steven 1849: 34). The second class, under Patrick Peacock, were instructed in the rules of the first Part of Pelisso, and wrote exercises three times a week (Steven 1849: 34). They also worked on Ovid's *Tristia*, Cicero's *Familiar Epistles*, and on Sundays they memorised the Catechism (Steven 1849: 34). The third class, under John Balfour, were taught the second Part of Pelisso, Erasmus' syntaxis, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Terence, and on

Sundays they were taught Buchanan's *Psalms* (Steven 1849: 34). Hume was responsible for teaching the fourth and most senior class, whose instruction consisted of the third Part of Pelisso, Buchanan's *Prosodia*, Linacre on the construction of Latin, Virgil, Sallust, Caesar's *Commentaries*, Florus, Ovid's *Epistles*, and on Sundays Buchanan's *Heroic Psalms* (Steven 1849: 34). The High School continued to focus on Latin, then, and did not teach any other languages, such as Greek. Hume's students used the *Dunbar Rudiments*, created by Hume's own former schoolmaster Simson, and so these students will have received very similar instruction in the fundamentals of Latin to that which Hume experienced himself a few decades before.

Hume's responsibilities as principal master included dealing with disputes between the other regents, assessing the boys upon their entry to the school and deciding which class to place them in, enrolling the new scholars and informing them that they must submit to discipline, assessing all four classes once a week and correcting any general faults he found, and giving or denying permission for either advancing or holding back students, or dividing a class (Steven 1849: 35). There were quarterly exams in February, May, August, and November, and the three junior classes moved up in February while the senior class moved up to the University in September, all of which being processes that Hume must have been heavily involved in (Steven 1849: 36). Further minor changes to the testing of students were made in 1598 (Steven 1849: 38-39). The key points to take from the system at Edinburgh High School which may have influenced Hume are the focus on Latin and the fact that Hume will have been used to codification in language. His experiences with codification in the Latin language may, perhaps, have influenced his decision to write the *Orthographie*.

In 1601, there was an attempt to revert back to the old system at the High School, but there is no consensus on what exactly happened here. According to Steven (1849: 40), the town council attempted to revert back to the system of one master and one usher. They claimed that the masters at the High School were not abiding by the rules set down in 1597 (Steven 1849: 40-41). When the council reported their intention to change back to the old system to the Kirk, they were convinced to give the new structure a longer trial (Steven 1849: 40-41). As far as can be seen in Steven's account (1849), there is no indication that the old system was ever reverted to after this longer trial, so it appears that the new system was eventually deemed fit for purpose.

Durkan, on the other hand, tells a different story concerning the 1601 changes (2013: 114). He states that Hume disliked the new system which had been introduced, preferring the employment of ‘a single doctor of his own choice capable of carrying out his wishes, and in 1601, he obtained this’ (Durkan 2013: 114). He then goes on to comment that the town council was not pleased about getting rid of the newer system, and that at the start of the next academic year they ‘rather hesitantly found it expedient to ‘make an assay’ or him for another year as master of the high school’ (Durkan 2013: 114). He states that the ‘more ample staffing arrangements’ were reverted to by John Ray, who took up the post of principal master upon Hume’s resignation from the school (Durkan 2013: 114). Unfortunately, this incident does result in a lack of clarity over both Hume’s working environment between 1601 and 1606, and also Hume’s personal preferences regarding the system.

It is clear from this detailed description of Hume’s career that he was acknowledged by the local authorities, albeit at times with hesitancy, as having a considerable professional standing, especially with reference to linguistic issues. He was also evidently a somewhat disputatious (even cantankerous) man, used to exercising a considerable degree of authority, and it is likely that he carried these characteristics – along with his reputation for learning – into his later positions at other schools. The information available particularly concerning Edinburgh High School allows for a much clearer view of Hume’s responsibilities, which helps to demonstrate what sort of position he was used to holding. This in turn will aid our understanding of his approach to a text like the *Orthographie*, by demonstrating how he was used to approaching language – as a knowledgeable figure used to giving instruction.

It is likely that Hume had a number of students at Edinburgh who would go on to become highly influential figures, though finding out who these students were would require a lengthy and rather optimistic research process, or chance. One man who would have been taught by Hume, discovered by chance due to his interest in another linguistic scholar’s work, was William Drummond of Hawthornden. According to the ODNB, Drummond began studying at the University of Edinburgh at age fifteen, having previously studied at the Edinburgh High School. Tracing back the years would put Drummond in the High School while Hume was master there. Drummond is known for his interest in languages, and his library includes Bullokar’s *Booke at Large* (Macdonald 1971: 188-189). Perhaps Hume, who would have been responsible for a significant portion of Drummond’s

early Latin education, may have been an early influence on Drummond's interests, something which we will return to briefly in section 3.3.3. Drummond did have one of Hume's religious texts in his library too: his *Diduction* of 1602 (Macdonald 1971: 196), mentioned in section 3.1.1 in relation to the Hamiltons of the University of St Andrews.

There is little known about Hume's personal life; almost everything that is known about him, unsurprisingly, is related to his education and his work. Wheatley does note, however, that Hume married a Helen Rutherford, though it is not said when or where they were married, and no detail is given of where she was from (Wheatley 1870: viii). During Hume's time at Edinburgh High School, however, they had three children: two sons and one daughter, all born between 1601 and 1606 in Edinburgh (Wheatley 1870: viii).

Hume left Edinburgh High School in 1606, taking up the position of master of Prestonpans Grammar School (Steven 1849: 42). It is not clear why he left the High School. Hume was replaced at Edinburgh High School by John Ray, formerly Professor of Humanity at the University of Edinburgh, who presided over the school for twenty-three years until his death (Steven 1849: 49).

3.1.3. Later years at Prestonpans and Dunbar

In July 1606, Hume's new position as the master of the grammar school at Prestonpans was confirmed, and he began teaching Latin, Greek, and Hebrew there (Wheatley 1870: vii; Durkan 2013: 114). The school had been founded by John Davidson, minister of Prestonpans, during his tenure between 1596 and 1604 (see ODNB for details of his career, from which the following account is largely derived). Though Davidson had died two years before Hume took up the position of master of the school, it is probable that the two men at least knew each other by sight; Davidson attended St Leonard's College at the University of St Andrews between 1566 and 1570, then served as a regent and an examiner there, so they would have both been in St Andrews at the same time.

Davidson was another religious controversialist – this time a Presbyterian – who frequently found himself in trouble with those in power in Scotland. During his tenure at Prestonpans he set up the school, and the erection of the relevant buildings was mainly done at his own expense. He also published one tract for 'Young Schollers in Christianity' and wrote an anti-episcopal text during this time. There appears to be very little

information on the running of the school at Prestonpans, besides the fact that it was a trilingual academy (Durkan 2013: 114). Durkan (2013: 358) seems to record only three or four other members of staff at the school in the period in which Hume was master, and they were not necessarily all present at the same time.

National concerns now impinged on Hume's career. The Scottish Parliament announced a commission on the state of Latin grammar and the teaching of it across Scotland in 1607, and formally stated that there should be a grammar monopoly (Durkan 2013: 114). This search for a new Latin grammar would occupy much of the remainder of Hume's life, alongside his teaching. The following year, he is alleged to have written the dedication for his work *Grammatica Nova* (Durkan 2013: 115), the Latin grammar which would – to a point – fulfil this proposed monopoly. It appears that Hume had been working on his grammar for a long time, and delegates were appointed to examine it in 1610, reporting back favourably on it in 1611 (Durkan 2013: 115). *Grammatica Nova* was published in 1612 by Thomas Finlason (about whom there is no useful information available). It did not, however, gain much favour; Hume wrote to Andrew Melville in 1612 about the opposition *Grammatica Nova* faced (Durkan 2013: 116). Durkan's summary of this letter is that Hume noted the opposition of Archbishop Gledstanes of St Andrews and John Ray, who succeeded him at Edinburgh High School, and that though Chancellor Seton supported Hume's monopoly, Archbishop Spottiswood had changed his mind and written to the King to suggest that the monopoly be cancelled (Durkan 2013: 116). The bishops, allegedly, were opposed not so much to Hume's interest in Peter Ramus (a well-known French scholar whose work allegedly influenced Hume's grammar: see Durkan 2013: 116), but his friendship with Melville (Durkan 2013: 116). This friendship had led to Archbishop Gledstanes' threats to accuse Hume of treason when he acquired 'neglected correspondence' of Hume's, in which he had written in favour of Melville to the principal of St Andrews (Durkan 2013: 116-117). The fact that Hume was so quick to put forward his own work for this monopoly, as well as his later actions regarding it, suggests that he was deeply in favour of a single, prescriptivist system of Latin education – something which was apparently carried over to his interest in English and Scots.

Incidentally, it is not clear how, or indeed if, Hume and Melville – one of the most prominent 'public intellectuals' of his day – met. Melville, another graduate of St Mary's College, St Andrews (a decade or so before Hume's time there), overhauled the curriculum at the University of Glasgow (and attempted to do the same at St Mary's College, St

Andrews) and was active in the continued reform of the Kirk. He developed a deep distaste for the episcopacy, and would later find himself very much out of favour with those in power, including the King, which led to a spell of imprisonment in the Tower of London and ultimately his removal to France, where he remained until his death (the above discussion of Melville's career is derived from ODNB).

Steven (1849: 44) gives quite a detailed description of part of *Grammatica Nova*, in which Hume writes about his views on how boys should be educated. According to Steven, Hume 'deplores in strong terms the voluptuousness, effeminacy, and general corruption of the age, and dwells with singular sensitiveness on the little respect paid to the instructors of youth' (Steven 1849: 44). His thinking is that a young man's studies should continue until the age of twenty-five, and that the young 'ought not [...] to be left to self-government till they can safely steer their course between Scylla and Charybdis' (Steven 1849: 44). He asserts that children should love school early in life, and he of course recommends what books should be used in education and when (Steven 1849: 44). This provides a very clear image of the type of education favoured by Hume, which will undoubtedly have influenced his instructional writing such as the *Orthographie*. He comes across as a man of very strong opinions and a lover of strictly enforced authority over the young, used to developing and providing instruction.

There is little else to mention of Hume's time at Prestonpans, besides the births of three more children – two sons and a daughter – between 1608 and 1610 (Wheatley 1870: viii).

Shortly after the publication of his Latin grammar, Hume moved from Prestonpans back to his former school in Dunbar as the master of the school. It is slightly unclear exactly when this happened. Durkan (2013: 118) states that Hume moved from Prestonpans 'to his hometown of Dunbar in 1613', but does not specify whether he entered straight into the grammar school at Dunbar upon his return to the town. It seems a little strange that the date of his move to Dunbar should be known or recorded without his having taken up the position at the school upon his move, but McCrie (1899: 437) gives 1615 as the year Hume took up his new post, a date followed by both Wheatley (1870: viii; drawing on an earlier edition of McCrie's work) and Kniezsa (1997: 52). Hume was presumably teaching Latin using his own grammar at Dunbar. As is the case with Prestonpans, there appears to be little detail available concerning the grammar school at Dunbar and how it was run. Durkan records two or three other staff members at the school

during Hume's tenure (2013: 271).

King James VI of Scotland and I of England returned to Scotland – for the first time since his accession to the English throne – in 1617. On 13th May, the King stopped at Dunglass, and Hume addressed the King in Latin (Wheatley 1870: viii; Durkan 2013: 120). Dunglass was then home to Alexander Home, the first earl Home, who was a distant relative of Hume the grammarian, but the ODNB entry for the earl credits this address instead to Alexander Hume the poet and minister of Logie, which would have been quite the feat for the poet, as he had been dead for eight years at this point.

Earl Home's life was as turbulent as any in that period. He had been involved in the Ruthven Raid, and found himself imprisoned on several occasions. His involvement with the earl of Bothwell and his adherence to Catholicism caused him several issues over the 1590s, and was mistrusted by the general assembly. He was, however, trusted sufficiently by the King to be sent as an ambassador to the King of France on two occasions, and received numerous offices after the Union of the Crowns, and James spent the first night of his journey to England at Dunglass, as well as the first night of his return visit to Scotland in 1617. The King, then, esteemed him well enough, which served him reasonably well (for this information about Home's career, see his ODNB entry). Strangely, Earl Home seems therefore to have been one of Hume's 'safer' friends when it came to the King.

The oration that Hume (the grammarian) gave for James began with a rather grand and obsequious statement: ''You are Priam, we are the sons of Priam.'' (Durkan 2013: 120). He then gave a short history of the Scottish monarchy, before proceeding to James' own day and the state of Scotland at the time (Durkan 2013: 120-121; Steven 1849: 46). Steven notes that Hume contrasted the security of the Borders since James' accession to the English throne with the situation before the Union of the Crowns (1849: 46), while Durkan claims that '[Hume] was clearly an advocate of union under a British flag, but was keen that the Scottish element should not be steam-rollered out of existence' (2013: 121). Though, of course, it should be noted that these implications are made by a speech given to the King himself and as such was unlikely to contain anything which would not meet James' absolute approbation, this particular position of Hume's being pro-union but keen to retain the Scottish aspect is very important to keep in mind when studying his work on the use of language in both Scotland and England. It will without question have affected his views on Scots and English and also his approach to the aims of the *Orthographie*, as

James’ own views of language will have (see section 3.2).

Shortly after this visit of the King’s, Hume’s *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* appeared. As discussed in Chapter 1, the manuscript is undated and so we do not know quite when it was written, but the dedication to the King, which mentions James’ visit to Scotland, suggests – along with other internal evidence, already discussed in section 2.1 – that the tract was written around 1617 (Wheatley 1870: iii; Durkan 2013: 121).

While producing the *Orthographie and Congruitie*, Hume had not forgotten his *Grammatica Nova*. In 1622, he appealed over the neglect of his monopoly, but this attempt did not succeed (Durkan 2013: 122). The next year, he resumed his campaign for the acceptance of his grammar, including the printing of *Virtutes Grammaticae*, a statement of the benefits of his grammar (Wheatley 1870: ix; Durkan 2013: 122). Hume’s tenacity in the defence of his grammar demonstrates his confidence in his own linguistic and educational capabilities. Also in 1623, and additionally in 1627, Hume is found as a witness to a deed as ‘schoolmaster of Dunbar’ (McCrie 1899: 473). As there does not appear to be a date given to his leaving Dunbar, it is useful to have such information to establish that he was still teaching at the school at these times, when he was in his late seventies.

His Latin grammar’s fortunes rose somewhat in 1629, albeit briefly, when Charles I wrote that Hume had been robbed of his monopoly, stating that the complaints should be reconsidered by unbiased judges (Durkan 2013: 124). The memorandum of this letter is found, according to Wheatley, in the records of the Privy Council of Scotland on 8th and 16th July 1630 (Wheatley 1870: viii). In 1630 a committee was created to examine *Grammatica Nova*, and this committee took the decision to send out 200 copies to various schools, but it was beaten by the work of David Wedderburn, whose work was chosen in 1631 to take up the monopoly instead (Durkan 2013: 124). Hume demanded compensation from Wedderburn – which he was granted – and also refused to teach Wedderburn’s work himself, or to allow his son to teach it (Durkan 2013: 124). Both Humes were granted exemptions from teaching the otherwise school-standard text, presumably continuing to use Hume’s own grammar, which he began editing that year (Durkan 2013: 124). This also proves Hume’s confidence in his capabilities, and additionally his sense of security as a knowledgeable figure in such matters.

It is not known exactly when Hume died, but Durkan (2013: 112) states that Hume was 82 when he wrote his own epitaph in 1633. It does seem likely, then, that Hume did not live too much past that year, if he was at such an advanced age.

The image we get of Hume after reconstructing his life is of a man who had very specific and very set opinions on both religion and language. He does not appear to be any more or less opinionated in these matters than those around him; he seems to fit into a more general atmosphere of often controversial – and usually very determined – viewpoints. He did have a knack for associating himself with rather unpopular figures, though the only significant effect of this appears to have been the lack of acceptance of *Grammatica Nova*. It is also notable that he had experience of England and its language, and that he at least stated that there were benefits from the Union of the Crowns (though, of course, he was hardly likely to have spoken ill of James' accession to the English throne to the King's face). Whether he really believed that there were benefits to these closer ties with England or not, it is certainly worth keeping in mind when reading the *Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue*, given its presence in the Royal Manuscripts collection.

3.2. Scotland and England during Hume's life

3.2.1. Scotland's relationship with England during Hume's lifetime

Anglo-Scottish relations during Hume's lifetime had undergone a recent improvement. Throughout the previous centuries, Scotland and England had little in the way of a positive relationship. In the decades preceding Hume's birth in 1550 (as recorded by Durkan 2013: 112), there had been some ups and downs, from the marriage of James IV to Margaret Tudor, to the troubled relationship with Henry VIII and his numerous aggressive actions towards Scotland, to the English intervention under Elizabeth during Mary of Guise's regency. This continued in a more relaxed manner during Hume's earlier life; Elizabeth I's approach to Scotland was generally less aggressive than her father's, though the religious differences between her and Mary in Scotland, in addition to Mary's claim to the English throne, caused considerable tension. This led to certain interventions from the English, though these were not so much England up against Scotland as a whole, but rather England throwing its weight behind the Protestant faction in Scotland. The closeness of Scotland's relationship with England varied during James VI's minority as different groups gained

and lost control of the country, as demonstrated by Lockyer (2005: 178-179) and Stewart (2003). A reasonably positive relationship with England seems to have been maintained by James during Elizabeth's reign, as his thoughts will have been on his chances of succeeding to the English throne (Lockyer 2005; Stewart 2003). Elizabeth granted James a subsidy which varied in value year to year (Lockyer 2005: 180). The execution of James' mother in England soured Elizabeth's relationship with him and with many of his nobles, albeit temporarily (Stewart 2003: 88-93). In general, throughout Hume's lifetime up until James' accession to the English throne, Anglo-Scottish relations appear to have been tentatively positive, but rather precarious. James' accession to the English throne necessitated more positive relations at a practical level, and opened up questions about political union: a topic which Hume was evidently interested in (see section 3.1.3).

It appears that there was still a significant amount of disdain for the Scots in England after James' accession, as will be seen in section 3.2.2. Politically, however, the relationship between the two nations improved after 1603, for the simple fact that James was now monarch of both kingdoms. The level of factionalism appeared to have died down in Scotland by this point, which had often involved groups being pro- or anti-English in previous years (Stewart 2003; Lockyer 2005).

3.2.2. The English view of Scotland

It is difficult to establish general opinions of the Scots on England through this time. The views of the English on Scotland, both before and after the succession, come through a little more clearly – or at least the views of members of the court and Parliament. Stewart (2003: 86) notes a memorandum concerning James as the potential heir to the English throne; the memorandum cites a number of ''horrible, detestable, and cruel facts'' which were committed in Scotland under James' reign and the alleged inaction of the King in the aftermath. Though the memorandum concerns reasons why James was viewed as being an unsuitable inheritor (Stewart 2003: 86), it does also paint a picture of the Scots nobles as being duplicitous and violent. After James' accession in England, there are a number of instances which show negative views of the Scots in England. During the ultimately unsuccessful campaign for a political union between the two nations, a handful of comments were made by members of Parliament which showed a distaste for the Scots. Notably, Sir Christopher Piggott launched a tirade against the Scots in 1607, in which he labelled Scotland ''poor and barren'' and its people ''beggars, proud, and generally traitors

and rebels to their King'', stating that the English and the Scots were as different as ''a judge and a thief'' (Stewart 2003: 214-215). Though Piggott was removed from his position, another member declared that 'England had no room for Scots' (Stewart 2003: 215). Three years earlier, in the processes of the Union Commission of 1604, Stewart states that the English were wary of Scottish competition in trade, the admission of Scots to the English trade guilds, and the submission of Englishmen to 'what they perceived as a brutal Scottish legal system' (Stewart 2003: 214). Lockyer (2005: 286) also states that the 1614 Parliament made a 'bitter attack on […] the Scots'. Numerous powerful Englishmen, then, would have preferred to keep the Scots at a distance, and held negative views of them to varying degrees and for varying reasons.

James' visit to Scotland in 1617 also raises some indicators of the English view of Scotland. Stewart recites Anthony Weldon's opinions, in which his distaste for the country as a whole is second to his distaste for its people: ''I must confess it is too good for those that possess it, and too bad for others to be at the charge to conquer it'' (Stewart 2003: 288). Stewart does also include an anonymous English opinion which was more positive; this courtier reported that ''The country affords more profit and better contentment than I could even promise myself by reading of it. […] They strive, by direction, to give us all fair contentment, that we may know that the country is not so contemptible but that it is worth the cherishing'' (Stewart 2003: 288). The anonymous courtier was perhaps overly optimistic about the views of his fellow Englishmen, as he also stated that not only was the King extremely pleased about the experience, but 'so are the English of all conditions' (Stewart 2003: 288). He had, at least, not interacted with Weldon. Between these two accounts, it would be safest to assume simply that there were a range of opinions on Scotland and the Scots from the English visitors in 1617. These views on the Scots will be considered in Chapter 5, when we discuss the potential of the *Orthographie* for success.

3.2.3. The King

James VI and I, as the dedicatee of the *Orthographie*, is a key figure to examine in this study. Specifically, James' attitudes and approaches to his two kingdoms, separately and together, ought to be considered due to the potential influence that they may have had on Hume and his work. The King's perspectives and actions regarding the sociocultural landscape of the two nations are particularly important, and within this we will primarily focus on religion and language – the former is important because of its overwhelming

impact on day-to-day life at the time and its potential to demonstrate James' approach to the two kingdoms in relation to each other.

3.2.3.1. James VI and I and his kingdoms

Stewart (2003: 167) notes James' comments in Edinburgh in 1603 as he was preparing to leave for his new kingdom, in which 'he made it clear that what was uppermost in his mind was unity between his two realms', and Stewart records part of this speech to demonstrate James' views of the similarities between his two kingdoms. As Hume was still at Edinburgh High School at this time, it seems almost inevitable that he would have heard the contents of this speech at least second-hand, if not in person. Over the next few years, James would provide what little push there was for a union between England and Scotland. He wrote to the Scottish Privy Council in 1604 that the case would not need to be made due to the number of similarities between the two nations, and called them ''two twins bred in one belly'' (Stewart 2003: 209). He also essentially described the union as inevitable, as they were not divided by any great physical feature, and the two nations were waiting for James who united them in his person to unite them in law (Stewart 2003: 209). James favoured the name of 'Britain' for the proposed combination of England and Scotland, which the English Parliament was not prepared to accept for a number of reasons (Stewart 2003: 212). Lockyer asserts that James wanted 'the separate names and identities of England and Scotland to be subsumed in the new, all-embracing one of Great Britain' (2005: 282). James styled himself as 'King of Great Britain' (Stewart 2003: 213), which is the title by which Hume addresses him in the dedication of the *Orthographie*. It is also notable here that Hume labels the supposed shared language the 'Britan tongue', not either English or Scots. It seems that Hume was strongly engaging with the idea of Britain that James had put forward, even after the most evident push for it had died away.

James demonstrated his displeasure concerning English opinions on the Scots in 1604, in response to Sir Christopher Piggott's tirade as mentioned in section 3.2.2; James stated that ''…he was a Scot himself and that nothing could be applied to the nation in general in which he had not his share'' (Stewart 2003: 215). His relationship with his native country, however, was perhaps not quite as strong as he may have claimed; he had promised in 1603 to return to Scotland at least every three years (Stewart 2003: 167), but did not return once until 1617 (Stewart 2003: 283). He claimed that his return was due to a ''salmonlike instinct' to return to his home, though his desire to reshape the Scottish Kirk into a more Anglican form appears to have been a major factor too (Stewart 2003: 285-286). His

speech to the Scottish Parliament in that year included a hope that he could ‘‘reduce the barbarity’, as he put it, of Scotland to ‘the sweet civility’ of England’ (Stewart 2003: 290). Though he also listed negative traits of the English, it does appear from this that James held a higher opinion of his English subjects than his Scottish ones, and it was commented on that he aimed to shape the Scottish government system to follow the English one (Stewart 2003: 290). His apparent favouring of the English appears to have been of long standing; Lockyer (2005: 183) reports that in 1604, James stated that ‘he was happy to be in ‘the promised land, where religion was purely professed, where he sat among grave, learned and reverend men – not, as before, elsewhere, a King without state, without honour, without order, where beardless boys would brave him to his face’’. Lockyer also notes, however, a comment made by James in the same year in which he stated that in Scotland he was better heeded by his subjects, while in England he was, he believed, criticised constantly (Lockyer 2005: 283). Regardless of this, James appears to have displayed considerable favour to England over Scotland in many cases, which may have affected Hume’s direction in the *Orthographie*.

3.2.3.2. James VI and I, the Church, and the Kirk

The main thing to note about James and the Church and the Kirk is that he actively tried to bring the Scottish Kirk in line with the English Church. This was unpopular with a number of figures in the Kirk, who did not agree with James’ views on the role of the King or of the episcopacy within the institution (Lockyer 2005: 488-9; Stewart 2003). This disagreement between King and Kirk concerning royal and episcopal authority was of long standing by the time of James’ accession to the English throne, stretching back into the regencies of his minority (Lockyer 2005: 177-182; Stewart 2003). He had similar issues with the English Puritans, though it seems that they were of less concern than the Scottish Presbyterians (Stewart 2003). The push to anglicise the Kirk was newer, and Lockyer (2005: 488-9) points out a series of actions taken by James and his representatives to anglicise the Kirk and to re-establish episcopal authority. This culminated in the Five Articles of Perth in 1617-18, which were unpopular with the Scots according to Lockyer (2005: 488-9). Stewart (2003: 285-294) asserts that a number of the Scottish establishment were wary of the King’s motives for returning to Scotland in 1617, as they were under the impression – correctly, as it turned out – that the main reason for the visit was to push the Kirk into anglicising.

James’ activity with regards to the English and Scottish religious institutions suggests

that the King was leaning heavily into his newfound Englishness. He did, of course, have his issues with aspects of his English kingdom, though these seem to have been related more to his uneasy relationship with the English Parliament as noted in section 3.2.3.1 (see also Stewart 2003; Locker 2005) than it was to his relationship with the Church. James' favouring of the English side can also be seen in the evolution of his relationship with language.

3.2.3.3. James VI and I's writings and his views on language

James was a prolific author, and as is to be expected, his early writing was in Scots. He engaged heavily with Scottish verse in his early years, associating himself with the 'Castilian Band' and writing his *Rewlis and Cavtelis of Scottis poesie* (Stewart 2003: 63). The *Basilikon Doron*, written before his accession to the English throne, was anglicised significantly in its first (very limited) print run in 1599. The manuscript form is, of course, written in Scots, but it was printed by Waldegrave in 1599 and again in 1603. Waldegrave was an Englishman, and we have already seen in section 3.1.1 that he exerted an anglicising influence on the language of Scottish printing. Comparing the three versions of the *Basilikon Doron* does demonstrate this in a very clear way (Craigie 1944); the manuscript text is distinctively Scots, while the two published texts clearly take English forms. McClure points this out when discussing the anglicisation of Scots, but he puts that down to James himself, rather than Waldegrave (McClure 1994: 36). It has been noted elsewhere that James' writing in general, as well as his courtiers' writing, 'quickly adapted to the norms governing Early Modern English', and this shift included Scots who remained in their native country (Corbett, McClure & Stuart-Smith 2003: 11). McClure (1994: 33-34) points out that the similarities between English and Scots meant that throughout the history of Scots, the language was 'never immune to influence from [London English]'. It should also be noted that the King James Bible, published in 1611, was a translation into English (Stewart 2003: 202). Given that it was in use within the English Church, this is entirely to be expected, but it is another area in which James' subjects – particularly one as interested in language as Hume – would be able to observe the King's attentions to the language of the south.

Stewart (2003: 171-172) gives accounts of a handful of opinions on James in 1603, and a couple of these are useful in establishing at least some views of English and Scots at the time. The Venetian ambassador to England is quoted as having said that James spoke English but makes no mention of Scots or 'Scottish' as a separate entity (Stewart 2003:

171), and Anthony Bacon noted that James spoke ‘in the full dialect of his country’ (Stewart 2003: 172). It appears that, by some at least, Scots was deemed a dialect of English. James himself seems to have presented this view at least at times; Stewart (2003: 209) quotes part of his address to Parliament in 1604, in which James pushed for the union of England and Scotland, and he states that the two kingdoms are ‘united […] both in language, religion, and similitude of manners’. In 1617, James commented to his Scottish audience that they were following the bad influences of the English in part by ‘speak[ing] neither Scottish nor English’ (Stewart 2003: 290). Perhaps this admonishment was one of the occasions noted by Hume in the Dedication of the *Orthographie* upon which James ‘fel […] on this subject reproving your courteoures, quha on a new conceat of finnes sum tymes spilt (as they cal it) the king’s language’ (Wheatley 1870: 2). Here, James treats Scots and English as separate entities.

James was a keen scholar and was well-versed in multiple languages, Latin included. Stewart (2003: 45) describes a conversation that the King had with a number of Scottish scholars upon his return to the country in 1617, in which he ‘berated English scholars for their bizarre pronunciation of Latin’. James praised his former tutor Buchanan for his abilities in speaking Latin and Greek, and stated that the Scottish scholars ‘express the true and native pronunciation of both’ (Stewart 2003: 45). Hume, for all he took issue with the style of teaching Latin grammar, makes it clear in the *Orthographie* that he concurs with this view, as will be seen in section 4.1.

James’ interest in language is clear, though his views on the relationship between English and Scots are less so. From the comments he made which are referenced above and his approach in his own writing over time, it seems that perhaps he acknowledged the numerous similarities between the two but was also aware of the distinctions. From the two comments specifically, it is difficult to establish whether or not he perceived them specifically as two separate languages or as one. He referred to them as one language to the English but as two to the Scots, so it is likely that he was simply pandering to his audience in these comments.

3.3. General directions of linguistic scholarship around Hume

3.3.1. The doctrine of littera

The doctrine of *littera* was a fundamental aspect of linguistic understanding in Hume's time, going back to classical works, notably Aelius Donatus's *Ars Maior* (Lass & Laing 2013). It was inherited by later scholars in Europe (Abercrombie 1949: 58), and the doctrine will without doubt have been enormously influential on Hume. Abercrombie describes the *littera* as 'a thing with three attributes, *nomen*, *figura*, and *potestas*. *Figura* was the letter as written, *potestas* as pronounced, and by its *nomen* it could be identified for discussion or teaching' (1949: 58-59). Lass & Laing (2013) cite Donatus' definition, in which 'each *littera* has a *potestas*, as inseparable from it as its name and shape […] Just as the *potestas* is a local property ('accident') of the *littera*, so each *littera* would seem to be appropriately connected with just one *potestas*', which demonstrates the deep connection between the elements involved, and also the one-to-one relationship between elements: one sound to one letter form and vice versa. A particularly interesting part of their translation of Donatus' definition is this: 'littera is (a) sound which is capable of being written alone' (2013). This illustrates the depth of the connection between the elements of the *littera*; the sound is viewed as being 'capable of being written' (Lass & Laing 2013), it is not described as being written by way of a letter form. Lass & Laing (2013) also state outright that 'a foundational principle of the doctrine was the univocal binding of *figura* and *potestas* in a single universal unit'. This concept of unity between *figura* and *potestas* will be seen clearly throughout Hume's work.

Abercrombie specifically discusses the doctrine of *littera* in relation to Hume and other orthoepists of his day, and notes that the modern definition of 'letter' is a recent phenomenon (Abercrombie 1949: 54-55). He also comments that earlier definitions of the word 'letter' incorporated the sound alongside the character, and that it was a point of ambiguity amongst Hume and his contemporaries (Abercrombie 1949: 54-55). Hume does not directly use any of the Latin terms, but he certainly does address the concepts at least of *figura* and *potestas*. Abercrombie points out that descriptions of vernaculars across Europe used this doctrine, and so inherited a Latin framework (1949: 59). Given the prevalence of Latin in education and religion in Europe at this time (as can be seen throughout the present chapter), this is hardly surprising. Abercrombie notes English discussions of <j> and <v> and the debate over their status as letters in relation to <i> and <u> as evidence of this (1949: 60). He also describes the relationship between the *nomen*, *figura* and *potestas* as an arbitrary one (Abercrombie 1949: 60). It is particularly noted that

the relationship between *figura* and *potestas* is ‘not easy to discover’, with significant variation in the ways that grammarians understood this relationship (Abercrombie 1949: 59). Hume’s own understanding of this relationship will be explored throughout the rest of this study.

Abercrombie defends Hume and his fellow orthoepists in their usage of ‘letter’ and accompanying terms, noting that a number of them (Hume included) use a variety of synonyms to differentiate between the spoken and written aspects (1949: 56). He records Hume’s terminology as ‘sound’ (for *potestas*) and ‘symbol’ (for *figura*) (Abercrombie 1949: 56). Abercrombie states that the early modern orthoepists’ (including Hume) usage of the term ‘letter’ was ‘possibly inconvenient, probably misinterpreted, but certainly not muddled’ (Abercrombie 1949: 58).

3.3.2. Other orthoepists around Hume’s time

Hume was not alone in his drive to ‘fix’ usage of the vernacular. From the mid-fifteenth century to Hume’s day, there were a number of other authors who produced texts intended to standardise English. It is notable that Hume appears to be the first Scottish writer to do this. A number of English writers had preceded him in this field within the previous century. Salmon (1994: 1) notes that in the sixteenth century, the study of speech-sounds by English scholars was taken up for a number of reasons: the study of the classical languages, the improvement of literacy, standardising English, and teaching other languages. She also discusses the impact of the English push for orthographic reform on the study of speech-sounds, and the impact of Protestantism – ‘one’s salvation depended on individual interpretation of the Bible’ (Salmon 1994: 3). There were, then, several reasons for the general trend towards this new form of prescriptivism in the vernacular. Another key point about these writers is made by Minkova: ‘Their philological training was in the Classics […] and they often tried to adjust their descriptions to fit the norms of Latin pronunciation’ (2014: 235). This is certainly true of Hume, and the careers or language of choice of some of these other writers suggest that this is a likelihood in broader circles.

Prominent orthoepists and grammarians who preceded or were contemporaries of Hume include Sir Thomas Smith (1568), John Baret (1574), John Hart (1551, 1569, 1570), William Bullokar (1580, 1586), Richard Mulcaster (1582), Edmund Coote (1597), and

Alexander Gil (1619/1621). There are numerous others, particularly in the decades after Hume's *Orthographie* was written, but these are the writers in or near his own time who were particularly well-known, or have received considerable attention in the time since their works were published. They wrote on various aspects of the English language – namely grammar, spelling, and pronunciation – and all took the route of describing the supposedly 'correct' form to use. This was generally taken from the educated London variety (Salmon 1994: 3). It appears that all of Hume's predecessors and contemporaries, and his successors too, took an existing variety of the language as a standard at the level of pronunciation, then aimed to describe this standard pronunciation and align the spelling system accordingly, whereas Hume takes a different route and aims to reform both pronunciation and spelling simultaneously.

Hume mentions both Baret and Smith in the dedication of the *Orthographie*; Baret, he notes, had referred in his *Alvearie* of 1574 to Smith's work on the subject, and Hume was concerned for the fate of his own attempts, considering the fact that a text by such a man as Smith was ultimately 'sunck in the gulf of oblivion' (Wheatley 1870: 1-2). Hume calls Smith's work 'a learned and judiciouse monument' on the same subject matter as he himself deals with in the *Orthographie* (Wheatley 1870: 2). Sir Thomas Smith's 1568 *De recta et emendata linguae Anglicae scriptione, dialogus* pushes for a phonemic spelling system (Nevalainen 2006: 32; Salmon 1999: 16). Salmon (1999: 16) notes that Smith makes comparisons between southerners and those who are north of the Trent, and also that he 'derides country folk', so Smith is clearly aware of the variation in usage and is not fond of it.

Smith was one of the key figures advocating for the controversial reform of Greek pronunciation, and was also heavily involved in Elizabethan politics, having been sent as an ambassador to France for a number of years, becoming Secretary of State, and also having been granted land in Ireland to establish a colony. His published attitudes towards Ireland, its people, and the English in Ireland demonstrate a broader view on his part of the English – particularly powerful southerners – as generally superior, besides painting him as a deeply unpleasant man by modern standards (and the standards of the Irish population of the time, we may suppose). The ODNB notes that the reformed Greek pronunciation system proposed by Smith and his friend John Cheke was 'established on the assumption that single letters were intended to express single sounds, as men would not have invented redundant letters' (aligning with the doctrine of *littera*), and on the basis that 'custom' was

insufficient as a system due to differences between countries and across time; an 'authentic' Greek pronunciation would require 'close attention to the literature'. This would go some way to explaining his favouring of a phonemic spelling system for English; if a classical language as highly revered as Greek would not contain redundant letters, then English should not either, in the minds of scholars like Smith. Given that English received no attention in the education system from the grammar school onwards, but languages like Latin and Greek did, the reliance on classical languages as a framework for English makes sense. It was the framework that these scholars had worked with for several years, and a transference of a known and highly-regarded system to the local vernacular would be a logical choice for them. This would carry across to other writers mentioned here, not just Smith, and Hume himself is clearly one such classically-minded scholar.

The ODNB also notes that the programme of spelling reform in which Smith participated 'has been seen as part of the developing sense of English national consciousness', something which Smith seems to have been heavily engaged in with regards to politics, judging by the ODNB's account of his life. It is also stated in this entry that Smith would espouse 'fashionable intellectual causes', which may have contained 'an element of self-promotion', and also that he came from a modest background up through into the upper echelons of English society, which was resented by some of the more well-to-do around him. These factors could all tie in to his interest in orthographic reform and the standardisation of the vernacular. His less glamorous upbringing could, perhaps, have put him in a position to wish to use the language in a way that would not separate him from his more upper-class colleagues, and if he could be at the forefront of a movement to reform and regularise aspects of the language to produce a form which would be regarded as dignified and well-educated, so much the better (for these particulars of Smith's career, see his ODNB entry).

John Baret's comments appear to be limited to parts of his *Alvearie*, which is a trilingual (quadrilingual in a later edition) dictionary. His introductions to each letter include discussions about spelling and pronunciations, and are in some cases used to air grievances about the system as it seems to have been at the time. In the introduction to the letter E, Baret discusses the number of vowels, which he says is a matter of dispute, and also his views on the relationship between spelling and sound (Baret 1574: 246). He states that spelling should closely follow speech, and that writers must 'begin to weede out of our writinges a great number of ſuperfluous letters', including idle <e>, to 'amend a great deale

of our corrupt writing, and reduce it againe to true Orthography' (Baret 1574: 246). In this section is also included the comment which Hume latches onto for the future of his own *Orthographie*:

> '…I will not preſume to determine thereof [regarding the sound value of the letter E], but in the meane time caſt in ſome ſuch little doubtes among others, vntill I ſee the Uniuerſitie of the learned better reſolued & agreed about the ſame. For ſurely we may ſtill woonder and find fault with our Orthographie (or rather Cacography in deede) but it is impoſſible (in mine opinion) for any priuate man to amend in vntill the learned Uniuerſities haue determined vpon the truth thereof, & after the Prince alſo with the noble Counſell, ratefied and confirmed the ſame, to be publickly taught and vſed in the Realme' (Baret 1574: 246).

Here, Baret is advocating for a royally-approved standard form of English, established by the universities. Hume notes in the Dedication of the *Orthographie* that James 'fel on Barret's opinion that you wald cause the universities mak an Inglish gra*m*mar to repres the insolencies of sik green heades' as the Scottish courtiers who 'on a new conceat of finnes sum tymes spilt (as they cal it) the king's language' (Wheatley 1870: 2).

Baret's reference to Sir Thomas Smith's work is a comment on the need perceived by both men in the English language for certain letters in order to fill gaps. Baret notes that 'ſome letters are wanting […] as wee be perfitely inſtructed in the booke of Orthographie, learnedlye compyled by the right Honorable, ſir Thomas Smith knight', and then goes on to complain about the use of the letter <g> in both *Giles* and *Gilbert*, then states that he believes that the letter <c> is misused in English (Baret 1574: 21). He also notes that <i> and <v> must be used both for vowels and consonants, which he also views as a problem (Baret 1574: 21).

Little appears to be known of Baret's life, which makes it somewhat difficult to establish his reasoning behind the comments on English spelling in this work, but what is known is that for several years he taught Latin at Cambridge (ODNB). The ODNB also notes that Baret stated that the *Alvearie* was produced by inverting his and his students' Latin-English notes to English-Latin, and that it is in fact based on other earlier works. It is also stated that Sir Thomas Smith, whose work is referenced by Baret, was probably

largely responsible for bearing the costs of publication. Smith, a former member of the same university, therefore seems likely to have been influential on Baret's decision to comment on the state of English orthography. Besides this, perhaps some of his comments are due to comparisons between English and the other two languages in his dictionary, which resulted in his finding English to be lacking.

John Hart has received considerable attention from modern scholars. Lass deems him 'probably the most important of the sixteenth-century witnesses [for pronunciation], and one of the monuments of English descriptive phonetics' (1999: 60). Both Lass (1999: 60) and Salmon (1994: 3) note that Hart has been declared an outstanding phonetician. He produced *The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our Inglish Toung* (1551), *An Orthographie* (1569), and *A Methode* (1570), which aimed at an orthographic system in line with pronunciation (Lass 1999: 59; Nevalainen 2006: 32). Spelling should reflect pronunciation, in Hart's opinion, with enough letters to represent each sound, and 'spelling should keep pace with language change', something which Hart understood would occur (Lass 1999: 60). The pronunciation model which Hart picked was, as was the general practice amongst these writers, that of educated London speech, and this accent he claimed could be taught with 'his phonetic alphabet, which would be especially helpful to speakers of Lowland Scots (who were monolingual English speakers) and to speakers of Welsh and Irish, who were mostly bilingual, and who all wanted to "improve" their accents' (Salmon 1994: 3). We may assume that the inclusion of the Welsh and the Irish was down to an attitude that they should be made to conform to English standards as they were under forced English rule, though the inclusion of the Scots is curious; the Scots were independent of the English. The idea that they would want to, or ought to, follow English standards is therefore interesting. Though he believed that educated London speech should be the basis of the standard form for spelling, he also states that one could not blame 'a native of Newcastle or Bodmin for writing in his own vernacular 'to serue hys neyghbors'' (Lass 1987: 67). It seems that he was open to a certain degree of variation at a local level (though his derision for those who were not using the educated London variety suggests that he would not be terribly pleased about this matter).

Hart was displeased about the number of spelling practices 'that did not match the pronunciation of his time'; he criticised the use of superfluous letters and 'unnecessary variation […] in homophones', as well as the use of final <-e> to indicate long vowels (Nevalainen 2006: 33). He also disliked the practice of using one letter to represent

multiple sounds, such as <g> for /g/ and /ʤ/, and the preference for <-le> over <-el> in words like 'circle' and 'fable' (or as Hart would have it, 'cirkel' and 'fabel'), as in his view the vowel is sounded before the final consonant and so should be written in that manner (Nevalainen 2006: 33). Many of these points are also made by Hume in the *Orthographie.* Hume does not mention Hart as he mentions Smith and Baret, but perhaps he was aware of Hart's work. Hart does not seem to have been widely successful. According to Nevalainen (2006: 33), his system was adopted by a few people but 'failed to gain general acceptance'. Salmon (1999: 20) states that the adoption of his system in a few texts, such as Whythorne's autobiography, constitutes a measure of success. It seems likely that Hart's introduction of new symbols would have been an obstacle to success.

William Bullokar's *Book at Large* (1580) and *Bref Grammar* (1586) also aim at a reformation of English spelling. Both Dobson (1968: I, 96) and Nevalainen (2006: 32) state that his system was intended to be phonetic (or more realistically phonemic)[3], but Salmon (1994: 12) claims that he did not favour the phonemic scripts of Smith or Hart, rather his interests in reforming the spelling system lay purely in his aim to improve literacy. Bullokar refers back to both Smith and Hart, but dislikes their introduction of new letters (Dobson 1968: I, 97). Dobson notes that Bullokar saw the 24-letter alphabet as insufficient, and that as a result of this, letters would have several 'meanings' (Dobson 1968: I, 97). Bullokar introduces diacritics, for example promoting the use of diacritics in place of the vowel-consonant distinctions between <i>-<j> and <u>-<v> (Dobson 1968: I, 98). He also notes a number of superfluous letters which he would remove from the language (Dobson 1968: I, 98). Dobson labels Bullokar's system 'extremely complicated', and also that he relies upon the traditional spelling system too much to represent pronunciation (1968: I, 99). Nonetheless, Salmon (1999: 20) notes that his system can be seen in use in some notes made in one book, though she does not say what book. It does not appear that Bullokar was overly influential at least at a practical level, but his *Booke at Large* was listed amongst the library of Hume's former student, William Drummond of Hawthornden (Macdonald 1971: 188-189). There was some interest in his work, though it evidently did not translate into the use of his system.

[3] 'Phonetic' indicates a particular realisation of a sound, implying a level of specificity about the sounds in question which would be impractical and unlikely; phonetic understanding in the Early Modern period was more limited than it is at present, and modern scholars cannot establish phonetic realisations from that time. 'Phonemic', which describes sounds as units of lexical distinction, allows us to discuss these sounds in a manner more representative than specific. See Ogden (2017).

Richard Mulcaster's *First Part of the Elementarie* (1582) was the first and only part of an incomplete work concerning the entirety of elementary education, and largely concerns orthography (Dobson 1968: I, 118). In it, Mulcaster denounces spelling reform on the basis of phonemic representation, as there was 'too much variation in speech, especially in regional dialects, to recommend pronunciation as a basis for orthography' and instead 'relied on established usage to provide the basic guidelines for spelling' (Nevalainen 2006: 35). Mulcaster appears then to be indifferent to variation in speech, though he clearly does not care for it in spelling. He had produced a couple of Latin verses for Baret's *Alvearie* some eight years before the publication of his own work (Salmon 1999: 32), so it may be imagined that Mulcaster was familiar with the contents of Baret's work at least. Possibly this would be what brought him to dislike the practice. Instead, Mulcaster favoured more reliance on convention than his predecessors had proposed; Salmon (1999: 34) describes Mulcaster's comments on the evolution of writing, in which he states that 'writing, originally based on sound, was later affected by reason [...] and custom' and she notes that 'one aim of his work was to show [...] how an originally phonemic writing-system evolved into one where usage and convention played a major part'. So Mulcaster was aware of convention as one factor to consider in spelling reform, and variation in speech as another, just as Hume was. Their responses were quite different; Mulcaster leaned more towards using convention to regularise spelling and leave the variation in speech alone, while Hume (though he does leave space for convention) decided that he may as well attempt to reform pronunciation too. Nevalainen (2006: 36) notes that in the seventeenth century, custom won out over the phonemically-based reforms and texts 'like Mulcaster's had a direct impact on how English orthography was taught and learned'. Nevalainen (2006: 35) also points out that of the 8,000+ words in the spelling list which Mulcaster created, 'over half of them are identical with modern standard spelling', while Salmon (1999: 34) calls him the most influential writer in his field.

Another apparently successful figure was Edmund Coote. His 1596 text *The English Schoole-Maister* appeared in over fifty editions in the century or so following its initial publication (Nevalainen 2006: 36; Salmon 1999: 17). Coote produced this text while working as a schoolmaster, and the text deals with various aspects of language (Dobson 1968: I, 34). It contains a spelling-book and a dictionary of difficult words (Nevalainen 2006: 36). According to Dobson, Coote labels himself as opposed to spelling reform, preferring that writers use 'the best' of current spelling conventions instead (Dobson 1968:

I, 34). He also views ‘the use of dialectal pronunciations as the chief source of spelling errors’ and disdains the speech of ‘‘country people’’ (Dobson 1968: I, 34). Coote’s popularity is noted by Nevalainen (2006: 36) and Salmon (1999: 17), and also by Dobson (1968: I, 35), who points out that Coote’s structure and ideas were used by other writers during the seventeenth century, but that he himself likely ‘followed, to a large extent, the teaching practice of his time’.

The last writer we shall consider is Alexander Gil, whose *Logonomia Anglica* was published in 1619 (Dobson 1968: I, 131) and the second edition in 1621 (Gil 1621 [1969]). His work was, therefore, contemporary with Hume. In fact, Gil was at Oxford between 1583 and 1589 (Dobson 1968: I, 131), and so may have been at the University around the same time as Hume (as we do not know when Hume left Oxford). Dobson states that the spelling system proposed by Gil ‘was not a perfect phonetic representation of English’, but that it would have been a good practical basis for a reformed system, in that it was ‘thoroughgoing and simple and did not depart too far from the old orthography’ (Dobson 1968: I, 131). Salmon, however, states that Gil’s work, as well as that of a later writer, Charles Butler, was ‘of such complexity that they could have no chance of success’, compared to Hume who, in her view, had the potential to be influential (1999: 35). Gil is noted to have favoured certain letter forms from Old English, such as <ð> and <ʒ> (Dobson 1968: I, 136). He also focuses on the speech of the educated classes for the basis of his system, as his predecessors did and his successors would continue to do (Dobson 1968: I, 136), condemning ‘provincial and vulgar pronunciations’ as well as ‘the new-fangled and affected’ (Lass 1999: 59). Gil is known as the ‘promoter of the General Dialect’ (Nevalainen 2006: 36), alternatively the ‘Common’ dialect (Dobson 1968: I, 137). The amount of success deserved by Gil’s *Logonomia* appears to be a matter of dispute: Dobson suggests that of all reformed spelling systems proposed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ‘none deserved to succeed more than that of Alexander Gil’ (Dobson 1968: I, 131), while Salmon (1999: 35) views the *Logonomia* as overcomplicated. It does appear that generally, Gil did not meet with much success, deserving or not, but as cited in section 2.2.3, he may have influenced his pupils, notably the poet John Milton.

Overall, orthoepy in Hume’s day appears to have had a number of similarities, but took two general routes, very broadly speaking: one route was to favour a phonemic orthographic system (which would align closely with the doctrine of *littera*, a likely source of inspiration for many of these writers; Hart’s work would exemplify this route), and the

second route was an orthographic system based on the selection of conventions within contemporary usage (such as would be seen in Mulcaster's work). Hume occupies a space which brings these two options together to an extent, though he heavily favoured the phonemic route. Convention, however, does play a role in the *Orthographie*. Hume's approach on this subject will be explored in the following chapters.

3.3.3. Orthoepy in Scotland

It is unclear exactly how far English orthoepy extended its reach into Scotland. We have, however, mentioned two examples already – Hume himself, and William Drummond of Hawthornden. James VI's *Rewlis and Cautelis*, noted in section 3.2.3.3, also points to an interest in this field of study. It seems not unreasonable to suggest that Hume was likely to have come across the idea of spelling-reform while in England, particularly while at Oxford. He was, after all, in England for many years and spent a few of them at one of the Universities, where ideas of this kind would be readily accessible. While it is possible that Hume had come across this type of work in Scotland, there does not appear to be any explicit evidence to support this. The likelihood of Hume discovering this kind of work in England, where it had been written and published, appear somewhat higher.

Drummond's only visible interaction with orthoepy is his possession of one of Bullokar's texts, as mentioned above. We have already discussed the potential of Hume's influence on his former student Drummond in such a way, though we might assume in this case that – given that Hume does not mention Bullokar in the *Orthographie* – Drummond may perhaps have gone in his own direction on such a matter. It appears that Drummond only visited England once, and briefly at that, but he was in contact with some Englishmen, amongst them the playwright Ben Jonson (ODNB). Jonson visited Drummond in Scotland in 1618-19, and was interested in English linguistics himself, compiling a grammar that would be published posthumously (ODNB). In Drummond's own recordings of their conversations during this visit, English grammar is mentioned twice (Patterson 1924: 45, 51). Perhaps Jonson was influential on Drummond and introduced him to Bullokar's writing. No writer on the English language is mentioned within this record.

4. The contents of the *Orthographie*

4.1. Chapter analysis of the *Orthographie*

What follows is a structured analysis of the contents of the *Orthographie*. The purpose of this section is partly to reword the contents of the *Orthographie* in a form more accessible to the modern reader, and partly to aid us in understanding his rules and comments in order to progress further in this study; there are several places in which the *Orthographie* is somewhat confused, and this section aims to resolve as many of these issues as possible, or failing this, to highlight points of confusion. Hume's terminology has been retained, although glossed to assist the present-day reader. (Discussion of certain points of Hume's terminology can be found in section 5.3.1). Hume's chapter and section divisions have generally been retained, but there are a few places in which the numbering of sections or chapters is incorrect in the *Orthographie*. In the case of sections, the number has been noted as incorrect in italics next to Hume's usage. There are also two chapters titled 'Cap. 7' in Hume's text. For ease of cross-referencing, the second 'Cap. 7' has been titled 'Cap. 7 (II)'. All other chapter headings are maintained as they are in the original text. Latin and Greek phrases have been translated as well as possible using Simpson (1996), Morwood (2005), and Perseus.

Hume does not differentiate between letter forms or sounds through notation. It has proven difficult in many places to establish where Hume discusses symbols and sounds separately or together as one unit, but the general rule in this section is that where Hume discusses only sounds, lower case letters have been used, and where he discusses symbols alone or both sounds and symbols in combination, capital letters have been used. It should be remembered throughout this section that it is often difficult to tell exactly what Hume is saying in this regard, and so there are a number of these points which are open to interpretation.

CAP 1 – *Of the groundes of orthographie*

1 – Writing orthographically should involve the consideration of the 'symbol', the 'thing symbolized', and 'their congruence'. Hume intends to define these terms in this chapter to ensure the understanding of the reader.

2 – The ‘symbol’ is the ‘written letter’, which, Hume says, visually represents the sound that should be pronounced.

3 – The ‘thing symbolized’ is the sound itself, which sound is indicated by the ‘symbol’ (as defined in Sect. 2).

4 – Their ‘congruence’ Hume describes as ‘the instrument of the mouth’, which ‘utteres the sound’ when the ‘eie sees the symbol’. That would presumably mean the mouth itself, i.e. the articulators.

5 – The above are the ‘groundes of al orthographie’, ‘leading the wryter from the sound to the symbol, and the reader from the symbol to the sound’. Hume illustrates his point by discussing the pronunciation of *God*, describing the articulation of the two consonants <g> and <d>, and stating that the articulations lead to the knowledge of the symbols he must write. The vowel, he says, ‘is judged be the sound’ (which he will describe later), which he calls the ‘key of orthographie’.

CAP 2 – *Of the Latine vouales*

1 – Symbols in English/Scots are taken from Latin, as is the case across most of Europe. Hume argues that the Latin usage of symbols must be understood in order to ‘rectefie our aun’ usage. He lists 23 Latin symbols: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, X, Y, Z.

2 – Five of these symbols are vowels, one is a ‘noat of aspiration’, and all the rest (seventeen symbols) are consonants.

3 – Hume describes a vowel as the symbol of a sound made without ‘the tuiches of the mouth’. By ‘tuiches of the mouth’, it appears that he means contact between the articulators.

4 – Vowels, he says, are distinguished by ‘delating and contracting the mouth’. He lists the vowels: A, E, I, O, U.

5 – Hume acknowledges the difficulties in knowing exactly how Latin should be pronounced as it is no longer possible to hear a Roman speak, and each nation now pronounces Latin according to their own vowel sounds.

6 – His focus with this tract is to deal with ‘our aun britan’ language, meaning the vernacular in England and Scotland, so he will ‘omit curiosities’ and anything which is of

no interest to us. The ‘Britan’ tongue involves varieties in pronunciation, which leads to variation in the pronunciation of Latin across England and Scotland. In order to ‘make a conformitie’ in both Latin and the vernacular, he wants to start with Latin. (This could be for several reasons. One, it has been his focus for much of his adult life. Two, Latin is the focus of education at this point in time. Three, and the only reason actually given in the text, the vernacular symbols come from the Latin symbols so it would make sense to use them as a starting point. The influence of the first two points should not be ruled out).

7 – Of A: The pronunciation varies between England and Scotland. England pronounces the vowel as both nations pronounce *bare*, while Scotland pronounces it as both nations pronounce *bar*.

8 – Hume favours the Scottish pronunciation, which he says is based in reason.

9 – The Scots, he says, always give A one sound, whether it comes before or after a consonant. The English, however, vary its pronunciation. Hume uses *amabant* as an example: the English, he says, will pronounce the first two ‘syllabes’ (which here may illustrate the variation in meaning employed by Hume, with ‘syllab’ meaning ‘syllable’, or a single letter/sound, or a cluster of letters/sound not quite forming a full syllable) as they do *bare* and the last as they do *bar*. It would then be pronounced, presumably, as something like /ɛmɛbɑnt/. Hume declares that for all letters, it is always better that they have only one sound. The Scots have only one sound associated with A in Latin, therefore their pronunciation is superior in his mind. He further criticises the English pronunciation as sounding like ‘the sheepes bae’, which the Greeks symbolise with η ‘βη’, not α ‘βα’.

10 – Latin-speakers had two additional sounds deriving from A with the addition of another vowel: Æ and AU. These are diphthongs.

11 – Latin-speakers define diphthongs as the sound of two vowels coalesced into one sound. This definition, he says, is obvious in AU, but less so in Æ as it is pronounced at his time, as it is generally pronounced as E, regardless of the presence of A as the ‘principal’ vowel. At first it does seem to have had a different sound from A, such as that which the Scots use in *stean* or the English use in *stain*. This ‘corruption’, he says, is too entrenched for reason to dislodge it, and he does not believe that he should try to go against it.

14 *Number incorrect* – Of E: reason would dictate that E should have one sound, as doubtlessly the initial intention was to give every sound its own symbol and every symbol its own sound (here Hume demonstrates the doctrine of *littera*), but it may be discerned that there are in fact two. Because England and Scotland do not differ in their

pronunciations of E, Hume will not question it. His purpose is not to 'deal with impossibilities', but merely to conform the north and south 'beath in latine and in English'.

15 *Number incorrect* – There are two Latin diphthongs derived from E: EI and EU. Both hold to the definition which was given in Section 11 of this chapter.

16 *Number incorrect* – Of I: Scotland and England differ in their pronunciation of I, but he deems both sides to have some reason behind them. The English pronounce 'mihi, tibi, and sik otheres' as it is pronounced in *bide*, whereas the Scots pronounce it as it is pronounced in *bid*.

17 *Number incorrect* – He finds some reason for the English sound amongst ancient writers. Cicero states that Latin *bini* and Greek *βίνει* are pronounced alike. Varro and other ancient writers use EI for certain I spellings in Latin, e.g. *domineis* for *dominis*, which is more like the *bide* sound than the *bid* sound. If this argument worked for 'short' I as it does for 'lang' I, and if the ει pronunciation was known, this would be enough to settle the matter in Hume's eyes. However, the I in *mihi* and so on is 'short' in the first syllable and 'common' in the second (the meaning of 'common' is unclear). The sound of EI being also uncertain, he holds to the decision he made in Section 9 of this chapter to favour the more consistent pronunciation, and therefore deems the English pronunciation 'not right' (they do not pronounce the I alike in *is/quis/id/quid* as they pronounce it in *mihi/tibi/sibi*).

18 *Number incorrect* – Of O and U: O is pronounced alike in Scotland and England for Latin. U is pronounced as 'eu' (which presumably means something like /ju/) in England when it is at the start or end of a 'syllab', e.g. 'teu' for *tu*, 'eunum meunus' for *unum munus*. As this is a diphthong sound, and also because the English themselves also pronounce U differently when a consonant follows it, he hopes that he will not have to go any further to prove that it is 'wrang, and not […] a pure voual'.

CAP 3 – *Of the Britan vouales*

1 – Of A: there are four 'sounds' for A in English/Scots, all of which differ from each other significantly enough to change the meaning of a word, e.g. 'a tal man' vs 'a gud tal' vs 'a horse tal' (*tall* vs *tale* vs *tail*, it appears).

2 – Hume recommends imitating Latin or Greek to solve this issue. These languages devised 'diphthongs' to differentiate (by which he means digraphs). He states that the simplest of the four sounds, 'or that quhilk is now in use', should use A, and the other three

should be given ‘diphthongs’. He would write ‘the king’s hal’ with an A, ‘a shour of hael’ with AE, ‘hail marie’ with AI, and ‘a heal head’ as the Scots call it (the English using ‘a whole head’) with EA. So there are three ‘diphthongs’ besides the vowel itself: A, AE, AI, EA. To these should be added AU, which he acknowledges as ‘of a distinct sound’, as the Scots *knawlege* (which ought to be spelled *knauledge*, according to this rule)*,* which in England is *knowlege*.

3 – Hume suggests to all teachers that diphthongs should not be named by the vowels they are made of, but rather by the sound they make, as it would be easier for learners to take the sound as they hear it from their teacher than to piece it together themselves from the individual vowel components.

4 – Of E: there are two sounds for E in English/Scots. It is difficult to judge which sound is simpler. The two sounds are demonstrated in *el* vs *el* (or *ell* vs *eel*), and *hel* vs *hel* (or *hell* vs *heel*). His recommendation is that Scots who are confused by this system should imitate the English, who distinguish the two sounds well by writing *el* (*ell*) and *eel* with a ‘diphthong’. He is aware that some symbolise the latter with IE, e.g. *eie* (*eye*), *hiel* (*heel*), etc. He is indifferent, and just wants one of the two to be used. He says that the ‘advised judge’ should decide the best option themselves, but he prefers IE, firstly because *eye* is better symbolised *eie* than *ee*, and secondly because the Greeks express η as εε, which appears to be closer to α than ε.

5 – Of I: there are two sounds for I in English/Scots, as in ‘a man’s wil’ (*will*) vs ‘the wil of a fox’ (*wile*). He favours the English method again, asking that Scots learn from them. He states that the English differentiate between the two by writing *wil*, *fil*, *mil*, *stil* and *wyl*, *fyl*, *myl*, *styl.*

6 – He points to Baret’s *Alvearie*, which notes that some people would use Greek ει to symbolise one sound and ̣ι to symbolise the other, as in *rειd* and *bειd* (*ride* and *bide*), and *rι̣d* and *hι̣d* (*rid* and *hid*). He sees the reason behind it, and ‘therefoer wil not censure it, except I saw the auctour’s whole drift’. Hume, however, will avoid novelties and will use the letters already in use. As there is no other use of Y as distinguished from I, he is happy to use I and Y to distinguish the two sounds as the English do.

7 – Of O: O is sounded the same across the board. There are, however, a number of diphthongs: OA *roar*, *boar*, *boat*, *coat*; OI *coin*, *join*, *foil*, *soil*; OO *food*, *good*, *blood*; OU *house*, *mouse*. Thus *mountan* and *fountan* are usually written, although it would be more ‘etymological’ to write *montan* and *fontan*.

8 – A ‘grosse errour’ is usually made in this last diphthong by spelling *how* and *now* with W. W is a consonant, so it cannot make up part of a diphthong, which this definitely is.

9 – Of U: As for Latin, in English/Scots the English pronounces U as ‘eu’ in certain contexts, and the Scots pronounce it as ‘ou’. Both, in Hume’s mind, are wrong; they are both diphthongs, but a vowel should be simple. In his opinion, the French sound is the nearest to the correct vowel sound as is pronounced in *mule* and *muse*.

10 – No diphthong for U has been observed, according to Hume’s knowledge. He is unsure how it would be spelled or named. He does see ‘it’ (what sound he is referring to is unclear) in ‘to bou, a bow’. He does not know whether *bou* should be *buu* or *bow* should be *boau*, e.g. Robin Hood ‘wer not able to buu his aun bou, or to bou his aun boau’. Hume leaves it for others to decide.

CAP 4 – *Of consonantes*

1 – The above dealt with vowels and diphthongs, and now Hume moves on to the consonants.

2 – A consonant is a letter which symbolises a sound made with ‘tuiches of the mouth’. He describes it as a sound being ‘broaken’.

3 – He states that there are seven ‘instruments’ of the mouth which break the vocal flow to produce consonants: the bottom lip, the upper lip, the ‘outward’ teeth, the ‘inward’ teeth, the top of the tongue, the middle of the tongue, and the roof of the mouth. Three of these he describes as ‘hammeres stryking’, and the other four as ‘stiddies’ (which Wheatley defines as an anvil in his glossary. This definition also appears in the DSL under ‘study(e’, alongside a definition of ‘the passive articulator’: DSL n.[1] *study(e*), which the ‘hammeres’ hit.

4 – The ‘hammeres’ are the bottom lip, the top of the tongue, and the middle of the tongue. The ‘stiddies’ or anvils are the upper lip, the ‘outward’ teeth, the ‘inward’ teeth, and the roof of the mouth.

5 – The bottom lip hitting the upper lip makes B, M, or P. The bottom lip hitting the teeth makes F or V.

6 – The top of the tongue hitting the ‘inward’ teeth makes D, L, N, R, S, T, or Z.

7 – The middle of the tongue hitting the roof of the mouth makes the rest of the sounds: C, G, K, J, Q, and X. In total this gives 18 consonants borrowed from Latin.

8 – These were in turn borrowed from the Greeks, except J and V, which are now sounded differently than they were by the Romans. Plutarch symbolises them more like vowels in his time, closer to the vowels 'quherof they are maed', as in 'ἰόυνιος ὀύινδεξ' for 'junius vindex', instead of using γ and β (as in 'γόυνιος βίνδεξ'), as would be used to represent the pronunciation at Hume's time.

9 – In Hume's day, the sounds represented by Plutarch by 'ἰόυ' and 'ὀύ' – represented in Roman letters by J and W – still exist, he says, in words like *yallou* and *winter*. These are 'worn out of the latin use', so Hume advises that the Latin sound now in use should be left to Latin, and take as 'ours' (English/Scots) the sound which is no longer used in Latin. The Latin sounds should be given the Latin symbols J and V, and the symbols 'usurped' by English/Scots-speakers should be used for the sounds which remain in use in the vernacular – Y and W for *yallou* and *water*.

10 – Some spell *yallou* with a Z, which Hume says is a mistake. Another error of his time is not demonstrating the difference between V and W. Z, he says, is a 'dental' sound, made with the top of the tongue and the root of the teeth. 'Yal' (Y), however, is a 'guttural' sound, made 'by a mynt of the tongue to the roofe of the mouth' (Wheatley defines 'mynt' as 'aim', so this description appears to illustrate not a touch in the mouth so much as a closeness between the articulators. The DSL, under 'mint', also includes numerous senses which centre around 'aiming', 'intending' or 'making movements towards' striking, which supports this: DSL n.[1] *mint*). The 'organes' being so distant from each other and the kinds of contact being of such different types, Z cannot be used to represent the sound in *yallou*, nor anything else like it.

11 – On the subject of V and W, Hume notes that there is a sound in the vernacular which is not heard in the Latin of his day, in addition to the Latin sound being part of the vernacular. He commends the 'wisdom of the south', which keeps the Latin symbol for the Latin sound and gave the English/Scots sound a symbol unused in Latin. The English also did this for J and Y; just as Latin-speakers took I to represent a consonant in Latin which the Greeks did not have, they also took Y (a similar vowel to I) for the 'correspondent' sound, which is not used in the Latin pronunciation of Hume's day.

12 – Hume would recommend, for the distinction of both sound and symbol, that the symbols and names of both I and U be used for the vowel sounds, e.g. *indifferent* and

unthankful. The symbols J and V should be used for the Latin consonants, as in *vain* and *jestes*, and their names should be 'jod' and 'van'. The symbols Y and W should be used for the English sounds, as in *yonder* and *wel*, and their names should be 'ye' or 'yod' and 'we' or 'wau'.

13 – Hume calls H a 'noat of aspiration' in Cap. 2 Section 2. It is not a vowel because it 'makes no sound' with a consonant, for example CH, and it is not a consonant because it is produced without 'the tuich of the mouth', e.g. *ha*.

14 – H can affect all vowels and diphthongs, e.g. *hand*, *hen*, etc. It cannot, however, affect a vowel in English/Scots if it comes after it. It can affect some consonants, he says. It affects G after the vowel, e.g. *laugh*, P before the vowel, e.g. *phason*, and S and T before the vowel, e.g. *think* and *shame*. He says that with C, English/Scots speakers 'spil the aspiration' to produce CH, which he describes as an 'Italian chirt', e.g. *charitie*, *cherrie*. He will discuss this particular point later.

CAP 5 – *Of our abusing sum consonantes*

1 – Here Hume comes to an issue he cannot fix, and would be glad of help. He states that there should be a symbol for every sound and only one sound for each symbol. This, he says, 'reason and nature craveth', and he is convinced that the 'worthie inventoures of this divyne facultie' were aiming for such a system.

2 – He does not know how it happened, but this system has not been followed, as in both English/Scots and in Latin, one symbol has multiple sounds, even in one word, e.g. *lego*, *legis* (according to Section 9 of this Cap., Hume is referring to the G here).

3 – Of C: It appears that the Greeks pronounced this letter as K (/k/), as they write *Cicero* as *kikero*, *Cæsar* as *kaiser*, and Plutarch writes *principia* as *πριγκίπια*.

4 – In English/Scots and Latin, that sound is maintained before A, O, and U, e.g. *canker*, *conduit*, and *cumber*. Before E and I, however, it is sometimes pronounced (both in Latin and in the vernacular) as an S (i.e. /s/), e.g. *cellar*, *certain*, *citie*.

5 – If C follows a vowel and another consonant accompanies it, it is pronounced as K (/k/), e.g. *occur*, *accuse*, *acquyre*. If it is at the end of a 'syllab', E is added and it is pronounced as an S (/s/), e.g. *peace*, *vice*. Neither 'idle' E nor the /s/ sound have any reason behind them, according to Hume, nor does he dare go against 'so strang a tyde'. He

thinks it is rather better to 'erre with al, then to stryve with al and mend none' – essentially, this is so consistently used that it is not worth fighting.

6 – Even where C has its 'awne sounde' (of /k/) in the 'original', the sound can be changed to the 'chirt we spak of' in Cap 4 Section 14, by which he means /tʃ/. This cannot be symbolised with a Greek or Latin letter (presumably a single one). *Canto* becomes *chant*, *castus* becomes *chast*, *κυριακὴ* becomes *church*. Hume recounts hearing the Oxford professor of Greek, Dr Laurence, give his view on this matter: in essence, the Scots maintain the supposedly correct form *kirk*, while the English 'corrupt' it to produce *church*.

7 – He believes that the /tʃ/ sound (represented by CH) is 'barbarous', but as it is too common to be 'mended' both before the vowel (e.g. *chance*) and after it (e.g. *such*), it should be symbolised with CH as it is in his day, even though neither C nor H have any 'affinitie' with the /tʃ/ sound. CH should be used, he says, firstly because it has been used for so long, and secondly because there is no other way to symbolise it other than with a new symbol, which would be difficult to introduce.

8 – This is a rather confused section. CH 'in nature' is 'c asperat', e.g. *charus* and *chorus*, and this sound is also in use in *licht* and *micht* (*light* and *might*). If Hume had been 'at the first counsel', he would have proposed to give CH its own sound. As it stands, nothing is to be changed if it is not necessary to do so, so he is happy to recommend the southern practice, which entails using GH for *licht* to produce *light*, and use CH for 'the other sound', even though it is technically improper. He recommends this system to the Scots, who are yet to observe it.

9 – G, Hume says, is not as corrupted as C. It has two sounds even in Latin, even within one word (as observed in Cap. 5 Section 2), but both hold to 'the nature of the symbol' and 'differ not in the instrumentes of the mouth, but in the form of the tuich', as may be observed in *ago*, *agis*, *agam*, *ages*.

10 – G never follows the vowel in Latin. Before A, O, and U, it always has 'the awn sound', while before E and I it 'breaks it'.

11 – In English/Scots, G may either begin or end the 'syllab', e.g. *gang*. It may also have either sound before or after the vowel, e.g. *get*, *gist*, *gin*, *giant*.

12 – The English have two ways to distinguish the two sounds, but Hume approves of neither. For the first sound (which seems to be /g/), some people write GG, e.g. *egg*, *bigg*.

For the other sound (which seems to be /dʒ/), some use DG, e.g. *hedge*, *bridge*. Hume says that these are not ‘according to all things’, i.e. they are not used consistently across the board. The name *Giles*, he notes, cannot be written as *dgiles*, nor can *giles* (which seems to be *guiles*) be written as *ggiles*. These are not in general use after the vowel either, e.g. *age*, *rage* are never written with DG. As neither the sound nor the symbol have, in Hume’s opinion, any reason to take multiple forms, without any ‘greater auctoritie, nor the reach of a privat wit’, the fault is in his view ‘incorrigible’.

13 – Hume is not ignorant of what an ado the learned make about the symbols C, G, K, and Q being multiple symbols for ‘one sound’, but he chooses not to get involved in that issue as it is ‘besyde my purpose’ – he does not intend to correct Latin symbols, but rather to find the best use of them in English.

14 – T is the last of the ‘misused souldioures’, and always keeps its own sound (/t/), except in TIO spellings, e.g. *oration*, *declamation*, as in English/Scots TIA and TIU are not pronounced as they are in Latin. It should be observed that if TIO is preceded by an S, the T is pronounced as /t/, e.g. *question*, *suggestion*.

15 – Hume has to this point briefly dealt with the letters and their sounds, which he would ask the printers to express as: A, AE, AI, AU, EA, B, C, D, E, EE, EI, EU, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, OA, OO, OU, P, Q, R, S, T, U, UI, V, W, X, Y, Z. He would ask the masters teaching their students to sound diphthongs not by their constituent vowels, but by the sound they make as a unit. He would also have them call W ‘wau’ or ‘we’, rather than the current ‘double-u’ or ‘double-v’, and to call V ‘vau’ or ‘ve’, and likewise to call J ‘jod’ or ‘je’ to differentiate it from I.

CAP 6 – *Of the syllab*

1 – He now moves on to the ‘syllab’, which he describes as ‘a ful sound symbolized with convenient letteres, and consistes of ane or more’.

2 – A ‘syllab’ of one letter is only ever symbolised with a vowel, e.g. A in *able*, E in *ever*, etc. A consonant, he says, cannot make up a ‘syllab’ by itself.

3 – A ‘syllab’ of more than one letter can be made up of only vowels, or of a combination of vowels and consonants. A ‘syllab’ made up of only vowels is a diphthong (in this instance), which have already been discussed.

4 – A 'syllab' made up of a combination of vowels and consonants can have one of many constructions. It could start with the vowel, e.g. *al*, *il*. It could start with one consonant, e.g. 'tal man'. It could start with two consonants, e.g. *stand*, *sleep*. At most, it can start with three consonants, e.g. *strand*, *stryp*. It could end with the vowel, e.g. *fa*, *fo*. It could end with one consonant, e.g. *as*, *ar*. It could end with two consonants, e.g. *best*, *dart*. At most it can end with three consonants, e.g. *durst*, *worst*.

5 – It should be noted that, when dividing 'syllabes', any consonants in the middle of a word which are viable at the start of a 'syllab' belong to the vowel that follows them – they are generally (if not always) syllable-initial. E.g. *que-stion*, *qua-rel*, *fi-shar*, *sa-fron*, *ba-stard*, *de-scrib*, *re-scue*.

6 – Hume observes that in printing and writing, if a word is split across two lines, the partition must be made at the end of a 'syllab', so that there are full 'syllabes' on either side of the divide. E.g. *magistrat* would be separated as 'ma-gistrat', or 'magi-strat', but the M cannot be parted from the A, nor the G from the I, the S from the T, or the T from the R.

CAP. 7 – *Of the rules to symbolise*

1 – To symbolise correctly, Hume recommends determining the sound of the vowel first. Is it a simple vowel or a compound? Which vowel is it? No rule, he says, can be given for the second question but the 'judgement of the ear'.

2 – Establishing the consonants is the next stage. Firstly, it should be noted whether they 'break the voual' before or after it, then the number of consonants should be observed, and finally with what 'organes of the mouth' they are made with.

3 – The organs 'quherwith the syllab is broaken' are the key to determining which consonants must be used to symbolise the 'syllab', as was said in Cap. 1 Section 5.

4 – The consonants may differ in 'hammar' (as noted in Cap 4. Section 3) and 'stiddie'/anvil, e.g. B /b/ and D /d/. They may agree in 'hammar' and differ in 'stiddie'/anvil, e.g. B /b/ and V /v/. They may agree in both organs and differ in touch, e.g. F /f/ and V /v/, M /m/ and P /p/, or C /k/ and G /g/.

5 – A touch before the vowel (a consonant preceding the vowel) is the act of 'lifting the hammer af the stiddie', e.g. *da*, *la*. A touch after the vowel (a consonant succeeding the vowel) is the act of 'stryking the hammer on the stiddie', e.g. *ad*, *al*. In the event that the

'hammer and the stiddie are ane' (as in, the same articulators are used for various sounds), they can differ in the 'hardnes and softnes' of the touch, e.g. *ca* /ka/ and *ga* /ga/, or *ta* /ta/ and *da* /da/. W and Y, Hume says, make so 'soft' a contact that it is hard to perceive the sound, hence why they are symbolised with vowels in Latin writing. These two are only used before the vowel, e.g. *we*, *ye*, *wil*, *you*. After the vowel they make no consonantal sound, and so should not be written with a consonant. *Now* and *vow*, etc., should not be written with a W.

6 – As was said in Cap. 1 Section 5, the key to orthography is the congruence of the symbol and the sound symbolised, meaning that both the sound and symbol must belong to the same 'organes' and 'be tuiched after the same form'.

7 – It is clear, in Hume's view, that 'soundes pronunced with this organ can not be written with symboles of that', e.g. a labial symbol cannot be used for a dental or guttural sound, nor a guttural symbol for a dental or labial sound.

8 – To demonstrate this issue, and to 'reform an errour bred in the south, and now usurped be our ignorant printeres', Hume tells a story about his encounter with a good friend of his while he was in the south. The pair began debating whether or not *quho*/*who, quhen*/*when, quhat*/*what*, etc., should be written with Q or W, which became a heated discussion. They debated on the subject many times, then met a doctor of divinity in Bath of both their acquaintance. The doctor invited them to dinner. When they were there, his opponent brought the topic up amongst 'his awn condisciples' (presumably everyone else present was English), by claiming that Hume was 'becum an heretik'. The doctor asked how, and Hume's opponent said that Hume denied that *quho*/*who* should be spelled with a W, but rather with QU. The doctor asked for Hume's reason. Hume then laid out his grounds for sound and symbol congruence, with much interruption from his opponent – the doctor had to keep the latter quiet. Hume then said that a labial letter could not represent a guttural 'syllab'. W is a labial letter, while *quho* is a guttural sound. W therefore cannot symbolise *quho*/*who*, or any other 'syllab' of that kind, he stated. Everyone 'barked at ones', and the doctor quieted them, before saying: 'the proposition […] I understand; the assumption is Scottish, and the conclusion false'. Everyone laughed, 'as if I had bene dryven from al replye, and I fretted to see a frivolouse jest goe for a solid ansuer'. Hume's proposition is grounded in Cap. 7 Section 7, which no one with any understanding of reason can deny, in his opinion. So the question must rest on whether W is a labial letter and *quho* a guttural 'syllab'. W can be supported as labial by the examples *wil*, *wel*, and *wyne*, as is said in Cap. 5 Section 5. As for *quho*, it differs from *quo* only in 'aspiration',

and W cannot be aspirated as it is not a ‘perfect consonant’. Hume therefore appeals to ‘judiciouse eares’ to judge whether the aspiration in *quho* is or is not made deep within the throat and is therefore not labial.

CAP 7(II) – *Of rules from the Latin*

1 – In Hume’s view, as English/Scots borrows from Latin a lot, it stands to reason that speakers should either follow Latin rules for symbolising, or deduce from them the grounds of our orthography.

2 – Therefore, whatever in English/Scots is derived from Latin words written with C, should also be written with C in English/Scots, even if it sounds like an S (/s/) ‘to the ignorant’, e.g. *conceave* and *receave* from *concipio* and *recipio*; *concern* and *discern* from *concerno* and *discerno*; *accesse* and *successe* from *accedo* and *succedo*.

3 – Furthermore, borrowed words written in Latin with an S should be written with an S in English/Scots, e.g. *servant* from *servus* and *sense* from *sensus*.

4 – English/Scots must also maintain any Latin spellings with S and C together, e.g. *science* from *scientia*, and *ascend* from *ascendo*.

4 *Number incorrect* – The ‘difference of C and S’ (meaning where they are used) should be more closely attended to because homophones are often distinguished in their spellings by these two symbols. For example, ‘the kinges secrete council’ vs ‘the faithful counsil of a frende’, or ‘a décent weed’ vs ‘descént of a noble house’. The latter examples also differ in ‘accent’ (by which Hume means stress).

5 *Number incorrect* – Words deriving from Latin which are spelled with TIO should also be written in English/Scots with a T, e.g. *oration*, *visitation*, and *education*.

6 *Number incorrect* – Words deriving from Latin which are spelled with TIA and TIUM are written in English/Scots with CE, e.g. *justice* from *justitia* and *vice* from *vitium*. The E which comes after the C is ‘idle’ in these spellings, but Hume states that usage has ‘made it tollerable to noat the breaking of the c’, ‘for al tongues bear with sum slippes that can not abyde the tuich stone of true orthographie’.

7 *Number incorrect* – C is also used in words which, in Latin, are spelled with X, e.g. *peace* from *pax,* and *nurice* from *nutrix*. In the south, Hume notes, the latter is *nurse*,

which he believes is ‘not without a falt both in sound and symbol’. This rule also gives English/Scots *felicitie*, *audacitie*, and *tenacitie*.

8 *Number incorrect* – In Hume’s opinion, vowels should be kept in line with their Latin originals, which is a source of contention between England and Scotland. He gives a variety of examples:

- Latin *retineo* → Scottish *retine*, English *retain*.
- Latin *foras* → Scottish *foran*, English *forain*.
- Latin *regnum* → Scottish *regne*, English *raigne*.
- Latin *cor* → Scottish *corage*, English *courage*.
- Latin *devoro* → Scottish *devore*, English *devour*.
- Latin *vox* → Scottish *voce*, English *voice*.
- Latin *devoveo* → Scottish *devote*, English *devout*.
- Latin *guerrum* → Scottish *wer*, English *war*.
- Latin *gigas* → Scottish *gyant*, English *giaunt*.
- Latin *mons*, *montis* → Scottish *mont*, English *mount*.

‘Of this’, Hume says, ‘I cold reckon armies’. Arguably he already has, in this list of examples (the longest list of examples he gives anywhere in this treatise). He will not, however, ‘presume to judge farther then the compasse of my awn cap’, for though Scotland keeps nearer to the original Latin in these cases, all tongues have their own impact on borrowings from Latin and from other foreign languages.

CAP 8 – *Of sum idiomes in our orthographie*

1 – In English/Scots Hume notes that there are certain ‘particles’ (by which he appears to mean sounds) which cannot be symbolised with Roman symbols, ‘nor rightlie pronunced but be our awn’. For example, in many places where L and N come after a consonant and they cannot ‘move’ without a vowel intervening, the L or N will be so ‘absorb[ed]’ that it is difficult to tell if there is an intervening vowel or not.

2 – In such cases, some people write the vowel after the L or N to avoid this vowel being pronounced before the consonant, e.g. *litle*, *mikle*, *muttne*, *eatne*. This does cause another issue – some pronounce the vowel after the L or N – but he does not dare ‘presume to reprove’ because he cannot work out how to avoid both issues. Instead, he will leave it to the writer to decide.

3 – Some of ‘our men’ (this seems to mean the English and Scots in general rather than one or the other) have taken up unusual methods for symbolising, which he would like to see reformed. If he cannot provide reason for his proposals, though, no one should change their methods on his account.

4 – Firstly, he takes issue with writing *peple* as *people*. He understands this spelling as it comes from the Latin *populus*, but if that is the reason for this spelling, then he would also like to know the reason why those who write *people* ‘wryte not as they speak’. He knows that France sets the example of speaking one way and writing another, but that example would also give reason to ‘absorb’ the S at the end of every word. ‘Al exemples are not imitable’, he argues.

5 – Some people would also write *logicque*, *musicque*, and *rhetoricque*, with CQUE. If this is done to maintain the original C in the Latin *logica*, etc., he asks why would they not use a K instead, rather than ‘hedge it in with a whol idle syllab’? In Hume’s view it would be more orthographical and also easier for the learner to use K, as C and K are so closely related; one is the Greek form and the other the Latin form of the same sound. It is as absurd to write what is not pronounced as it is to pronounce what is not written.

6 – English/Scots-speakers would also write an ‘idle e’ at the end of almost every word (perhaps a slight exaggeration on Hume’s part). Some defend it in that the E is not idle; it affects the vowel before the consonant, and the affected sound often alters the signification, e.g. *hop* vs *hope*, *fir* vs *fyre*, *fin* vs *fine*, *bid* vs *bide*, and many more. It is true, he says, that the sound of the pre-consonantal vowel often does change the signification, but it is untrue that idle E after that consonant changes the sound of this vowel. A vowel divided from another vowel by a consonant cannot by any means return through the consonant into the preceding vowel. Consonants between vowels are like ‘partition walles betwuen roomes’. Nothing can change the sound of a vowel but another vowel ‘coalescing with it into one sound’ which has already been discussed in Cap. 3. E.g. *hop* vs *hoep*, *fir* vs *fyr* or *fier*, *bid* vs *byd* or *bied*.

7 – In some cases, he admits, this idle E must be tolerated. Firstly it must be tolerated in words ending in C, to ‘break the sound of it’ (to denote /s/), e.g. *peace*, *face*. Secondly it must be tolerated after S (final S), e.g. *false*, *ise*. Thirdly, it must be tolerated after a ‘broaken’ G (meaning /dʒ/), e.g. *knawlege*, *savage*. There may be more places in which it must be tolerated, and these he allows because he knows no other way to deal with these issues, not because he thinks it is orthographically acceptable to allow any ‘idle’ symbol.

CAP 9 – *Of the accentes of our tongue*

1 – Not only do England and Scotland differ more in ‘accent’ than in symbolising, but one word with various ‘accents’ can have different significations. Therefore Hume recommends that whoever has the authority to do so should command all printers and writers to note the accented syllable in every word, with no less diligence than the Greeks would note theirs. By ‘accent’, it appears that Hume is discussing stress.

2 – Cicero ‘makes it a natural harmonie’ that every word has one acute ‘syllab’ (i.e. a stressed syllable), and that ‘syllab’ should never be further from the end of the word than the third ‘syllab’ from the end, which grammarians call the ‘antepenult’. Hume agrees that this is certainly true in Greek and Latin, the languages that Cicero understood. Had he understood English/Scots, however, Cicero would sometimes have found the accent in the fourth ‘syllab’ from the end, e.g. *mátrimonie*, *intóllerable*, *intélligences*. Anyone may understand this ‘if he accent the antepenult matrímonie, or the penult matrimonie, or the last as matrimoníe’ (as it will sound wrong).

3 – English/Scots has the same accents as are found in Latin and Greek: the acute, the circumflex, and the grave.

4 – The acute accent ‘raiseth the syllab’ it is found in, e.g. *profésse*, *prófit*, *ímpudent*. In other words, according to Hume, the ‘acute accent’ represents the stressed syllable.

5 – It may be found on the last ‘syllab’, e.g. *supprést*, *preténce*, *sincére*. It can be on the ‘penult’, e.g. *súbject*, *cándle*, *cráftie*. It can be on the ‘antepenult’, e.g. *diffícultie*, *mínister*, *fínallie*. It can also be on the fourth ‘syllab’ from last, as is said in Section 2 of this Cap., e.g. *spéciallie*, *insátiable*, *díligentlie*. In all of these cases, if the accent is changed, the speaker shall ‘spill the sound of the word’.

6 – The grave accent is never noted in English/Scots, but is only understood to exist in all ‘syllabes’ which do not have either of the other two accents. It is added only ‘for difference’ in some words, and the accent leans in the opposite direction to the acute accent: `. Hume gives no example of the use of a grave accent. It appears, but is not entirely certain, that he associates the grave accent with unstressed syllables. We may construct an example from his discussion: *ímpùdènt*.

7 – The circumflex both ‘liftes and felles the syllab’, and combines both of the marks of the other two accents: ˆ. As in Latin, this has almost no use in Scotland. The English,

however, use it frequently, in which use their dialect differs more from that of Scotland than it does in either sound or symbol. As for the grave accent, Hume gives no example of the circumflex in use, and it is not clear what he means in this section.

8 – The use of the accent will be important for the correct pronunciation of the language and in conforming the dialects, which (as said above) differ most in this.

CAP. 10 – *Of the apostrophus and hyphen*

1 – Printers symbolise both 'apostrophus' and 'hyphen' as well as the letters.

2 – 'Apostrophus' is the removal of a letter or 'syllab' from a word, or from between two. It is always marked 'above the lyne', and is like a comma, so '.

3 – It is most common that 'apostrophus' is used within one word in 'poesie', for example *grug'd* or *destroy'd*.

4 – Between two words, letters or 'syllabs' are taken either from the end of the first word or from the beginning of the second.

5 – English/Scots-speakers take from the end of the first word when it ends with a vowel and the next word begins with a vowel, e.g. 'th' ingrate'; 'th' one parte'; 'I s' it' for 'I see it'.

6 – When taking from the start of the second word, Hume states that the Scots 'use a mervelouse libertie': 'he's a wyse man' for 'he is a wyse man'; 'I'l meet with him' for 'I wil meet with him'; 'a ship 'l of fooles' for 'a ship ful of fooles'. This is used in the 'common language'. More peculiarly, he says, sometimes the end of the second word is cut, e.g. 'he 's tell the' for 'he sal tell the'.

7 – The hyphen is a 'band uniting whol wordes joined in composition', e.g. *hand-maed*, *heard-man*, *tongue-tyed*, *out-rage*, *foer-warned*, *mis-reported*, *fals-deemed*.

4.2. Hume's rules

Table 1 below is intended to demonstrate in a clear and reduced manner the alignments between spellings and sounds which Hume describes. Each entry in the table contains a letter or digraph (most of which come from Hume's own proposed list of letters and digraphs for the use of printers (Wheatley 1870: 16), with a few additions explicitly

mentioned by him but not included in this list), the sound value which appears to be assigned to it on the basis of Hume's descriptions, an example word taken from the *Orthographie*, and any other relevant details on how or where that particular spelling should be used, or its relationship to other spellings.

The manner in which sound values were assigned to spellings depends on the situation. Many of the consonants are barely described in the *Orthographie*, besides their letter forms and place of articulation. In these instances, their expected contemporary values are maintained. There are a few consonants which are described in more detail, usually because Hume views them as being 'abused' in their usage, or because they were generally seen as linked to certain vowels due to Latin usage, for example J or V. Most of these consonants are also fairly simple to establish values for. Any potential uncertainties have been discussed in the table.

The vowels cause considerably more trouble. The exact values have been difficult to determine in many instances. Hume uses contemporary examples to illustrate them, sometimes in both English and Scots. Whether he uses one language as an example or both, there have been a number of instances in which the value of the vowel has been unclear. Individual issues are noted in the 'Details' column of the table, alongside the decisions made for the sake of transcriptions.

The column of example words only contains one relevant example for each spelling-sound pairing, rather than the full list given by Hume. Some spelling-sound pairings are given more than one example word when it has been necessary to illustrate certain criteria pertaining to these pairings. For example, where <c> produces the sound /k/, Hume specifies that this would happen before <a>, <o>, or <u>, and so an example is given for each of these vowels. This column gives the spelling provided in Hume's original text as recorded by Wheatley (1870) e.g. <hael>, and then the modern equivalent is given in italics, e.g. *hail (weather)*.

The 'Details' column includes any relevant information about each entry, such as its connection to other letters, details of any criteria set on the letter's usage to represent that particular sound (e.g. <c> used as /k/ alongside the vowels <a>, <o>, or <u>), or any problems in determining the exact sound value which should be assigned to the letter in question and the path which will be taken with these cases.

Table 1: A list of Hume's spelling rules

Symbol(s)	Sound	Example word(s)	Details
A	/a/	<hal> *hall*	The 'simplest' sound of A. Presumably this letter would also represent /ɑ(:)/ if necessary, e.g. 'hall' in English, but it seems more likely that Hume is referring to the Scots usage, so our transcriptions will use /a/.
AE	/e(:)/	<hael> *hail (weather)*	A-'diphthong' (digraph). Described as a different 'sound' to AI and EA.
AI	/e(:)/	<hail> *hail (greeting)*	A-'diphthong' (digraph). Described as a different 'sound' to AE and EA.
AU	/ɔ(:)/	<knauledge> *knowledge*	A-'diphthong' (digraph), 'of a distinct sound'.
B	/b/	---	---
C	/k/	<canker> *canker* <conduit> *conduit* <cumber> *cumber* <occur> *occur*	Sounded as /k/ if it comes before A, O, or U. Sounded as /k/ in VcC constructions.
	/s/	<cellar> *cellar* <citie> *city* <peace> *peace*	Sounded as /s/ if it comes before E or I 'sometimes'. Sounded as /s/ after a vowel in final position, must be accompanied by -E.
CH	/ʧ/	<church> *church*	---
D	/d/	---	---
E	/ɛ/	<hel> *hell*	---
('idle' -E)	No sound	<face> *face* <false> *false* <savage> *savage*	Idle final -E is acceptable after S, C, or G; -CE is /s/ rather than /k/, -GE is /ʤ/ rather than /g/, -SE is not given a reason.
EA	/e(:)/	<heal> *Scots for 'whole'*	A-'diphthong' (digraph). Described as a different 'sound' to AE and AI.
EE	/i(:)/	<heel> *heel*	Alternative option for this sound: IE.
EU	/iu/ or /ju/	---	Only actually described as a fault in English pronunciation, but included in his final printer's list. Exact value is not clear, but the /ju/ transcription will be used if needed.
F	/f/	---	---
G	/g/	<gang> *gang*	---
	/ʤ/	<giant> *giant*	---
GH	/x/ (or perhaps /ʧ/)	<light> *light*	Described as being of the same sound as CH in 'church'. Examples indicate he actually means /x/, which will be used in transcriptions if needed.
H	/h/	<ha> *ha*	'Neither vowel nor consonant'. Only makes /h/ with no consonant next to it.
I	/ɪ/	<bid> *bid*	Separate from J – I only represents the vowel.

IE	/i(:)/	<hiel> *heel*	Alternative option for this sound: EE.
	/eɪ/ or /əɪ/	<bied> *bide*	Alternative option for this sound: Y. Exact value is uncertain due to use of examples of descriptions, but /eɪ/ will be used in transcriptions if needed as this is the Scots value, and Hume seems more comfortable with Scots values.
J	/ʤ/	<jestes> *jests*	Separate from I – J only represents the consonant.
K	/k/	---	---
L	/l/	---	---
M	/m/	---	---
N	/n/	---	---
O	/o/ or /ɔ/	---	No description is actually given. /ɔ/ will generally be used in our transcriptions due to its prominence over /o/ in both English and Scots.
OA	/o(:)/ or /ɔ(:)/	<boat> *boat* <boar> *boar*	O-'diphthong' (digraph). Difficult to establish exact vowel quality. The examples used indicate that it could be either depending on surrounding sounds, which is how any relevant transcriptions will be completed. Lack of differentiation on Hume's part may be due to phonetic closeness.
OI	/ɔɪ/	<coin> *coin*	O-'diphthong' (both diphthong and digraph).
OO	/u:/	<food> *food*	O-'diphthong' (digraph).
OU	/ɔu/ or /ou/	<house> *house* <hou> *how*	O-'diphthong' (both diphthong and digraph). Often 'incorrectly' written as -OW, as in 'how'. It is difficult to establish exactly what Hume meant by this; in Scots <ou> often represents /u/, as in <house> /hus/, but it seems evident that he is referring to a diphthong. Taking the Scots pronunciation of 'how', we will use the phonemic representation /ɔu/.
P	/p/	---	---
PH	/f/	<phason> *?*	Described as being 'befoer the voual'.
Q	/k(w)/	---	Never actually described in itself, but it is connected with C, K, and G, with all four being possibly of 'the same sound'.
QUH-	/ʍ/	<quhat> *what*	Laing & Lass (2019) raise /hw/ and /xw/ as phonemic realisations of this particular spelling. The present study will maintain /ʍ/, but readers may prefer to substitute in /hw/ or /xw/.
R	/r/	---	---
S	/s/	---	---
SH	/ʃ/	<shame> *think*	Described as being 'befoer the voual'.

T	/t/	--- <question> *question*	--- In a -STIO spelling, T retains /t/.
	/s/	<oration> *oration*	In a -TIO spelling, T seems to take /s/, though the specifics of this sound are undescribed.
TH	/θ/	<think> *think*	Described as coming ‘befoer the voual’.
U	/u(:)/, perhaps /y(:)/	<muse> *muse*	French is ‘closest’ to the ‘true’ sound. Separate from V – U only represents the vowel. The actual vowel quality indicated by this letter is unclear. We will use /u(:)/ in any transcriptions, but the /y/ alternative should be noted. Might have diphthongs – situation unclear.
V	/v/	<vain> *vain*	Separate from U – V only represents the consonant.
W	/w/	<water> *water*	Only to be used before a vowel.
X	/ks/	---	Never described, but included in printer’s list.
Y	/eɪ/ or /əɪ/	<byd> *bide*	Baret’s alternative – ɛι. Alternative option for this sound: IE. As for IE, we will use /eɪ/ for any transcriptions as this is the Scots form, which Hume seems to be more comfortable with.
	/j/	<yonder> *yonder*	Only to be used before a vowel.
Z	/z/	---	Never actually described. Not to be used for /j/ (as in <z> derived from <ȝ>).

4.3. Comparative transcriptions

Table 2 below contains a set of transcriptions of part of the *Orthographie*. The text in use is the start of Cap. 7, Section 8: the ‘*quh-* story’, in which Hume details his encounters with a number of Englishmen who mock his defence of spelling their <wh-> words with <quh->. For ease of reading, the transcriptions are integrated line by line. The original text is given as recorded in Wheatley’s edition (1870: 18).

The first transcription given below the original text is an approximation of the Scots of Hume’s day. This transcription is intended to be relatively conservative. There existed, at this time, the possibility for anglicisation in Scots, but in order to allow for the variety which existed across England and Scotland, it has been deemed appropriate to err on the side of the more traditionally Scots pronunciations of the day. This Scots transcription was created by use of the *Dictionaries of the Scots Language/Dictionars o the Scots Leid*

(DSL), the *Concise Scots Dictionary* (Scottish Language Dictionaries 2017), and the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) to establish the modern equivalents of each word in terms of pronunciation, the spelling variations available historically (particularly around Hume's day), and the etymological roots of the words. This information was then taken diachronically to establish the vowel qualities in use in Scots at Hume's time, using Caroline Macafee's adaptation of A.J. Aitken's historical outline of Scots vowels (Macafee 2003: 140-141). This visualisation of vowel developments also provides a record of the principal Older Scots graphemes in use for each vowel (Macafee 2003: 140-141), which information was used to aid the choice of vowel qualities. This process also proved difficult, however; this visualisation works in three broad blocks of time, with the Middle Scots period deemed as spanning about 250 years. There will undoubtedly have been intermediary stages in vowel developments, but it has been deemed appropriate for the present study to err slightly on the conservative side and use the 'Middle Scots' values, listed as being used from 1450 to 1700 (Macafee 2003: 140-141). Presuming that the values given fall broadly in the middle of that period, this option should coincide with a relatively conservative set of sound values for Hume.

The second transcription given is an approximation of the London-based English of Hume's day, where the intention has also been to err on the conservative side. The transcription has mainly been based on David Crystal's *Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation* (2016), which has provided the majority of the transcribed words for this particular transcription, either through its own transcriptions or by directing the reader to the modern pronunciation, which were then taken for our purposes from the OED. A few words which did not appear in this dictionary were dealt with by taking the root from the OED and tracing forwards, e.g. for *antagonist*. A number of points of contention were checked against Dobson's work (1968, II), for example the pronunciation of OI in e.g. <point>. Given that the original text has a Scots base, it has been necessary to determine a point at which it would be inappropriate to transcribe a given word in an English pronunciation. Many of the words included have developed separately in Scots and English from the same root, but these developed forms still serve equivalent functions. These have been transcribed in their English form. There are a few words, however, which do not have direct equivalents in English, namely Scots *spering*. These have not been transcribed in an English pronunciation. Any Latin in the text has also not been transcribed, either in English or Scots.

The final transcription has been constructed from the table of Hume's rules seen above (Table 1), to demonstrate from his own text what his spelling would theoretically indicate in terms of pronunciation. This is a highly speculative endeavour, and relies at least partially on the assumption that Hume was using his own spelling system within the *Orthographie*. It is difficult to establish exactly to what extent he was using the system; there are a number of cases in which he clearly uses his rules, such as his consistent use of <quh> in place of English <wh>, but there are cases in which he does not, for example his spelling of <how> (which he has already spoken against) or his inconsistency in the use of idle <-e> in word-final position. The ambiguities in his rules also make this task difficult to complete. It is still a useful exercise, however, as it will still allow us to pick up on places where his spelling system has merit or where it has faults, particularly when it is extended to connected speech or text. The problems with establishing accurate vowel qualities have already been discussed above, and the decisions made in the table of rules above (Table 1) have been adhered to within this particular transcription, but the alternative possibilities which have been acknowledged mean that this transcription taken from Hume's rules is based in part on editorial decisions made on the balance of probability, or on the choice to use a symbol to represent a broader vowel space than is generally done. Information about these particular choices can be found in the 'Details' column of the table of rules above (Table 1).

Hume does not explicitly describe unstressed or reduced vowels, which is a considerable gap in his work that we will return to throughout the remainder of this study. This transcription works on the assumption that this is missing information, rather than that he was indicating the same vowel qualities in all unstressed syllables as would be found in stressed syllables. Another gap which has been treated similarly is that of double consonants in his spelling. These have been taken simply to represent a single consonant as pronounced, and a lack of discussion on the matter within the *Orthographie*. Where Hume deviates from his proposed system by writing <now> or <how>, the transcription has used the vowel which he proposes in the text, chiefly because to transcribe these words with final -/w/ is impractical due to the nature of this sound.

It is important to note that the intention of the Scots and English transcriptions is to provide an *approximation* of the speech of Hume's time, and that they are neither likely nor intended to be perfectly accurate. The aim is to use these transcriptions to help us understand where Hume's own rules are similar to contemporary speech on either side of

the border and where they differ. The difficulties in producing transcriptions from Hume's own rules have already been discussed above. One difficulty which has been consistent across the transcriptions is that of transcribing connected speech. Though it is important to deal with connected speech in order to see Hume's system working in practice, doing so produces issues when it comes to the vowel qualities we can associate with things like function words, e.g. 'and', or where stress might be placed amongst a string of monosyllabic words, for example, when might the first person pronoun 'I' be stressed or unstressed? In general terms, Dobson (1968: II, 445-446) notes that stress in this period brings a considerable amount of uncertainty. In the Scots and English transcriptions below, stress marks are only given in polysyllabic words. Monosyllabic content words have generally been taken as stressed, and monosyllabic function words generally as unstressed, though there are some exceptions. In the transcription based on Hume's rules, the stress pattern has been taken from the Scots and English transcriptions as he gives no indication of which syllables are stressed or unstressed within the text. Where a vowel has been deemed to be reduced in the Scots and English transcriptions, the transcription from Hume's rules has been deemed to contain an unstressed vowel of undefined quality, and the symbolisation of these vowels can be found below.

It should also be noted that length marks have generally been left out of all transcriptions due to the difficulties associated with establishing actual vowel lengths in historical pronunciations (which affect the Scots and English transcriptions), and the difficulties in establishing vowel lengths in Hume's descriptions (affecting the transcription based on Hume's rules). Frequently in Table 1, vowel qualities are given length marks in brackets, but where there is uncertainty (i.e. in most cases), they have been left out of the transcription in Table 2.

Periodisation has also proved to be a difficult task. The number of changes in the phonemic system of both English and Scots, and the impossibility of determining exactly when they happened and what the system was at a particular point in time, means that it has been necessary in this exercise to take approximate values, particularly for the vowels. This is why the English transcription has been mostly taken from Crystal's dictionary of Shakespearean pronunciation (2016) and the Scots transcription has largely been taken from Macafee's record of Aitken's vowels (2003: 140-141); both put us roughly in the right time period and come from generally well-respected scholars in this area. The effects of the Great Vowel Shift, and their timings, have been a particular problem here; precision

in vowel qualities has been difficult to achieve. These numerous issues, besides the general issues of uncertainty over sixteenth- and seventeenth-century pronunciation, have led to the necessity for settling for approximations.

Each of the lines of the transcriptions have been coded with two letters in the left-hand margin to indicate which version of the text they belong to. These two-letter codes are as follows:

OT = Original text, as taken from Wheatley (1870: 18)

Sc. = Scots transcription

En. = English transcription

HR = Transcription developed from Hume's rules

Although these are transcriptions of hypothetical connected speech, each word has been separated in the manner of standard text for ease of reading, and additionally the punctuation has been maintained, though separated by spaces from the word preceding. In some cases there are sounds which may or may not appear, and these are indicated by round brackets surrounding them. In the final transcription based on Hume's rules, there are many places where a vowel quality cannot be given due to the lack of discussion surrounding unstressed vowels. In these cases, the missing vowel has been replaced with a question mark enclosed in round brackets: (?). A word which has not been transcribed for one of the reasons stated above is italicised and enclosed in curly brackets, e.g. {*spering*}. Spellings are marked in the standard way: <w>.

Table 2: Comparative transcriptions

1	OT	To clere this point, and alsoe to reform an errour bred in the south, and now usurped be our
	Sc.	/tɪ klir ðɪs pɔint , ɪnd ˈalsɔ tɪ rɪˈfɔrm ɪn ˈɛrɔr brɛd ɪn ðɪ suθ , ɪnd nu uˈzʊrpɪt bei ur
	En.	/tə klir ðɪs pɔɪnt , ənd ˈalsɔ tə rɪˈfɔrm ən ˈerər brɛd ɪn ðə səʊθ , ənd nəʊ ʊˈzurpt bəɪ əʊr
	HR	/t(?) klɛr(?) θɪs pɔɪnt , (?)nd ˈalsɔɛ t(?) r(?)ˈfɔrm (?)n ˈɛrɔur brɛd ɪn θ(?) sɔuθ , (?)nd nɔu uˈsurp(?)d bɛ ɔur
2	OT	ignorant printeres, I wil tel quhat befel my-self quhen I was in the south with a special gud
	Sc.	ˈɪgnɔrɪnt prɪntɪrz , eɪ wɪl tɛl ʍɪt bɪˈfɛl mɪˈsɛlf ʍɛn eɪ wɪz ɪn ðɪ suθ wɪð ɪ ˈspɛsiul gyd
	En.	ˈɪgnɔrənt prɪntərz , əɪ wɪl tɛl ʍat bɪˈfɛl mɪˈself ʍen əɪ wəs ɪn ðə səʊθ wɪθ ə ˈspesɪəl gʊd
	HR	ˈɪgnɔr(?)nt ˈprɪnt(?)r(?)s, ɪ wɪl tɛl ʍat b(?)ˈfɛl m(?)ˈsɛlf ʍɛn ɪ w(?)s ɪn θ(?) sɔuθ wɪθ (?) ˈspɛsɪ(?)l gud
3	OT	frende of myne. Ther rease, upon sum accident, quhither quho, quhen, quhat, *etc.*, sould be
	Sc.	frind ɔv meɪn . ðer rez , uˈpɔn sum ˈaksɪdɪnt , ˈʍɪðɪr ʍo , ʍɛn , ʍat , {*etc.*} , suld bɪ
	En.	frɛnd əv məɪn . ðɛr roz , əˈpɒn sʊm ˈaksɪdənt , ˈʍɛðər hu , ʍɛn , ʍat , {*etc.*} , ʃʊd bɪ
	HR	frɛnd(?) ɔf meɪn . θɛr res(?), uˈpɔn sum ˈak(s)ɪd(?)nt , ˈʍɪθ(?)r ʍɔ , ʍɛn , ʍat , {*etc.*} , sɔuld bɛ
4	OT	symbolized with q or w, a hoat disputation betuene him and me.
	Sc.	ˈsɪmbɔleɪzɪt wɪð <q> ɔr <w> , e hot dɪspuˈtɛsɪun bɪˈtwin hɪm ɪnd mi .
	En.	ˈsɪmbələizd wɪð <q> ɔr <w> , ə hɔt ˌdɪspəˈtɛsɪən bɪˈtwin hɪm and mi .
	HR	ˈseɪmb(?)lɪz(?)d wɪθ <q> ɔr <w> , (?) hot dɪspuˈtasɪ(?)n b(?)ˈtuɛn(?) hɪm (?)nd mɛ .
5	OT	After manie conflictes (for we oft encountered), we met be chance, in the citie of baeth, w*i*th a
	Sc.	ˈɛftɪr ˈmɔnɪ ˈkɔnflɪkts (fɔr wi ɔft ɪnˈkɔuntɪrɪt) , wi mɛt beɪ ʧans , ɪn ðɪ ˈsɪti ɔv baθ , wɪð e
	En.	ˈaftər ˈmanəɪ ˈkɔnflɪkts (fɔr wi ɔft enˈkəʊntərd) , wi mɛt bəɪ ʧans , ɪn ðə ˈsɪtəɪ əv baθ , wɪð ə
	HR	ˈaft(?)r ˈmani ˈkɔnflɪkt(?)s (fɔr wɛ ɔft ɛnˈkɔunt(?)r(?)d) , wɛ mɛt bɛ ʧans , ɪn θ(?) ˈsɪti ɔf be:θ , wɪθ (?)
6	OT	doctour of divinitie of both our acquentance. He invited us to denner.
	Sc.	ˈdɔktɔr ɔv dɪˈvɪnɪti ɔv beθ ur eˈkwentɪns . hi ɪnˈveɪtɪt us tɪ ˈdɛnɪr .
	En.	ˈdɔktɔr ɔv dɪˈvɪnɪtɪ əv boθ əʊr əˈkwɛntəns . hi ɪnˈvəɪtɪd ʊs tə ˈdɪnər .
	HR	ˈdɔktɔur of dɪˈvɪnɪti ɔf bɔθ ɔur (?)ˈkwɛnt(?)ns . hɛ ɪnˈvɪt(?)d us t(?) ˈdɛn(?)r .

7	OT	At table my antagonist, to bring the question on foot ama*n*gs his awn condisciples, began that I
	Sc.	at ˈtebɪl mɪ anˈtagɔnɪst , tɪ brɪng ðɪ ˈkwɛstiun ɔn fyt ɪˈmangs hɪz aun kɔndɪˈseipɪlz , bɪˈgan ðat eɪ
	En.	ət ˈtɛbəl mɪ anˈtagənɪst , tə brɪŋ ðə ˈkwestɪən ɔn fʊt əˈmɔngst hɪz on kɔndɪˈsəɪpəlz , bɪˈgan ðat əɪ
	HR	at ˈtab(?)l(?) mei anˈtagɔnɪst , t(?) brɪng θ(?) ˈkwɛstɪ(?)n on fut (?)ˈmangs hɪs awn kɔndɪˈsɪp(?)l(?)s , bɛgan θat ɪ
8	OT	was becum an heretik, and the doctour spering how, ansuered that I denyed quho to be spelled
	Sc.	waz bɪˈkum an ˈhɛrɪtɪk , and ðɪ ˈdɔktɔr ˈspirɪn hɔu , ˈanswɪrɪt ðat eɪ dɪˈneɪt ʍo tɪ beɪ ˈspɛlɪt
	En.	wəs bɪˈkʊm ən ˈherɪˌtɪk , ənd ðə ˈdɔktɔr {*spering*} ˈhəʊ , ˈanswerd ðat əɪ dɪˈnəɪd hu tə bɪ spɛld
	HR	was bɛˈkum an ˈhɛrɛtɪk , and θ(?) ˈdɔktɔur ˈspɛrɪng hɔu , ˈansuɛr(?)d θat ɪ dɛˈneɪ(?)d ʍɔ t(?) bɛ ˈspɛl(?)d
9	OT	with a w, but with qu. Be quhat reason? quod the D*octour*.
	Sc.	wɪð e <w> , but wɪð <qu> . bei ʍat ˈrizʊn ? kwɔd ðɪ ˈdɔktɔr ./
	En.	wɪð ə <w> , bət wɪð <qu> . bəɪ ʍat ˈrezən ? kwɔθ ðə ˈdɔktɔr ./
	HR	wɪθ (?) <w> , but wɪθ <qu> . bɛ ʍat ˈres(?)n ? kwɔd θ(?) ˈdɔktɔur ./

The analysis given here will only be brief, as many of these points will be taken up in more depth in Chapter 5, as they are pertinent to broader issues in the text. As has been noted above, these transcriptions are simply an approximation of their respective sources, and so this analysis will be fairly tentative. There are, though, a number of things which we can say readily.

One of the most notable things which we can pick up on from the transcription of Hume's rules is that we cannot transcribe unstressed or reduced vowels effectively. There are 56 instances out of around 200 where it was not possible to transcribe a vowel: roughly a quarter of all occurrences of vowels in this transcription. Some of these instances are potentially the result of an idle <-e> rather than a vowel which would be pronounced, for example in <frende> in the third line of the transcriptions. A number of them, however, are due to a lack of description on Hume's part about the sound values of unstressed or reduced vowels.

The problems with establishing certain vowel qualities from Hume's descriptions have been described briefly in the table of rules (Table 1) in section 4.2, so we will not spend too much time on most of them here, but these two are particularly worth discussing. The actual quality of the <u> vowel is uncertain from Hume's descriptions, though he spends

some time on the subject. This will be taken up in our second case study in section 5.2. The value of the <a> vowel is also a problem; Hume uses only two examples for <a>: <hal> and <tal> (Wheatley 1870: 9-10). This would presumably represent /ɑ/ in English, however in Scots this would represent /a/. Hume makes no comment as to whether he favoured the Scots or English value, or even if he recognised a difference, so we have used the Scots value as this would have been the sound used in Hume's own speech. This would inevitably cause problems on a practical level for the English.

There are numerous places where the vowel qualities that we have assigned to Hume's spellings do not match up with either the English or Scots transcription. The transcription for *table*, for example, contains this /a/ due to an <a> spelling, while the Scots and English transcriptions both show mid front vowels. Words like *we* or *be*, which are identically transcribed in Scots and English or are at least very close, are given totally different values in the last transcription, e.g. /wi/ in both Scots and English seems to be /wɛ/ according to Hume's spelling. Of the vowels which match up to one language or the other, there does not seem to be a significant leaning towards one or the other. *Amangst*, for example, and instances of /eɪ/ (e.g. in *myne*) lean towards the Scots values, while the vowels in *what/quhat*, *both*, and *friend* (<frende>) lean more towards English. There is, perhaps, a slight leaning towards the Scots values demonstrated in this particular extract, but when we factor in the uncertainty of many of the vowel values given across all three transcriptions, that apparent leaning is perhaps of less significance.

There are one or two places in which we can see some uncertainties coming out of Hume's rules. The word *accident*, for example, presents a slight difficulty in its <cc> spelling. Hume states that 'behind the voual, if a consonant kep it, we sound it alwayes as a k; as, occur, accuse, succumb, acquyre' (Wheatley 1870: 14). All of these examples are clearly pronounced solely with a /k/ between the vowels. It seems, therefore, that Hume had perhaps forgotten to consider the scenarios in which a <cc> spelling would represent a /ks/ pronunciation, as in *accident*. The transcription retains the /s/ as a possibility, but this demonstrates an unclear description from Hume and so an issue in the text. The possibility of syllabic /l/ is also demonstrated in *table* and *condisciples*. Hume acknowledges the problem of <-le> spellings, but cannot give a final answer on the subject. He implies early on that a consonant cannot be syllabic, but he shows that he does not approve of a vowel sound either before or after the /l/ in these circumstances.

A further issue is that of certain voiced consonants. This is seen a few times within this extract, for different reasons. In the case of *usurped*, for example, the third transcription's use of /s/ in place of /z/ is caused by the lack of description of the consonants. Either he could have described <s> as representing either /s/ or /z/, or he could have specified that <s> and <z> should each be used for one sound, even though conventionally <s> could be used for two. As Hume has not made specific note of the variable sounds for <s> as he has for other consonants (e.g. <c> and <g>), the choice was taken in this transcription to assume a single value for <s> and <z>, as /s/ and /z/ respectively. In this way, a gap in the work is clearly demonstrated. Another case is that of <th>. One word which clearly demonstrates the issue is <this>. In both Scots and English, this is transcribed as /ð/. However, Hume does not describe the voiced sound anywhere. His only example word for <th> spellings is *think* (Wheatley 1870: 13), which would begin with /θ/, which has led to the third transcription's use of /θɪs/. Perhaps we might consider the /ð/ value to be implied, but it does appear to be another gap in the text. A further issue with the /θ/ value is that Hume specifically states that it comes before the vowel (Wheatley 1870: 13). However, as can be demonstrated by the word *south*, this is inaccurate. The third transcription has transcribed *south* as /sɔuθ/, simply because it is unclear how it would be transcribed otherwise to fit with this rule.

5. Case studies and discussion

Here we will begin with two case studies from the *Orthographie* to illustrate Hume's ideas about the relationship between sounds and spellings, as well as to demonstrate some of his merits and faults. The first case study will be the <quh->-<wh-> spelling debate, and the second will be an examination of the pronunciation of the vowel <u>. An examination of Hume's successes and failures will then follow, as well as a discussion of his overall ideas about the relationship between spelling and sound.

5.1. Case study – <quh-> spellings and <wh-> spellings

The story found in Cap. 7 Sect. 8 is possibly the best-known part of the *Orthographie*, a full account of which is given in section 4.1. As an illustration of Hume's system, it is particularly useful; he uses it as a sort of case study himself, demonstrating his logic in practice in one particular set of circumstances, and also showing the attitudes of others towards his system and his language.

In Hume's view, words such as *what*, *when*, *who*, etc. ought to be spelled with <quh-> rather than <wh->. This is because <w> is a 'labial letter', and the initial consonant in these words is a 'guttural sound' (Wheatley 1870: 18-19). His English friends in Bath, however, do not agree, and mock him for his assertion. Hume is insistent that his system is logical and justified, and is upset by the perceived ignorance of the Englishmen who have criticised him.

Dobson uses this part of the text as evidence that Hume 'can be allowed little credit as a phonetician', claiming that it 'shows how deplorable an ear he must have had' (Dobson 1968: I, 321). Dobson gives an account of Hume's logic, and then dismisses it by saying that 'the doctor neatly and justly replied' that 'the assumption is Scottish, and the conclusion false', and 'the point was lost on Hume' (Dobson 1968: I, 321). This is one of Dobson's unjust criticisms of Hume. Dobson would point out that Hume had clearly not observed the English pronunciation, which will (he seems to think) have been /w/ by this point. That seems to be an oversimplification of the situation; it is evident that the /ʍ/ pronunciation was still in use in much of England at this time. This will be elaborated on below. Regardless, this must be set next to the fact that he is very effectively observing the

Scots pronunciation of /ʍ/[4]. and that the Scots pronunciation is equally legitimate. Dobson overlooks the ignorance of the Englishmen in this story. Indeed, Hume is justified in calling it a 'frivolous jeste', as the Englishmen overlook his logic – which fits his observed pronunciation well – and disdain the supposed Scottishness of it. Hume's comments seem to overlook a variation in English pronunciation, which is perhaps something of a limitation of the text, but does not quite equate to a 'deplorable' phonetic perception. Dobson fails to even mention that Hume as a Scots speaker would be – or rather *might* be, given that English still retained /ʍ/ at least in some cases – using a different pronunciation to the English speakers he was debating with. Kniezsa, by contrast, is interested by 'how strictly he adheres to Scottish <quh>', which she observes 'logically follows from Hume's diatribe against the 'abuse' of <w> in the south' (Kniezsa 1997: 58). She does not, as Dobson does, dismiss his ideas here, nor does she approve them; her focus is on the spellings themselves, so perhaps she does not read as far into the phonological aspect as Dobson does, but focuses on the fact that it is a noticeably Scots orthographic tradition.

Our transcriptions in section 4.3 demonstrate that the /ʍ/- pronunciation was still alive and well in England at this time (as shown in Crystal 2016). Though there was evidently some shift towards /w/ – as can be seen in Wyld (1920: 311-312), and is suggested by the evidence supplied in LALME (McIntosh, Samuels & Benskin 1986: 88-91, 113-114, 120) – the /ʍ/ pronunciation seems to have been recorded by some of Hume's fellow orthoepists. Gil's *Logonomia*, published in 1621 and therefore very close to the production of Hume's *Orthographie*, specifically notes <wh> separately from <w> (1621 [1969]: 13). Gil points out the affinity between <w> and <wh>, in the same way that he notes affinities between <n> and <ng>, the voiced and unvoiced <th>, and a host of fricatives such as <z>, <s>, and <sh> (1621 [1969]: 14). Though Gil's work has been described as not intending to be a perfect phonetic representation of the language (Dobson 1968: I, 131), the deliberate separation of these two forms as well as the acknowledgment of their affinity indicates a recognisable difference in sound. Hart's *Orthographie* of 1569 uses <hu> for <wh-> words, e.g. <huer> for *where* (1569 [1969]: 48), and as we have already noted, Hart

---

[4] It should be noted here, as we have noted in Table 1, that this /ʍ/ value may perhaps be represented as /hw/ or /xw/, as seen in Laing & Lass (2019). The nature of historical phonology makes it very difficult to know the exact value which would be used in these circumstances. This study will continue to employ the symbol /ʍ/, but readers may prefer to substitute this for /hw/ or /xw/. The argument made in this case study remains feasible, I believe, with any of these three options, as all three contain a feature of friction made in the back of the vocal tract, which will be discussed in the following pages.

is famed for his phonetic abilities (see section 3.3.1). Mulcaster's 1582 *Elementarie* is a little unclear on the phonetic stance of <wh>, but it does appear that the <h> may affect the pronunciation (1970: 123). Hume's /ʍ/ pronunciation seems to have considerable support from his nearest contemporaries.

Hume's choice of <quh-> clearly originates in the typically Scots writing tradition. It seems that he favours this spelling on the grounds that it more accurately demonstrates the place of articulation for the sound in question. His categorisation of consonants describes <q> as being made by 'the midle tongue stryking on the rouf of the mouth', alongside <c>, <g>, <k>, and <x> (Wheatley 1870: 12). His actual description is a little hazy but it is evident that he has identified <q> as representing a velar sound. The sound indicated by <wh-> or <quh->, /ʍ/, is labial-velar. We will address the double articulation below, but the identification of the velar articulation in the sound leads to Hume's favouring of the velar spelling, as he might describe it (or 'guttural' spelling, to use his favoured – though misleading to modern readers – term). Besides Cap. 7 Sect. 8, the <quh-> spelling receives little other description. This, combined with his passionate defence of the spelling, suggests that the Scots <quh-> convention was suitable enough in Hume's eyes that it did not warrant discussion in the list of 'abused' consonants. His choice is not purely based on convention. In his view, rather, it seems to be a fine choice, which would need no justification if not for the mockery of his English friends.

Within the story itself, we may, perhaps, think at first that the choice of *who* as the primary example is unfortunate. After all, we can see in the English transcription in section 4.3 that the doctor and his countrymen would have pronounced this as /huː/, and though we have chosen /ʍo/ to represent the Scots pronunciation, there remains the possibility that there would have been an anglicised pronunciation such as /huː/ in use at least in some communities. So perhaps the Englishmen's main problem was that they felt that Hume's logic did not work for *who* due to the use of an /h/ sound, where Hume was presumably indicating a /ʍ/ pronunciation. However, in the case of an /h/- pronunciation, Hume's analysis is probably closer to the phonetic practices of English as well as Scots. Hume describes the letter <w> as labial, and the sound of *who* etc. as guttural (Wheatley 1870: 18-19). /w/ and /ʍ/ are both labial-velar and differ in voicing, which is perhaps where some difficulties may arise for all of the contributors to this particular conversation. In the absence of the methods of phonetic study available to us today, Hume and his companions would have had to rely on more rudimentary methods, such as simply judging how it felt to

pronounce them. The inclusion or lack of voicing in the sound may have impacted the sensation experienced. Though this is a basic and unscientific method, it works for our purposes: produce a /w/ sound, then produce a /ʍ/. The friction in the /ʍ/ seems to be more concentrated to the back of the throat, whereas the /w/ sound does not include friction (Ogden 2017: 83) and its voicing means that the vibrations are felt much further across the vocal tract and do not seem to be concentrated in one area as for /ʍ/. The lip-rounding is therefore likely to be deemed the prominent articulatory factor in /w/, if examined in this way, as opposed to the concentrated friction produced when pronouncing /ʍ/. Again, this is basic and unscientific, but if we consider that this is potentially the methodology which Hume and his fellows had at their disposal, then this system appears much more rational. The point of this study is, after all, to understand Hume's perspective as regards the production of the *Orthographie*.

This sensory difference between the two sounds lends justification to Hume's argument. It would be easier, it seems, to associate /w/ with a labial production – especially considering its widespread association, referenced by Hume, with the /u/ vowel – and to associate /ʍ/ with a velar production (which Hume labels 'guttural'), which is evidently what Hume has done. So, by this method we have a velar (or 'guttural' for Hume) sound in /ʍ/, pitted against the glottal fricative /h/ in the word *who*. Whichever of the two one might use, both are made far back in the vocal tract. If we then agree that <w> is a 'labial letter', as Hume states, and as can be understood through our rudimentary methods stated above, then neither the Scots /ʍ/ nor the English /h/ in *who* would, under Hume's system, be able to be represented by <w>. In the cases of *what*, *where*, *when*, etc., the Englishmen appear to be leaning towards the incoming English /w/ pronunciation, but we have already noted that the /ʍ/ pronunciation is still evidenced by Hume's contemporaries in English.

The criticism of the English doctor and his companions therefore makes little sense in a strictly practical view. The doctor's words were: 'the proposition […] I understand; the assumption is Scottish, and the conclusion false' (Wheatley 1870: 18). Assuming that the doctor did understand the proposition, why would he then deem the 'assumption' Scottish? We have demonstrated that these <wh->/<quh-> words, especially our key example word *who*, were produced frequently with back consonants, in English as well as Scots. Particularly when we consider *who*, to label this 'Scottish' and 'false' is illogical. It seems that the doctor and the other Englishmen were perhaps less concerned with Hume's actual logic, and more with his nationality and mother tongue. Had they paid any attention to the

system which Hume was employing, they would have been able to move past the simple fact of his favouring a typically Scots spelling form and understood that he was favouring it on the basis of a fairly logical sound-spelling connection, rather than the origins of that particular spelling. The approach taken by the doctor implies a readiness to mock and dismiss Scots forms as 'incorrect'. If we overlook *who* as an example and use other <wh->/<quh-> words (e.g. *what*, *when*), and look to the emerging English pronunciation of /w/ (which we have already noted was not observed by some of Hume's recent predecessors, and so presumably was not consistently used in English at this time), there still remains an issue with the doctor's criticism. If Hume's statement is taken as inherently Scottish, that does not make it false. Had the doctor been interested in a fair debate, he might have acknowledged the variations in pronunciation between the two nations, and within England itself. Instead, he equates Scottishness with incorrectness as a matter of course. Hume was fighting a losing battle with his English friends, and it appears that he was still doing so with Dobson three and a half centuries later. Now, though, it is hoped that Hume's favouring of the <quh-> spelling, taken alongside his arguments in its favour, will be treated more justly.

Another interesting piece of evidence to take from this case study is the way in which it demonstrates Hume's usage of the doctrine of *littera*. Hume refers to letters as being 'labial' or 'guttural' in the same way that he refers to sounds. The articulatory processes (part of the *potestas*) are associated with the written letter form (the *figura*). As we observed in section 3.3.1, the doctrine of *littera* depends on an inseparability of the *potestas* and *figura*, and Hume's association of the articulation from the *potestas* directly with the *figura* clearly illustrates the impact of the doctrine of *littera*.

5.2. Case study – Hume and pronunciation of <u>

Here we will examine Hume's views on the pronunciation of <u>. He comments on this vowel in both Latin and Scots/English pronunciation, which receive slightly different judgements from him. His discussion of the Latin pronunciation in Cap. 2 Sect. 18 is brief and fairly easy to understand. He is of the opinion that the English pronounce Latin <u/ū> incorrectly as a diphthong, which he writes as <eu> (Wheatley 1870: 9). This <eu> could perhaps imply /iu/ (or /ju/), or it could be representative of the Great Vowel Shift's impact on southern back vowels, and represent something around /əʊ/ (as demonstrated in Smith 2007: 128). It has been widely observed that around Hume's time, the pronunciation of

Latin was reliant on the pronunciation of the vernacular at a given time and in a given place (see Allen 1978). The pronunciation of Latin in England would have been affected by the Great Vowel Shift, but the same impact would not have occurred in Scotland, where the shift only affected the front vowels. Latin <u/ū> in Scotland would have retained the /u(:)/ sound. Hume makes no explicit comment on the pronunciation of Latin <u/ū> in Scotland, but it seems likely that he viewed the Scottish pronunciation as correct. He favours the Scottish pronunciation of Latin <a/ā> and <i/ī> as well, and was not the only Scot to favour his native country's pronunciation of Latin over that of England; James VI and I also viewed the Scottish pronunciation of Latin as superior to the English pronunciation (Stewart 2003: 45), as we saw in 3.2.3.3.

Hume also comments on the pronunciation of Scots/English <u>, where he criticises both nations. The English, he says, pronounce the vernacular <u> as <eu> as well (Wheatley 1870: 11), which as we have seen above appears to mean something like /əʊ/ or /iu/ (or /ju/). His own countrymen, he says, pronounce it as <ou> (Wheatley 1870: 11), which seems to mean something like /ɔu/. It is not clear where the Scots would get this pronunciation from; the Scots back vowels were not impacted by the Great Vowel Shift, and Macafee (2003: 140-141) does not show a development such as this, nor a spelling of <u> in use for the /ɔu/ diphthong (or /ou/ as shown in Macafee 2003: 140-141).

Wherever this Scots diphthongised pronunciation came from, Hume does not approve of it. He is insistent that the sound of <u> should be 'simple' (Wheatley 1870: 11), and neither the English nor the Scots meet his expectations. He then goes on to say 'if I sould judge, the frensh sound is neerest the voual sound as we pronunce it in mule and muse' (Wheatley 1870: 11). Evidently in these two example words, the English diphthong eventually won out, but in Hume's time is seems that these words contained a simple vowel. If we assume that the French vowel that Hume mentions is /y(:)/ as in modern French *lune*, then this would provide the simple vowel that he is seeking. Hume's descriptions of vowels, however, do not discuss how they are made. There is no mention of tongue placement or lip rounding, he simply uses examples to describe them. It is not clear if he deems the French vowel to be the nearest or absolutely correct. Does he mean that <u> should be pronounced as /y(:)/, or that /y(:)/ is the closest thing he has observed in vernaculars to /u(:)/? If he was in favour of /y(:)/, why call it the 'neerest' (Wheatley 1870: 11) and not just say this was the right value to use? Alternatively, if he was aiming for /u(:)/, why would he not refer back to his discussion of the Latin vowel?

Hume’s dealings with this vowel in the vernacular are unclear. His dislike of the Scots and English pronunciations is clear enough: they are diphthongs and should not be pronounced in cases where a single grapheme <u> is used. However, the exact value which he would associate with <u> spellings is uncertain.

5.3. Internal successes or failures

5.3.1. Quality of descriptions and terminology

The qualities of the descriptions and terminology which Hume employs varies. What phonetic terminology he does use is generally decent. He describes the ‘instruments of the mouth’ or the active and passive articulators for consonants as ‘hammeres’ and ‘stiddies’ (‘anvils’) respectively (Wheatley 1870: 12), which is a fitting system. His active articulators or ‘hammeres’ are ‘the nether lip, the top of the tongue, and the midle tongue’, and his passive articulators or ‘stiddies’ are ‘the overlip, the outward teeth, the inward teeth, and the roofe of the mouth’ (Wheatley 1870: 12). This is a more limited list than the modern one, particularly around the back of the vocal tract, but it does serve Hume’s purposes fairly well. There are a couple of slight gaps between Hume’s terms and the modern terms, but they are quite easily bridged: the ‘nether lip’ will be the lower lip and the ‘overlip’ the upper, and the ‘inward teeth’ seems to mean the alveolar ridge while the ‘outward teeth’ seem to mean the teeth themselves. Hume then categorises the consonants – specifically by letter (*figura*) rather than strictly by sound (*potestas*) – according to their articulators (Wheatley 1870: 12). He does not further categorise them by their manner of articulation or by their voicing. Generally, this does seem to be a failing of Hume’s phonetic abilities, but he does briefly approach manner of articulation and voicing in a way on a few occasions. His primary way of approaching these matters is to discuss the ‘form of the tuich’ as opposed to the ‘instruments of the mouth’, which receives most of its attention in Cap. 5 Sects. 4 and 5 (Wheatley 1870: 17). Here he discusses ways in which consonant sounds can differ from each other or be similar to each other, one way being the ‘instruments of the mouth’ which are used (the articulators), and the other being ‘the tuich’ which is used (Wheatley 1870: 17). Pairs of consonants which are listed as having the same articulators but differ in ‘tuich’ are <f> /f/ and <v> /v/, <m> /m/ and <p> /p/, and <c> /k/ and <g> /g/ (Wheatley 1870: 17). Here, two pairs differ in voicing (a voiced-voiceless fricative pair and a voiced-voiceless plosive pair), and one differs both in voicing and in the manner of articulation (a voiced nasal paired with a voiceless plosive). This

demonstrates that to Hume, what we would consider the separate matters of manner of articulation and voicing are the same thing. He then describes this difference of 'tuich' as being in the 'hardnes and softnes of the tuich' (Wheatley 1870: 17), which is not described any further but for the addition that /w/ and /j/ are produced with so 'soft' a contact – or indeed with a 'mynt' (or 'aim', presumably a recognition of approximants) – that they were labelled vowels by Latin speakers (Wheatley 1870: 17). This idea of 'tuich' is quite vague and does not lend the text much in the way of phonetic description, other than to acknowledge that sounds with the same articulators have other ways of differing from each other. A reader with a basic understanding of phonetics would have little trouble understanding this, but if one expects to gain a thorough grounding of English phonetics from this text, one would be somewhat disappointed.

This is exacerbated by Hume's descriptions of vowels. One thing which should immediately be said in Hume's defence is that vowels are notoriously difficult to contend with. Hume's only phonetic description of vowel production is that they are made 'without the tuiches of the mouth' and 'are distinguished the ane from the other be delating and contracting the mouth' (Wheatley 1870: 7). His handling of the vowels relies on contemporary examples. Rather than describing how a vowel is made physically, he refers to words where the vowel is found. This would probably be perfectly sufficient to teach someone who was reading the text at the time of its creation (setting aside any issues arising with Hume's identification of vowels, especially in English), but this causes problems for a later reader. We would have to rely – as we have done in this study – on the modern understanding of speech at that time. The text therefore has what we might term a temporal limitation when it comes to vowels: the functionality is compromised when the text is removed from its timeframe.

Other linguistic terminology used by Hume is also perhaps debatable in its quality. Due to the common reliance on the doctrine of *littera* and its impact on linguistic thought in Hume's day (see section 3.3.1), on occasion the differences between sounds and letters can be somewhat hazy as they are viewed as inextricably linked: discussing one often means discussing the other by virtue of the perceived *litteral* relationship. Two other terms could cause issues for a modern reader, and indeed have done: 'syllab' and 'diphthong'. To bolster his argument that Hume was an incompetent linguist, Dobson cites his use of the word 'diphthong' to represent what would now be called a vowel digraph as well as meaning two coalescing vowel sounds (Dobson 1968: I, 317). Certainly, this broader usage

of 'diphthong' can be confusing, particularly to the modern reader, but it is worth noting that the OED entry for 'diphthong' does include a sense: 'Often applied to a combination of two vowel characters, more correctly called DIGRAPH *n.*' (OED). This definition includes a note stating that 'When the two letters represent a simple sound, as *ea*, *ou*, in *head* /hɛd/, *soup* /suːp/, they have been termed an ***improper diphthong***: properly speaking these are *monophthongs* written by *digraphs*' (OED). This sense of the word 'diphthong' is demonstrated in examples from four different writers, including Hume, spanning the years 1530-1876 (OED). Perhaps Dobson would not have had access to this information, if this sense was only made available in the second edition of the OED, but he is likely to have had access to the OED's definition of 'digraph', or, more specifically, to the OED's first recorded use of the word. 'Digraph' in the OED is first recorded in 1780, long after Hume's time. It could certainly be said that Hume ought to have detailed the alternative definition of 'diphthong', but its usage to describe digraphs is not exclusive to Hume, and does not represent any difficulty in 'distinguishing between sound and symbol' (Dobson 1968: I, 317). Hume also uses 'syllab' not simply to represent 'syllable', but also to broadly mean 'sound' or a cluster of sounds not quite amounting to a syllable, or even 'letter' or a cluster of letters not quite amounting to a syllable. It is unclear how this has come about, as neither the OED nor the DSL define it in this way. They both define 'syllab' as meaning 'syllable' (OED; DSL). Hume uses this word in a more flexible manner. For both 'diphthong' and 'syllab', the context usually leads the reader quite easily to the correct answer.

5.3.2. Internal consistency of spelling

Hume's spelling across the *Orthographie* is quite inconsistent. As we have mentioned in section 4.3, there are numerous places where he does use his own spelling system, and numerous other places where he does not. For a writer who wanted spelling to be consistent, Hume did not do particularly well at this within the text. Kniezsa's table of spelling patterns could bear witness to this to a degree (1997: 56-57), though it may be more practical to illustrate this through the spellings of individual words rather than the spellings of the reflexes of a given vowel. Wheatley notes that Hume switches between Scots and English forms, e.g. *noe* and *nae*, within the text, and spells *two* three different ways (1870: 35). Venezky (1970: 21) points out another of Wheatley's (1870: 35) comments: that Hume also uses three different spellings of *judge*. Hume is also very

inconsistent in his use of idle <-e>. Hume's orthographic consistency within his text is quite poor. It has already been discussed in section 4.3 that it is not clear whether Hume was intending to use his own spelling system or not, but regardless of this his spelling is not consistent across this work, which does set a bad example to prospective students of the text.

5.3.3. Coverage and gaps

In a very general sense, Hume does appear to have set down the basis of a system which aligns both vernacular forms with each other in both spelling and pronunciation. What particularly lets this text down is the number of gaps in its coverage.

We have already raised a number of points which Hume misses or does not handle well. His handling of consonants is largely well done, but there are issues arising in a few cases. Firstly, he has an acknowledged difficulty with syllabic /l/ and /n/, as we saw in section 4.3. His definition of a single-sound syllable is that it must be a vowel, as a consonant cannot produce a syllable on its own (Wheatley 1870: 16). However, in words like *little* and *eaten*, he says, it is near enough impossible to tell whether or not there is a vowel pronounced before the /l/ or /n/ (Wheatley 1870: 20). Hume labels the pronunciation of a vowel both before the /l/ or /n/ and after them as an 'inconvenience' which he cannot work out how to avoid (Wheatley 1870: 20), yet he has already stated that a consonant cannot stand alone as a syllable (Wheatley 1870: 16). It is very unclear what exactly Hume is aiming for here, as he seems to be trying to eliminate all available options.

Hume's dealings with final <-e> could quite possibly take up an entire piece of research by themselves. His explicit attitude is reasonably clear; he gives a list of circumstances in which it is acceptable, though acknowledges that there may be more places in which it should appear, which he will yield to should they be necessary (Wheatley 1870: 21-22). His own usage of final <-e> within the text could either reveal these other positions in which it is necessary, or could be wildly inconsistent. An analysis of Hume's final <-e> is beyond the scope of this study.

Vowels make up a considerable number of the *Orthographie*'s gaps. As we have observed in section 4.3, the value of /ɑ/ may be counted as stranded by Hume's choices, though it is difficult to tell. We may assume that Hume has not identified this sound as it

predominantly appeared in English and not Scots. In Cap. 8 Sect. 6 (Wheatley 1870: 21), Hume gives <ie> as an alternative to <y> to represent /eɪ/ or /əɪ/, but he has already associated <ie> with /iː/ (Wheatley 1870: 10). There are further issues with vowels, such as his lack of discussion concerning unstressed or reduced vowels. Perhaps this is a point at which Hume relies on convention to a point, for the sake of ensuring that some homophones are kept orthographically distinct, for example, or any number of other reasons. Perhaps he simply did not think of it. In either case, it is a considerable gap in the work. It is also a failing in that, as can be seen in the transcriptions in section 4.3, Scots and English dealt with such vowels differently. These vowels were centralised in English, but not in Scots. In not discussing these vowels, Hume is missing a significant area in which he should, judging by his own statements, be trying to align both vernaculars in pronunciation and spelling. There are also numerous places where his system, when in use, veers away from both the Scots and English pronunciations of the day, as was discussed in section 4.3, but the additional question of to what extent Hume was using his own system makes it difficult to establish this exactly.

Considering the gaps and problems which we have discussed here, alongside the apparent timeframe within which the text was produced (about a year – see section 2.1), the impression given by the *Orthographie* is that Hume simply did not give it the time which such a project required. The dedication states that the text was written within the year before James VI and I's 1617 visit to Scotland, and also that James' comments to his Scottish courtiers about their language usage and his declared intention to have the universities write up a grammar caused Hume to send the manuscript to him (Wheatley 1870: 2). Perhaps Hume would have taken longer to work on the *Orthographie* if the opportunity for it to gain attention had not presented itself so early. Hume would likely have been of the opinion that he needed to get the King's attention as soon as possible after James' comments had been made. Had these comments come later, we might perhaps have seen a more polished piece of work. Hume's competence as a grammarian is evident. His Latin grammar was published and granted a monopoly which officially lasted two decades. The *Grammatica Nova* did not ultimately meet with much success, but that appears to have been due to quite particular details in relation to the Latin scholars favoured by either side of the dispute, as well as Hume's friendship with Andrew Melville, rather than an incapacity as a linguist on Hume's part (see section 3.1.2). We might also consider the fact that Hume, who was teaching in a grammar school and was therefore teaching classical languages rather than the vernacular (see sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3), would have had no

opportunity to test out the *Orthographie*. All of these factors, combined with the fact that orthography and phonetics were, it seems, new fields to Hume, are likely to have caused the issues we see in the *Orthographie*. All of this considered, we might perhaps say that Hume had done quite well, and that had he spent more time on it, he could have produced a work of high quality. As it is, the text we have is useful, interesting, and reasonably good even with its limitations. Perhaps the best way to describe its linguistic merit as regards its practical application is 'promising'.

5.4. External successes or failures: intentions and impact

Hume's work is undoubtedly unusual and very ambitious. In aiming to reform pronunciation at the same time as spelling, as well as trying to align Scots and English with each other in both aspects of language, the *Orthographie* is without a comparator within British orthoepy. Hume's contemporaries were focused on a standard English pronunciation, based on the educated London speech of the day. Hume does not take this approach, instead taking the apparently novel view that Scots and English should be treated on level footing and that the linguistic choices offered by the two should be considered on the basis of merit. His idea of merit seems to be a combination of consistency, clear Latin roots due to the use of Roman letters (or failing this a clear connection between sound and symbol), and a lack of unnecessary letters: not uncommon criteria amongst orthoepists. In the event that an option with this merit is not found in either Scots or English and he believes that changing public usage would be too difficult, he is willing to accept convention, demonstrating a sense of practicality.

Hume's choice to align the two vernaculars may have been due to the accession of James VI to the English throne as James I, and the subsequent anglicisation of the King's writing, as well as of that of his courtiers. Hume was noted to have been hopeful for the proposed union between Scotland and England, and wanted the Scottish element to be retained (Durkan 2013: 121; see section 3.1.3). This attitude is apparent throughout the *Orthographie*. Hume's attitude towards the combination of the two nations and their languages is something which should be examined in more depth.

Ultimately, however, this text met with no success in its day. The manuscript was evidently sent to the King, but was not published. It remained in existence only in the manuscript until Wheatley produced his edition in the 1860s. For two hundred and fifty

years, the *Orthographie* was effectively ignored and had no discernible impact on anyone, Scottish or English. Modern scholarship is divided on the work's potential for success. Dobson (1968: I, 316-321) evidently believes that it could not have received any success, whereas Salmon (1999: 34-35) believes that it could have been influential, given the chance. Perhaps, had it been published, the *Orthographie* might have found favour with readers who approved of the proposed union between Scotland and England. However, there also exists the likelihood in both nations that Hume's proposals would have been scorned by those who were not in favour of the union. Section 3.2.2 showed that there were numerous Englishmen who disdained the Scots. Would they have taken kindly to the idea that the English language should be changed in both its spelling and its pronunciation in order to align it with Scots? It seems unlikely, as can be proven by Hume's own account of his ill-fated arguments in favour of <quh-> spellings (see sections 4.2 and 5.1). Many of the English orthoepists did not meet with much success. It seems unlikely that a Scottish orthoepist would have found favour in England, if he was proposing the kind of changes written by Hume. In Scotland too, there could well have been a reaction. Though anglicisation was clearly a process which Scots was undergoing and would continue to undergo, a text proposing widespread changes to the Scots language in order to align it with English might perhaps have met with disapproval in Scotland too. It also seems to be the case that Hume was the first Scottish orthoepist. This makes him an interesting figure for linguists to study, but his fellow Scots may not have been interested in a new movement such as this. James himself evidently did not find enough merit in the *Orthographie* to do anything with it, though Hume appears to have tried to shape it to the King's preferences. Perhaps he was put off by the inconsistencies. Perhaps he felt that it fell too much on the side of one or other of the languages. Perhaps he deemed it too radical a proposal. Perhaps he never even read it.

The impact of the *Orthographie* since Wheatley's publication seems to have been low. It has been mentioned briefly in several more recent linguistic studies, but there has been little space allotted to this text in most cases, besides Dobson (1968) and Kniezsa (1997). Dobson (1968) dismisses most of the *Orthographie* quite rapidly, but the more recent discussions have been more optimistic about the text. Perhaps as the study of historical Scots and non-standard forms of English continues to develop, the *Orthographie* may be granted more space in the field. Hume's overall impact until now, however, has been very limited; this thesis is an attempt in part to remedy this neglect.

5.5. Hume's overall idea of the relationship between spelling and sound

Hume's idea of the relationship between spelling and sound is that the spelling system should have as strong a foundation as possible in phonemic representation, based on Latin sounds. A sound should be represented by its Roman letter as found in Latin, and where a sound is not found in Latin, it should be represented by what Hume calls a 'British' letter, as is the case with <w> /w/, etc. He does take a practical approach to the use of convention, however, acknowledging that reform in some areas of spelling would likely be impossible, for example the use of <ch> for /ʧ/, and that it would be better in such cases for everyone to be technically 'incorrect', as long as everyone is consistent. He seems to fall somewhere in the middle of a spectrum of orthoepy, in which one end would be the favouring of a directly phonemic spelling system (for example John Hart), and the other end would be the favouring of a consistent spelling system based largely in convention (for example Richard Mulcaster). Purely on these grounds, perhaps Hume could have met with some favourable reactions to his work. The system would be largely made up of direct mappings between sounds and symbols in order to simplify matters, without introducing new symbols, producing an over-complicated set of rules, or deviating too far from established convention.

The reliance on the doctrine of *littera* in the *Orthographie* is clear. Hume's system relies (for the most part) on the direct relationship between *figura* and *potestas*. Where he deems it necessary to follow the established convention of the day, he makes it very clear that this is often done against the doctrine of *littera*, for example the use of <ch>. He does not like this spelling personally, because in his view the sound of /ʧ/ has no 'affinitie' with either <c> or <h>, but ultimately he believes that it is better to continue using the <ch> spelling as it is so entrenched in conventional spelling and there is no other way he can think to spell it (Wheatley 1870: 14-15). Though he does in several cases allow for deviations from the doctrine of *littera*, Hume is by no means happy to do so, which he makes evident throughout the *Orthographie*. His practical compromises are begrudgingly made out of necessity.

6. Conclusion

The *Orthographie* undoubtedly has several failings as an orthoepic text, but what it also has is considerable merit. In this study, we have seen that Hume's spelling system is largely based on the influential doctrine of *littera* and therefore relies on a close relationship between symbol (*figura*) and sound (*potestas*), but that he accepts the need to fall back on convention on occasion (albeit begrudgingly). Hume's system is fairly typical on that basis, but what really sets his work apart from that of other orthoepists is his unusual dealings with English and Scots together, and his novel intention of aligning the two languages together without favouring one or the other arbitrarily. Though this could perhaps have damaged his chances of success with this text, its implications are worthy of further investigation. Hume's approach is to base the spelling-sound relationship on the source material of Latin where possible, and to use Scots/English letters to fill gaps (e.g. <w>), resorting to established convention if he can see no other option.

This study has also brought together information regarding Hume's life and the world around him from several sources, placing his orthoepic activities in context. The benefit of this biographical and sociohistorical information to the study of the *Orthographie* is that it provides us with an image of the world around Hume, and the potential influences on his work, as well as giving us the opportunity to speculate as to why the *Orthographie* did not meet with any success and how it might have been received in Scotland and England. It is hoped that this section of this study will also be valuable in its own right, as a detailed biography of an interesting figure in Scottish history.

As linguistic scholarship moves to show more and more interest in the study of language use outside of the London-based standard – a history of varieties of English (and Scots), rather than simply a history of standard English and its origins – it is hoped that this study will allow for a better understanding of the valuable addition to the field which can be found in Alexander Hume's *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue*. There are numerous aspects of the text which could and should receive more attention, and it is hoped that in future work on the orthoepists of this era and in attitudes towards language use, Hume will rightfully take a more prominent role.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Baret, John. 1574. *An aluearie, or, triple dictionarie in Englishe, Latin, and French*. London: Henry Denham. https://archive.org/details/aluearieortriple00bare/mode/2up?q=Thomas+Smith (Last accessed 11/08/21)

Gil, Alexander. 1621 [1969]. *Logonomia Anglica.* Menston: The Scolar Press Limited.

Hart, John. 1569 [1969]. *An orthographie*. Menston: The Scolar Press Limited.

Mulcaster, Richard. 1582 [1970]. *The first part of the elementarie*. Menston: The Scolar Press Limited.

Wheatley, Henry B. (ed.). 1870. *Of the orthographie and congruitie of the Britan tongue; A treates, noe shorter then necessarie for the schooles, be Alexander Hume*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Early English Text Society.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abercrombie, David. 1949. 'What is a "letter?"'. *Lingua*. 2. 54-63.

Allen, W. Sidney. 1978. *Vox Latina: A guide to the pronunciation of Classical Latin*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, James Maitland. 1926. *Early records of the University of St Andrews: The graduation roll 1473-1579 and the matriculation roll 1473-1579*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

British Library Catalogue. *Treatise 'of the orthographie [and, lib. ii, 'of the congruitie] of the Britan tongue', by Alexander Hume ; with a dedication to James I. The MS. ends with the verse (as an... Royal MS 17 A XI : [1603-1625].* http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS040-002107242&indx=1&recIds=IAMS040-002107242&recIdxs=0&elementId=0&renderMode=poppedOut&displayMode=full&frbrVersion=&dscnt=0&frbg=&scp.scps=scope%3A%28BL%29&tab=local&dstmp=1629903946838&srt=rank&mode=Basic&&dum=true&vl(freeText0)=Royal%20MS%2017%20A%20XI&vid=IAMS_VU2 (Last accessed 12/03/21).

Brockliss, L.W.B. 2016. *The University of Oxford: A history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Andrew. 1887. *Register of the University of Oxford, vol. 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press for the Oxford Historical Society.

Corbett, John, J. Derrick McClure & Jane Stuart-Smith. 2003. 'A brief history of Scots'. In John Corbett, J. Derrick McClure & Jane Stuart-Smith (eds.). *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 1-16.

Craigie, James. 1944. *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons Ltd for the Scottish History Society.

Crystal, David. 2016. *The Oxford dictionary of original Shakespearean pronunciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dickson, Robert & John Philip Edmond. 1890. *Annals of Scottish printing from the introduction of the art in 1507 to the beginning of the seventeenth century*. Cambridge: Macmillan and Bowes.

DSL. *Dictionaries of the Scots language/Dictionars o the Scots leid*. https://dsl.ac.uk/ (Last accessed 21/08/21).

Dobson, E.J. 1968. *English pronunciation 1500-1700, 2 vols*. (2nd ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunlop, Annie I. 1964. *Acta facultatis artium Universitatis Sanctiandree 1413-1588, Vol. 2*. Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable Ltd for the Scottish History Society.

Durkan, John. 2013. *Scottish schools and schoolmasters 1560-1633*. Jamie Reid-Baxter (ed. & rev.). Woodbridge: The Boydell Press for the Scottish History Society.

Early English Text Society. *Early English Text Society publications*. https://users.ox.ac.uk/~eets/publications.html (Last accessed 20/08/21).

Foster, Joseph. 1891. *Alumni Oxoniensis: The members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714: Their parentage. birthplace, and year of birth, with a record of their degrees, vol. 2*. Oxford: James Parker & Co.

Kniezsa, Veronika. 1997. 'Alexander Hume: *Of the orthography and congruitie of the Britan tongue'*. *Scottish Language*. 16. 52-62.

Laing, Margaret & Roger Lass. 2019. 'Old and Middle English spellings for OE hw-, with special reference to the qu- type: In celebration of LAEME, eLALME, LAOS and CoNE: In memoriam Angus McIntosh'. In Rhona Alcorn, Joanna Kopaczyk, Bettelou Los, & Benjamin Molineaux (eds.). *Historical dialectology in the digital age*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 92-112.

Lass, Roger. 1987. *The shape of English: Structure and history*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Lass, Roger. 1999. 'Phonology and morphology'. In Roger Lass (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. III: 1476-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 56-186.

Lass, Roger & Margaret Laing. 2013. 'Interpreting Middle English'. In Margaret Laing. *A linguistic atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325, Version 3.2* http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html (Last accessed 09/09/21) Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh.

Lockyer, Roger. 2005. *Tudor and Stuart Britain*. (3rd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Macafee, Caroline, with material from A.J. Aitken. 2003. 'The phonology of Older Scots'. In John Corbett, J. Derrick McClure & Jane Stuart-Smith (eds.). *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 138-169.

Macdonald, Robert H. (ed.). 1971. *The library of William Drummond of Hawthornden*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McClure, J. Derrick. 1994. 'English in Scotland'. In Robert Burchfield (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. V: English in Britain and overseas: Origins and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 23-93.

McCrie, Thomas. 1899. *Life of Andrew Melville*. (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons.

McIntosh, Angus, M.L. Samuels & Michael Benskin. 1986. *A linguistic atlas of late mediaeval English, vol. 2: Item maps*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Minkova, Donka. 2014. *A historical phonology of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Morwood, James (ed.). 2005. *Pocket Oxford Latin dictionary: Latin-English*. (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. *An introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

ODNB. *Oxford dictionary of national biography*. https://www.oxforddnb.com/ [Entries for: John Baret (R.W. McConchie); John Davidson (James Kirk); William Drummond of Hawthornden (Michael R.G. Spiller); Alexander Home, first earl Home (Maureen M. Meikle); Alexander Hume, writer (S.M. Dunnigan); Ben Jonson (Ian Donaldson); Andrew Melville (James Kirk); James Melville (James Kirk); Andrew Simson (Richard L. Greaves); Sir Thomas Smith (Ian W. Archer); Robert Waldegrave (A.J. Mann); Henry Benjamin Wheatley (J.D. Lee)] (Last accessed 23/08/2021).

OED. *Oxford English dictionary*. https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/ (Last accessed 23/08/21).

Ogden, Richard. 2017. *An introduction to English phonetics*. (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Patterson, R.F. (ed.). 1924. *Ben Jonson's conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*. London: Blackie and Sons Limited.

Perseus. *Search the collection (Latin dictionaries)*. https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/search?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0059 (Last accessed 17/07/21).

Reid, Steven J. 2011. *Humanism and Calvinism: Andrew Melville and the Universities of Scotland, 1560-1625*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Salmon, Vivian. 1994. 'John Hart and the beginnings of phonetics in sixteenth-century England'. In Keith Carlon, Kristin Davidse & Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (eds.). *Perspectives on English: Studies in honour of Professor Emma Vorlat*. Leuven: Peeters. 1-20.

Salmon, Vivian. 1999. 'Orthography and punctuation'. In Roger Lass (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. III: 1476-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13-55.

Scottish Language Dictionaries. 2017. *Concise Scots dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Simpson, D.P. 1966. *Cassell's Latin dictionary*. (3rd ed.). London: Cassell Publishers Ltd.

Smith, Jeremy J. 2007. *Sound change and the history of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Jeremy J. 2012. *Older Scots: A linguistic reader*. Edinburgh: The Boydell Press for the Scottish Text Society.

Steven, William. 1849. *The history of the High School of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: MacLachlan & Stewart.

Stewart, Alan. 2003. *The cradle King: A life of James VI & I*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Venezky, Richard L. 1970. *The structure of English orthography*. The Hague: Mouton.

Wyld, Henry Cecil. 1920. *A history of modern colloquial English.* London: T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd.