Proper Names and Proper Pronunciation in Shakespeare's Plays

Leonard R.N. Ashley

> Could *how* Betterton spoke be as easily known as *what* he spoke; then you might see the Muse of Shakespeare triumph, with all her beauties in their best array, rising into real life, and charming her beholders.
>
> *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber, Comedian* (1749)

This is a brief study of one of the most neglected aspects of the onomastic criticism of Shakespeare, the pronunciation of the names of his characters and of placenames that occur in his plays, within the general context of "Shakespearian pronunciation."

Even here, however, as it almost always the case in Shakespearian criticism, we find that the ground has been more or less measured before, if not exactly cultivated.[1] In the last century Alexander J. Ellis published a work *On Early English Pronunciation, with Especial Reference to Shakespeare and Chaucer* in three parts (1869-1889), and in this century we have had general studies such as E.J. Dobson's two-volume *English Pronunciation 1500-1700* (1957), as well as some slight notice of individual works of Shakespeare's own time, such as William Bullokar's *Booke at Large, for the amendment of Orthographie, for English Speech* (1580) and Richard Mulcaster's *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582). Nonetheless, much more remains to be done with the many works on pronunciation and how spelling does or does not adequately render it, works which the New Men of Shakespeare's time, self-fashioning and desirous of being in fashion, needed and heeded.[2]

Shakespeare's own pronunciation was discussed by some, such as Harry Morgan Ayres (in Brander Matthews' and A.H. Thorndike's *Shakesperian Studies*, 1916), in various articles, and has been the subject of books such as Helge Kökeritz's *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (1953). However, apart from scanty guidance in certain editions of the plays and in some reference books on names in literature, there has been little scholarship on how to pronounce proper names in Shakespeare. Scholars are still heard

discussing both "Vee-ola" and "Vye-ola," and students are frequently permitted to go on and on in classroom discussions about "Anthony" and "Cleopaytruh." Sometimes it seems that though scholars have by now settled on *Shakespeare* instead of *Shaksper* and other variants, and pronounce the dramatist's own name in a pretty standard way, they do not always feel the need to get the names of the characters correctly pronounced. This is largely due, I think, to the tendency, still strong, to regard the plays as texts to be read rather than as dramas to be played, which makes proper names visual rather than vocal entities. Of course, reading with proper attention to the meter, the verse would make obvious many of their errors of pronunciation, but some scholars tend to see rather than to say the lines.[3]

Predictably, it was a woman who ran an acting school in New York City who wrote a practical book originally called *How to Pronounce the Names in Shakespeare* (1919, revised as *A Pronouncing Dictionary of Shakespearean Proper Names*). She got E.H. Sothern to say, "So far as I am aware there is no book which provides final information on the subject" - presumably he meant no *other* book - and Sir Johnstone Forbes-Robinson to say, "I think it will be a most useful addition to a Shakespeare library." (Presumably he meant that it would be useful when the time came for a play to be taken from the library and put on the stage.) The author, Theodora (U.) Irvine, wrote in the preface to her first edition of the dictionary of its origin and method:

> For years I have received letters from actors, from club women, from teachers of English and of Dramatic Art, and from directors of dramatic organizations, amateur as well as professional, 'How do you pronounce these Shakespearean names - do you say Petrotchio or Petrookio ... ?'[4]

She found that "such a thing as a Shakespearean Pronouncing Dictionary did not exist" and that "the dozens of promptbooks left by the great managers and actors brought no hint of pronunciation," so she set out to eliminate haphazard pronunciation and "reproduce the pronunciation used by the majority of persons, who by reason of their general culture or their interest in the spoken word, or because of their understanding of phonetics, may lay claim to cultivated speech," turning to foreigners for the correct ways of saying foreign words. Mark Twain would have disagreed: in *Innocents Abroad* he asserted that "foreigners always spell better than they pronounce."

Miss Irvine hoped to foster a "more scholarly pronunciation" but conceded:

> Proper names in any language do not, or course, follow absolutely the rules that govern the pronunciation of ordinary words; they are a law unto themselves, following only certain fundamental characteristics.

Therefore, Miss Irvine's findings are essentially no more than her opinion based upon the theories and practice of the linguists and actors of her day whom she respected. Consequently, some of her judgments may tell us more about the style of acting in her time or even the dialects of British and American thespians, or the concept of foreign and native "Stage English" at the turn of the last century or so, than about what Shakespeare might have intended or his "Superfluous sort of men," the professional players, must have said. Miss Irvine is frank to admit that

> I do not look upon the decisions herein made as final - to claim that would be unpardonable arrogance - but it may at least be said that the pronunciations here recorded are faithful transcriptions of the times,

her times, especially useful to and especially derived from "actors and stage-managers."[5]

In Miss Irvine's day Walter Hampden (who said *Puh-troo'-chee-o*) was typical of the Old-School American actors and many British actors continued in an elocutionary style which today we should think very hammy. Some of the Old-School actor-managers can today be heard on early recordings, where their pronunciations may seem to some moderns as odd as some of their dramatic interpretations.[6] Even recordings by John Barrymore only a half-century old sound very unlike many modern actors.

To characterize the older actors' rendering of proper names, we may note briefly that they tend to deliver (say) *Bianca* as three syllables and occasionally *Christian, nation, patience,* etc. also as trisyllabic. But (as Margaret Webster once remarked) names like *Bianca* are "prone to debasement," and actors such as Orson Welles made *Julius Caesar* two two-syllable words: *Jool'-yuhs.* Walter Hampden confessed (or asserted): "I sound the final 's' in *Fortinbras,*" and Orson Welles said *Jak' doo boiz'* for *Jacques de Bois.*

Few actors err on *Gloucester,* but some pronounce the silent "w" in names such as *Warwick,* and accent an unexpected syllable of names such as *Viola,* or use pronunciations that sound odd to the Americans (Maurice Evans' *Flee'-ans*) or the British (*Bahl'-ing-brook*). Pedantic directors might insist that Regan's name in *Lear* be pronounced in the light of the spelling *Ragan* in a source.

Regional dialects on both sides of the Atlantic, not to mention Australia, the Caribbean, and so on, are not noticed usually in their own areas but

cause some hilarity when they are mixed at (say) some Shakespeare festival combining American, British, and More British (i.e. Canadian) actors, or occur in companies in which diverse origin or invincible ignorance has actors pronouncing names in two or more ways in the same production. If everyone in the cast who is concerned can be made to say *Juliet* as two syllables instead of one, Eva La Gallienne does not look foolish. If no one in the cast pronounces the "r" in *Hotspur*, all's well; but if some do and some do not, the audience may notice and disapprove.

I saw a Hotspur at Stratford (Ontario) complaining of his "woons," outacting all the others but sounding "too American" for the role and (especially) the role of the son of so indubitably British a father as he had in the play.

It has been the custom since Macready's productions in the early nineteenth century to play *Macbeth* in more or less Scottish costume, but the assumption of "borrowed robes" of Scottish accents, in the dialogue and the pronunciation of the proper names, is unusual. Orson Welles tried it (unevenly, if not unsuccessfully); however, it is as unnecessary as it would be to assume Italian accents for *The Merchant of Venice* or Illyrian ones for *Twelfth Night.*

I do not think it wise to pronounce foreign names other than as they are handled in the English of the plays, though Miss Irvine gives "a few rules for the benefit of those who care to know the pronunciation given these names in Italy today." Of course, we are interested in how the names are to be handled in plays written in the late 1500s and played now in the late 1900s. Therefore, her advice of some generations back is irrelevant anyway. In her day, "correctness" was a concern:

> Ada Rehan said in a letter written to me shortly before her death [1916]: 'Mr. Daly in his Shakespearean productions always used the Italian pronunciation of the names of characters, his authority being Horace Howard Furness.' [7]

(John) Augustin Daly's company in New York and London successfully teamed John Drew (whose parents were English and Irish, though he was born in America) and Ada Rehan, (of Irish birth, immigrating to the United States at the age of fourteen). Both of them sounded more British than American, and this may have contributed to their success on the London stage with Daly (who also opened a theatre there) as well as in New York. To Americans, at least, their pronouncing of Italian names in Shakespeare in a careful Italian style was very likely regarded as just another feature of a somewhat artificial "Stage English." Had British,

and to some extent American, attitudes toward the Irish been different, both might have put more brogue into their delivery and approximated the English of Shakespeare's day, in which *speak* sounded like modern *spake* and *bait* like *bate*. A modern actor with an Hibernian approach would at least get the rhyme in such Shakespeare couplets as this from *Henry V*:

> Follow your spirit; and upon this charge
> Cry, 'God for Harry, England, and Saint George!'
>
> (III.1.33)

To play Shakespeare in Irish-English (except in Ireland, perhaps) seems ill-advised now, whatever the Elizabethans sounded like.

Though there have been many attempts to stage Shakespeare's plays in modern times in the costume of his period and even on (our conception of) Elizabethan-type stages, and even though The Globe is now to rise on (actually, very near) its original site, to play the plays in "Elizabethan English" seems to me a crazy idea, though I should like to hear one of them staged or, better, recorded as a sort of sample. There is practically as much agreement about how actors spoke on Shakespeare's stage as about the physical stage itself, so such a production is no more far-fetched than "Elizabethan staging."[8]

How actors spoke in Shakespeare's time, how they pronounced the names, is an antiquarian matter now and must of necessity involve about as much speculation as scholarship. My view is that Shakespeare's company must have striven to agree on the sometimes strange names which the dramatist's sources, if not his inventions, dictated for them, pronouncing the unfamiliar as guided by the meter of the verse and, occasionally, rhymes and seeing to it that, with few exceptions, all the members of the cast who had to say a name would have some "standard" (if not always correct) pronunciation of it.

As a matter of fact, I judge that in the pronouncing of difficult names there was probably more agreement among actors than there might have been about the pronouncing of the langauge as a whole. Shakespeare's actors would have had even less common background and training than the boy actors who were essentially choristers.[9] Shakespeare's actors must have come from various parts of the country, and to one extent or another retained their regional accents. Richard Burbage, the son of the joiner James Burbage, must have spoken in one of the accents of London

from the time he was a boy actor in the theatres of Shoreditch, while Shakespeare surely retained in his speech something of his Warwickshire background.[10]

Today we tend to think, or to imagine if we do not think enough, that Shakespeare's players spoke some kind of "Stage English" as Shakespearian actors tend to do today. But one of the company, for instance, had his name rendered as "Thomas Poope" in the First Folio, and it seems likely that that spelling gives us, if not the way that actor said *pope*, at least a pronunciation that his fellows Heminge and Condell thought right. The letter "o" was obviously not consistently or even usually rendered as we render it today, as we see from rhymes such as *move* and *love* in Elizabethan verse. John Withal's *A Shorte Dictionarie for Yonge Begynners* (1562) has "woormes" for "worms." West Country people such as Sir Walter Ralegh must have done odd things with the "o" sound. Consider these lines from a famous poem by Ralegh written in his bible the night before his execution:

> Even such is tyme, which takes in trust
> Our *youth*, our Ioyes, and all we have.

(Italics mine.) While I grant that the printing of Elizabethan plays was such that we can never be quite sure we have the text, let alone the spelling, of the dramatist exactly as he wrote, in lyric poetry spelling is a pretty good guide to pronunciation.[11] While printers were apt to fiddle with spelling to shorten or fill out a line, this seems to have been done in the cheap printing of discarded play texts more than in the presentation of what was then regarded as far more "serious" verse.[12]

Elizabethan texts may today seem idiosyncratic to us and at one with that Protestant time when every butcher boy could be his own pope (as a Catholic author once put it), but I would argue that when John Rastell (d. 1536) wrote fifty years before Shakespeare of "the cost of wynchelsey" there was an attempt to render the long "o" sound we have in the modern word (*coast*), and when Ralegh in *The 11th; and last booke of the Ocean to Scinthia* (1592?) gives us *mich* for *much* it is as likely to be evidence of the way he spoke as it is to be a misprint.

This may suggest that when Elizabethan actors came upon unfamiliar names in plays they agreed to say them in whatever English way their own dialects and spellings would first suggest. With a Latin or Greek name there may have been some guidelines, though less known to mere actors than to University Wits and scholars (who had devised their own "rules" for Englishing the classical names, no one being sure how the

Romans and Greeks spoke anyway). When confronted with something that looked Latin but was not, such as *Mucedorus*, they would just take a stab at it. (Sir John Harrington's *Acadia* renders the name *Musidorus*, so presumably in the play that was in its own time much more famous *Mucedorus* did not have a hard "c".) If they got something like *Melpomene* wrong, it really mattered little so long as there was a consensus.[13]

If they made three syllables on occasion of *England* and *Gloucester*, Shakespeare accommodates them (or compels them) in lines such as "Than Bolingbroke's return to England" (*Richard II*, IV.1.17) and "O loving uncle, kind Duke of Gloucester" (*1 Henry VI*, III.1.142). Miss Irvine recommends accenting trisyllables such as *Westminster* and *Westmorland* on the first syllable, which I doubt is correct, much as I have noticed the English way of coming down on the first syllable (which divides them from Americans on words such as *lamentable*) even if it means mangling French words such as *brochure, chauffeur, garage, paté*, etc.

For the details of Miss Irvine's recommendations, see her *Pronouncing Dictionary*.[14]

With a number of major theatrical stars of or much influenced by the great Victorian tradition of English acting, a style flamboyant enough for the vast auditoria that London provided in the nineteenth century, Miss Irvine created her concept of a kind of internationally acceptable, basically London "Stage English," pronunciation of Shakespeare. She did, however, also cite as authorities more minor actors: Margaret Anglin, Beatrice Cameron, Charles Douville Coburn, William Faversham, Charles Rann Kennedy, F.F. Mackay, Edith Wynne Matthison, James McCullough, Phyllis Neilson-Terry, and Annie Russell. These too, whether British or American in origin, more or less spoke a "Stage English" acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic, not to mention Australia or anywhere else one might tour.

"English English," for a long time synonymous here with that nineteenth-century ideal "proper English," was with us from America's earliest days. Though the first American comedy of note (Royall Tyler's *The Contrast*, 1787) praises the Yankee and patriotically asserts the superiority of things American over anything foreign, it was in form and style copied from the "Laughing Comedy" of Richard Brindsley Sheridan, and would look and sound very British could we see it today as it was seen in the new Republic. The American stage, in fact, retained British models even when our first important native playwright, William Dunlap (1766-1839), selected American themes. Even when not presenting the works of Englishmen, our actors sounded English more than Colonial, if they

could. Touring English stars such as Edmund Kean or Fanny Kemble [15] or Charles Kean and his wife Ellen Tree could play Shakespeare here as they did in London, and Americans could play Shakespeare in London without adverse comment on their accents.[16]

Edwin Forrest played Iago to Edmund Kean's Othello in Albany, New York (1825), and Othello himself in New York City (1826). When he was hissed in London in *Macbeth*, it was not for his American accent. Like most American actors of Shakespeare, he developed some approximation of London "Stage English," because, after all, he was playing in an Englishman's works, often playing English characters. Even Marlon Brando as Mark Antony sounded rather British, though since John Barrymore few American actors would be mistaken for English ones, even if some Canadians on stage and screen were able to pass as British so far as Americans were concerned.

Much of the similarity between British and American kinds of "proper English" derived from Anglophile notions of elocution. Whereas later Arthur Miller's Willie Loman stressed the importance of being "well-liked" if one wished to succeed, earlier in America those who would rise strove to be well-spoken. Alexander Pope in *The Iliad of Homer*, III:283:

> But when he speaks, what elocution flows!
> Soft as the fleeces of descending snows
> The copious accents fall, with easy art;
> Melting they fall, and sink into the heart.

The well-born had to have a speech and posture that raised them above the common herd. Women had to resemble Margaret Dumont of Marx Brothers fame. In commerce men had to "think Yiddish but dress British" in New York, then as now. The children, and the children of middle-class parents who wanted to give their offspring "advantages" and "contacts," were sent to dancing schools, finishing schools, and elocution teachers.

Young members of Society wanted accents "soft" and an "easy," Anglophile way with words, not the "harsh" accents of America's big cities. They wore English fashions (or French, like the English), traveled abroad (because Europe was more "civilized"), even changed their names (later also their noses) to something more English. Teachers of elocution coached them to recite bits of Shakespeare (or Addison's *Cato* and other British classics) and acting schools enrolled them (more for "polish" than to see if they had thespian talent, because "life upon the wicked stage" was scarcely respectable).

The way to say Shakespeare became to some extent the way to speak in Good Society. A rewarding investigation could uncover the extent to which Shakespearian texts and acting styles influenced the concept of upperclass American speech, along with the reasons and the results of the decline of elocution teachers and indeed the cessation of speech testing for teachers in the public schools. That is part of the sociology of the whole country.

Oddly, however, Paul Fussell in his valuable "guide through the American status system," puts almost all his emphasis on vocabulary rather than accent, though he begins with John Brooks' comment that "one's speech is an unceasingly repeated public announcement about background and social standing," recognizing that this is "translating into modern American Ben Jonson's observation 'Language most shows a man. Speak, that I may see thee.'" He does note:

> Proles signal their identity partly by pronunciation, like the Texan on the [William F.] Buckley show who said *pro-mis-kitty* and 'I am a prole' at the same time. Proles drop the "g" on present participles, saying *it's a fuckin' shame*, as well as the *-ed* on past participles: thus *corned beef* becomes *corn beef* (or better, *corm beef*), and we also hear of *bottle beer, dark-skin people, old-fashion bake beans*, and *Mother's High-Power Beer*. 'First come, first served' is a favorite axiom. Roger Price, the student of Roobs or urban hicks, has located more prole pronunciations. He observes that "in Southern California even newscasters say "wunnerful" and "anna-bi-odicks" and "in-er-*ess*-ting." The word "interesting," pronounced in this manner, with the accent on the third syllable, is the infallible mark of the Roob.' Or, as we call it, the prole. To Price, other signs of Roobhood are saying
>
> | | | |
> |---|---|---|
> | fack | for | fact |
> | fure | for | fewer |
> | present | for | president |
> | oney | for | only |
> | finey | for | finally, and |
> | innaleckshul | for | "nondemocratic" |
>
> To say *en-tire*, like the Rev. Rex Humbard, the TV evangelist, is to indicate you're a high or mid-prole, but to say *merring-gew* when you mean the foamy egg-white stuff on top of pies is low.[17]

To my mind, these are merely examples of careless speech - and it should be *ol'-fashin bake beence.* I have never heard *merring-gew* except in middle-class jest, while dropping the "g" was once a sign of the huntin'-shootin'-fishin' English country aristocracy. Much more indicative of

class in America are such things as the clenched-teeth delivery of the upper middle-class parodied in *Auntie Mame* or the bored tones of Mr. Buckley, George Plimpton, and the "brat pack" *jeunesse d'orée.*

Acting never has been an upperclass occupation, despite the knighting of Irving and many more since and Olivier's peerage. British peers who have written for the stage are few: can you think of any besides Fulke Greville, the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Byron, Bulwer-Lytton? Drama is middle-class art.

Nonetheless, Shakespeare is Serious Culture and Shakespearian acting Serious Art, whatever the class of playwrights or players in Elizabethan times or since. Therefore, the accents of the Shakespearian stage are not unconnected with concepts of what proper speech should be both on and off the boards. To some extent Shakespeare, along with the electronic media which have helped to Americanize world English (everybody's second language internationally now) and his players have been instrumental in destroying Henry Sweet's prediction of about a century ago that by this time America, Britain, and Australia would be speaking mutually unintelligible languages. Shakespearian actors in all those places still sound more alike than they sound different and the heritage of Shakespeare is a cultural bond, a linguistic force.[18]

To this day many Americans agree with the late Alan J. Lerner that Britain is the most "civilized" country in the history of the world, especially if they know it through Shakespeare and other literature rather than through visits to Thatcher's Britain, though her countryman Dennis Potter describes Britain now, unkindly, as "scum left by receding bilge." Many Americans still believe that fancy speech or even correct speech is essentially The Queen's English, not Webster's, and that Shakespearian actors here and everywhere are somehow closest to the ideal, even if American ones seldom or never now render *duke* as dyuk (as Miss Irvine and her generation of teachers insisted it be pronounced). Even the British are giving that up now.

Clarence Day's pater in *Life with Father* taught him to be rather an English gentleman. As for language: "Aside from a few odd words in Hebrew, I took it for granted that God had never spoken anything but the most dignified English." Something like (we presume) Eastern Europeans such as John Houseman, John Simon, or the late Laurence Harvey (Ukrainian) or Leslie Howard (an Austrian Jew). Something like Sir John Gielgud (who has a Polish countess among his forebears) or Peter Ustinov (whose ancestry is a Continental amalgam) or the late George Saunders (born in St. Petersburg), perhaps, but in any case actorish.

To a considerable extent, the history of the development of a Shakespearian style (or styles) of acting is the history of the "high-toned" English pronunciation once considered a social necessity. One went into the movie industry and learned it, into the cinema and copied it. Colley Cibber in the late seventeenth century perceived the way his upperclass friends spoke and put their style on the stage for the instruction of what we today would call the yuppies. Sir Noel Coward taught a generation of two of Bright Young Things to copy the precise style of speech he himself had developed to communicate with his deaf mother and to express his own superior and blasé self.

But we have strayed into the influence of "Stage English" on society as a whole, and have referred to acting rather than the way actors said names and, specifically, Shakespeare's names, which is to depart from the topic almost as much as if we were to discuss how the mention of names from Shakespeare has been used to indicate or claim Culture, or the way in which Shakespeare's charactonyms have become (in *shylock* and *romeo* and such) the common coin of slang.

In connection with the pronouncing of Shakespeare names, within the larger context of the pronunciation of English in his own and subsequent times, we reach several conclusions:

The orthography of names in Shakespeare's early texts can yield useful information about the pronunciation of Elizabethan English. Though printing practices of the period must make us wary about asserting that we have accurate evidence of Shakespeare's own speech, at the very least we have a more or less phonetic representation of the sounds that seemed correct to his editors (fellow actors Heminge and Condell, whose speech can reasonably be assumed to be not unlike what was heard on the stages of The Globe and Blackfriars), and to his printers (William Jaggard [1569-1623], his son Isaac [1595-1627], and apprentices, including one John Shakespeare, a Warwickshire man who may have been a distant relative of the dramatist).

Proper nouns are subject to less variation than most words, and are an especially important source of linguistic information about a period with unsettled orthography. Moreover, names are more often repeated in dramatic texts than in other kinds of work. Shakespeare's considerable number and wide variety of plays presents us with a large number of the names of characters, some actors, and many placenames, the names being both ancient and contemporary, both domestic and foreign, some names occurring elsewhere and some new-coined according to discoverable linguistic rules.

Elizabethan England had a special interest in the quickly developing language; theorists of the period have left us commentaries which we can compare with practice. Both linguistic and dramatic texts of the period have been assiduously edited. In particular, onomastic matters were then considered of importance (witness William Camden's *Remaines Concerning Britain (1623)),* and there is contemporary commentary on them.

The First Folio of Shakespeare's plays (1623) is one of the most important and most carefully studied books ever published. Half of the plays, "Truley set forth, according to their first Originall" (the title-page claimed), were first published cheaply in quartos. Texts can be compared, with regard to names and other details. Plays first appearing in the First Folio were prepared with "care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them" by Shakespeare's "Friends": "As where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed," they claimed, "euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued them." Perhaps Edward Knight (Book-Keeper of The King's Men), Sir Walter Wilson Greg suggested (1955), edited the First Folio. Five compositors set it (one of them setting about half of the whole) in Jaggard's shop, some of their methods mangling the texts. Charlton Hinman's *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (1963) gives us both assistance in and warnings about the First Folio texts, making them more fully understood than practically any other Elizabethan printed documents.

Many of the names Shakespeare uses are to be found in other texts, dramatic and nondramatic, of his period and of a number of earlier periods. Shakespeare's anthroponyms and toponyms can be studied in historical context and do not often involve the problems associated with invented names of fiction.

Shakespeare's names occur in verse as well as prose. Meter assists in determining stress, rhyme in determining sound. Further, the wordplay of Shakespeare produces useful linguistic information, as well as wit, in puns, etc., hints about the significance of the name choice, etc. Period fashions, such as that for the polysyllabic and evocative, impressive or incantatory name to reverberate in what Thomas Nashe called "the drumming decasyllabon" of Christopher Marlowe's famous "mighty line", are seen in the verse Shakespeare wrote to satisfy the taste of his audience. Alfred Harbage has anatomized it in *Shakespeare's Audience,* first published in 1941.

Shakespeare's names occur in plays. Of course Shakespeare was the author of non-dramatic poetry as well, but it is as a dramatist that he is regarded as the master. Names (and other words) in plays have a special emphasis placed on their pronunciation: they are to be spoken. The pronunciation of names in drama demands settling on a single way of rendering them in a performance; names in drama cannot remain as vague or unconsidered in terms of their sound as can names in some other branches of literature, for plays are essentially for the stage, not the page.

From Shakespeare's names we can learn something of the sound and style of Elizabethan acting and of subsequent theatrical history. From accents we might now describe as rather Irish to American acting in accents we might describe as rather English, generations of the leading actors of the English-speaking world have concerned themselves and their audiences with the works of Shakespeare. In the last century, when "the sun never set on the British Empire," Shakespearian lines were delivered everywhere in some approximation of an artificial "Stage English" adopted and adapted by London stars; in this century, with the emergence of the United States as the imperial power, American English (with other tongues differing from that of The Royal Shakespeare Company, The Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, etc.) has taken an increasingly important place in world affairs and in acting, here and internationally. American dominance of the technology of communication (phonograph, cinema, television, popular music, and so on) has made American accents familiar and acceptable, even in the most serious legitimate and traditional theatre. Actors and scholars in the United States have a greater authority than ever before to determine how the names and the rest of the words in Shakespeare should be spoken for worldwide audiences. Those, increasingly, speak (or are studying to speak) American (rather than British) English. Indeed, studying Shakespeare, one of the cornerstones of our cultural heritage, we learn more than literary and theatrical history ("the stage"): we learn about our whole culture ("all the world").

The Folger Guide to Shakespeare (1969) is one of the few handbooks or "companions" to Shakespeare which provides a "Glossary of Principal Characters" and adds pronunciations "generally adopted by Shakespearean actors or required by the meter of Shakespeare's verse." The editors use "*a* as in *about; ay* as in *aid; ah* as in ... *'Ah me'; nah* ...; *e* as in *bet*; *ee* as in *tree; i* as in *it; uh* a short *a* sound; *aw* as in *awl; al* as in ... *alphabet,*" etc.

Here are the 153 names they feel need explanation. Read them aloud and see how many you get "right"!

Proper Names

Abergavenny (ab -er-gany)
Adriana (ay-dree-ah -nah)
Aemilius (ee-mill -ee-us)
Aeneas (ee-nee -ee-us)
Agrippa (uh-grip -uh)
Aguecheek (ay -gyou-cheek)
Albret (awl -bray)
Alcibiades (al-suh-bye -uh-dees)
Alencon (a-len -sun)
Aliena (a-lee-ay -nuh)
Amiens (ah -mee-enz)
Andromache (an-drom -uh-kee)
Antenor (an-tee -ner)
Antigonus (an-tig -uh-nus)
Antiochus (an-tye -uh-kus)
Antipholus (an-tif -o-lus)
Archidamus (ar-kuh-dah -mus)
Aviragus (ar-vuy-ray -gus)
Aumerle (o-merl)
Autolycus (aw-tol -uh-kus)
Auvergne (o-vair -nyuh)
Bassanio (ba-sah -nee-o)
Bassianus (bas-ee-ah -nus)
Belarius (bell-ah -ree-us)
Berkeley (bark -lee)
Berowne (buh-roon)
Borachio (bo-rah -kee-o)
Brabantio (bra-ban -sho)
Caius (kay -us)
Calchas (kal -kus)
Caphis (kay -fis)
Cerimon (ser- uh-mon)
Cesario (suh-zah -ree-o)
Chatillon (sha til -yun, or shat -i-lon)
Chiron (ky -ron)
Cleomenes (klee-ohm -uh-nees)
Clitus (lye -tus)
Coriolanus (kor -ee-o-lay-nus)
Curio (kyou -ree-o)
Dardanius (dar-day -nee-us)
Deiphobus (dee-if -o-bus)
Dercetas (der -se-tus)
Diomedes (dy-o-mee -dees)
Dion (dy -on)
Dionyza (dy-o-nye -zuh)
Dromio of Ephesus (dro -mee-o of ef -uh-sus)
Egeon (ee-gee -un)
Egeus (ee-gee -us)
Escalus (es -kuh-lus)
Escanes (es -kuh-nees)
Euphronius (you-fro -nee-us)
Fleance (flee -unce)
Fortinbras (for -tin-brahs)
Glendower (glen -doo-er)
Gloucester (glos -ter)
Gratiano (grah-shee-ah -no)
Gremio (grem -ee-o)
Grumio (groo -mee-o)
Guiderius (gwee-dee -ree-us or gee-dee -ree-us)
Hecate (heck -uh-tuh or heck -ut)
Helena (hel -uh-nuh)
Helicanus (hel-uk-kay -nus)
Hermione (her-mye -o-nee)
Hippolyta (hip-ol -uh-tuh)
Holofernes (hol-o-fur -nees)
Iachimo (ya -ke-moh)
Iago (ee-ah -go)
Iden (eye -den)
Jaquenetta (jack-uh-net -uh)
Jaques (jay -kwees)
Juliet (jool -yet)
Lepidus, M. Aemilius (ee-mill -ee-us lep -uh-dus)
Lodovico (lo-dovee -ko)
Longaville (long -guh-vill)
Lucentio (loo-chen -see-o)
Lucetta (loo-set -uh)
Luciana (loo-she-ah -nuh
Lucilius (loo-sil -ee-us)

Ashley

Lucio (loo'-sheeo)
Lysander (lye-san'-der)
Maecenas (mee-see'-nus)
Marcellus (mar-sel'-us)
Marina (ma-ree'-nuh)
Menas (mee'-nus)
Menelaus (men-uh-lay'-us)
Menteith (men-teeth')
Moth (mote)
Panthino (pan-thee'-no)
Peto (pee'-to)
Philemon (fill-ee-'-mon)
Philostrate (fill'-uh-strate)
Phrynia (frye'-nee-uh)
Pisanio (pee-zah'-neeo)
Poli'enes (po-licks'-uh-nees)
Posthumus Leonatus (poss'-tu-mus)
Proteus (pro'-tee-us)
Rambures (rahm-boo'-rees)
Reignier (ray'-neeay)
Rinaldo (ri-nol'-do)
Salerio (sul-e'-reeo)
Seleucus (sel-you'-kus)
Sicinius Velutus (si-sin'-eeus vey-you'-tus)
Silius (sil'-yus)
Siward (see'-erd)
Strato (stray'-to)
Thaisa (thay-is'-uh)
Thersites (ther-sye'-tees)
Thurio (too'-reeo or thoo'-reeo)
Titania (ti-tah'-nee-uh or ti-tan'-yuh)
Titinius (ti-tin'-eeus)
Titus (tye'-tus)
Trebonius (tree-bo'-nee-us)
Troilus (troy'-lus)
Tyrrel (tir'-el)
Ursula (er'-syou-luh)
Verges (var'-gees or ver'-gees)
Viola (vee'-o-la)
Worcester (wus'-ter)

Lychorida (lick-oh'-ruh-duh)
Lysimachus (lye-sim'-uh-kus)
Marcade (mar-kod' or mar-kade')
Maria (ma-ree'-uh)
Melun (muh-loon')
Menecrates (men-eck'-ruh-tees)
Menenius (muh-nee'-neeus)
Mercutio (mer-kyou'-sheeo)
Nicanor (nye-kay'-nor)
Parolles (pah-roll'-es)
Petruchio (pe-trew'-keeo)
Philo (fye'-lo)
Philotus (fye-lo'-tus)
Pindarus (pin'-da-rus)
Poins (poinz)
Polydore (pol'-i-dor)
Porculeius (proke-you-lay'-us)
Publius (pub'-lee-us)
Regan (ree'-gan)
Reynaldo (ray-nol'-do)
Rosaline (roz'-uh-line)
Saturninus (sat-er-nye'-nus)

Simonides (sye-mon'-i-dees)
Solinus (so-lye'-nus)
Tamora (tam'-or-uh)
Thaliard (thal'-yerd)
Thesues (thee'-see-oos)
Timon (tye'-mon)

Titus (tye'-tus)
Tranio (trah'-neeo)
Trinculo (tring'-kyou-lo)
Tybalt (tib'-ult)
Ulysses (you-lis'-ees)
Valeria (va-lee'-ree-uh)
Vincentio (veen-chen'-seeo)
Violenta (veeo-len'-ta)

I know of no actor or scholar who will have pronounced all the names listed above exactly as the editors of *The Folger Guide to Shakespeare* do. Moreover, one will question why some variants are permitted and others we must have heard are not. Then there are names not given pronunciations by Wright and Lamar that are heard in different ways. Some are Aaron (ar'-on, ay'-ron), Alice (al'-iss, al'-us), Alonso (al-on'-so, al-onz'-o), Antonio (an-to'-nyo, an-to'nee-o), Arthur (ar'-thur, ah'-thuh), Banquo (elsewhere mentioned).

Many more could be listed. Not addressed are the differences between British and American pronunciations of some English and French placenames that form the names of nobles; the way accents shift sometimes (in a couple of *Henry VI* plays it is "ahn-joo'"); and whether to say "France" *frawns* or not. We have in Shakespeare two men called Thomas Mowbray: one (1386-1405) is in *2 Henry IV* (Baron "Mow'-bree" and Earl of "Not'-in-gum") and another in *Richard II* (c. 1366-1399, the previous "Mow'-bree" and Duke of "Naw'-fuk"); Americans may need help with names such as these, as well as *Milan, Northumberland,* and *Vaux, Scroop, Salisbury, Sandys, Rotherham, Lancaster, Boleyn, Bigod, Pierce* (unless spelled *Piers*) and so on. In fact, a single standard for British, American, Australian, and other English-speakers is really impossible: one cannot expect speakers who cannot agree on basic vowels to do so on proper names. *The Economist* for 20 December 1986 notes that "the broadest divide in mother-tongue English lies between British English and American English" and notes:

> A Miami Beach realtor (estate agent), if she ever had occasion to refer to a hot-water bottle, might call it a *haat waa-der baa-dill.* A Cockney shop assistant (salesclerk) calls hers a *'o' waw-uh bo-oo.* (p.130)

I hope (one hopes) we shall see neither Crackers nor Cockneys in Shakespeare (except in comedy, dialect parts), but these days nothing is certain except, perhaps, that accents will differ from place to place and actors and audiences should not be *hostile* (US: haw'stul, UK and Canada: haw'-style) to Shakespearian productions in strange accents (an all-black Joseph Papp *Julius Caesar* or an all-Midwestern *All's Well* in Ohio, even a Manchester Macbeth or a Romeo and Valley Girl) unless they are insensitively mixed in a single cast. Even mixtures are pretty well tolerated in New York, for instance, with white, black, Hispanic, and some indefinable accents all heard in a single production of Shakespeare in The Park. If Lear's daughters are of three different races it disturbs fewer than it used to. (I am still wondering why Bill Cosby's kids in his TV series, however, are of several different shades and I do not think I could cope with a black

Desdemona or even a Des-day'-mon-a in opera.) When actors are portraying persons of a certain background, English kings and their cohorts, for instance, an attempt at an English accent seems justifiable, just as Olivier assumed an American accent to play Tennessee Williams' Big Daddy. For plays set in (say) Vienna or Verona, I believe Americans should play it in American and Britons in English. To *assume* an English accent to portray a Scottish or Danish king is absurd. However, comic characters may speak in low-class British or general Mummersetshire accents.[19]

Whether it's *ben-kwo* or *bang-kwo*, at least it can be consistent in the cast and stressed on the correct syllable. Correct for Shakespeare: Wright and LaMar do not say what to do with *Andronicus*, but it must be accented on the second syllable, not on the third as the Romans would have had it, to suit the verse. And if occasionally *Henry* has to be three syllables or a polysyllable swallowed, so be it.

The meter should not be violated in English verse plays, so far as is possible. (For Americans, so far as is *humanly possible*.) The pronunciation, one might say, as "Saki" says of a gentleman's socks in one of his short stories, ought to excite our admiration without riveting our attention.

The names and all the words given proper stress to suit the iambic pentameter (with its many variations), I see no reason why Shakespeare cannot be played in Jamaican English or the English of Delhi or of Boston, England, or Boston, Massachusetts. Alfred Harbage in his "reader's guide" to *William Shakespeare* (1963) touches very briefly on pronunciation, and we may conclude with his authoritative remarks:

> It is comforting to know that the concordance of sound and meaning persists even though our pronunciation differs from Shakespeare's. The difference is less than was once supposed. He did not speak like a contemporary of Chaucer or like an Irishman with a brogue. His "r" sounds were more prominent than the modern Englishman's, and some of his vowel sounds broader, but his accent was neither Irish nor American although similar in a few details to both. Neither was it a modern English 'public school' accent. If his lines sound better when spoken by English actors, it is because they speak with more precision and more respect for sound, and are more used to speaking verse, not because their accent is more 'authentic.' Fortunately the beauty of sound of Shakespeare's poetry, like the concordance of sound and meaning, may be regarded as a constant - in his day and ours, in England and America ... .[20]

Brooklyn College

Notes

[1] Murray J. Levith's *What's in Shakespeare's Names* (1978), as can be seen from reviews listed by Coates in this issue, makes little or nothing useful out of the pronouncing of the names, and offers some ideas which are typical of those that have brought from Thomas Markey and others a suspicion that literary onomastics is not "scientific." Fausto Cercignani's *Shakespeare's Works and Elizabethan Pronunciation* (1981) inevitably covers names less specifically than Helge Kökeritz's *Shakespeare's names: A Pronouncing Dictionary* (1959), a follow-up to his *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (1953). Kökeritz recorded for Columbia (1955, reviewed by Frederic G. Cassidy in *College English* XVI, 199) *Examples of Shakespeare's Pronunciation.*

Names in literature are included in various literary reference books and dictionaries and discussed to a limited extent in various editions of Shakespeare's works, individual and collected. Wilhelm Viëtor deals with *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* in two volumes (*Shakespeare Phonology* and *A Shakespeare Reader*). Henry J. Richmond has a specialized study of *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin Proper Names in English*, but it is dated 1905 and needs updating. So do the standard *An English Pronouncing Dictionary* (Jones) and *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* (Kenyon & Knott). Now many general dictionaries include the pronunciation of real and fictional names. Still useful is Henry Sweet's *A History of English Sounds from the Earliest Period* (1888); research in linguistics has concentrated in the intervening century more on grammar, syntax, "deep structures." Is there a "deep" governing factor affecting English and American sounds?

Rhymes are a useful guide, and examples of names rhymed in Shakespeare are easily found in concordances. (Marvin Spevack's is computerized and would greatly facilitate a dissertation.) Previous scholarship has occasionally erred in failing to recognize that *both* the name and the rhyme may have been pronounced differently than they are today.

The bibliographical guides to Shakespeare scholarship are massive and yet record few articles such as R. B. Le Page's "The Dramatic Delivery of Shakespeare's Verse" (*English Studies* XXXII [1951], 63-68), newspaper articles such as R. A. Autry's "Pronouncing Shakespearian Names" (*Times Literary Supplement*, 19 September 1952, 613), and acting-school booklets such as Clive Sansone's *On the Speaking of Shakespeare.* Actor's passing comments on speaking Shakespeare and pronouncing his proper nouns remain to be collected from autobiographies, interviews, etc. So do more or less minor comments in theatrical reviews and criticism. For instance, Harley Granville-Barker touches on the pronunciation of *Coriolanus* in his *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (1958), for the subject must inevitably come up for those who think of the plays in terms of staging decisions.

Placenames is the subject of Sugden's *A Topographical Dictionary to the Works of Shakespeare and His Fellow-Dramatists.*

Ashley

[2]Cf R.E. Zachrisson, The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as Taught by William Bullokar (1927) reviewed by W. van der Graf in *English Studies* XVIII (1936), 39-43; H.G. Fiedler, *A Contemporary of Shakespeare on Phonetics and on the Pronunciation of English and Latin* (1936). Works on John Hart include: Otto Jespersen, *John Hart's Pronunciation of English (1569 and 1570)* (1907); Bror Danielsson, *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation* (1955); and H. Stanford London, "John Hart, Orthographic Reformer and Chester Herald, 1567-1584," *Notes & Queries*, New Style V (1958), 222-224. Otto Diebel's dissertation (Geissen, 1912) was on Thomas Smith's *De recta et emendata linguae Anglicae scriptione dialogus* (1568). After various wordbooks, the first English dictionary was Robert Cawdry's (1604).

Thomas R. Lounsbury states in his preface to *English Spelling and Spelling Reform* (1909) that "there is no one subject upon which men, whether presumably or really intelligent, are in a state of more hopeless, helpless ignorance than upon that of the nature of English orthography." This state of "more than Egyptian darkness" interested some of Shakespeare's contemporaries such as Bullokar, Hart, and Smith but it must be remembered that while some powerful personages wanted to improve their elocution with their elevation - the Tudors trying to lose the Welsh accent, the Writhes changing their surname to *Wriothesley* (that of Shakespeare's patron, the Earl of Southampton), county magnates increasingly taking up London ways, residences, accents - regularity in spelling was not much addressed until its convenience for lexicographers appeared. Dramatists did not use dictionaries, and among Shakespeare's 37,000 or so individual words (almost 2000 of them proper names) there were many of his own inventions. We owe so much to his vocabulary now that it it difficult to realize how free he was with words, how like an e. e. cummings of the Renaissance. His orthography was untrammeled. For what was "standard" in that freebooting period, the studies are rather hard to find. They include: Grace F. Swearingen, "English Orthography," *Modern Language Notes* XX (1905), 212-14; Eduard Sievers on *King Lear* in a *Festschrift* for Alois Brandl (1925), and Wilhelm Marschall's "Shakespeares Orthographie" in *Anglia* LI (1927), 307-22; August Lummert's dissertation (Berlin, 1883) on *De Orthographie der ersten Folioausgabe der Shakespeareschen Drama*, and my former colleague Gladys D. Haase's dissertation (Columbia, 1952) on *Spenser's Orthography: An Examination of a Poet's Use of the Variant Pronunciations of Elizabethan English*; Alfred W. Pollard on "English Spelling as a Literary and Bibliographical Clue," *The Library*, Fourth Series, IV (1923), which only hints at what spelling can mean; and William Matthews' "English Pronunciation and Shorthand in the Early Modern Period" in *University of California Publications in English* IX (1943), 135-214. Shorthand was important in the Elizabethan period, and Pitman reprinted John Hart's *Orthographie* in 1850. It was once argued more than it is now that the texts of some plays were stolen in the playhouses by shorthand transcription (to which I have always challenged: wouldn't someone notice a person dipping a pen that frequently?).

Shakespearian spelling needs to be reëvaluated in the light of a better understanding of the orthography of the period.

[3]F.G. Blandford prepared a booklet of twenty pages for the Festival Theatre Company (Cambridge) on *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (1927). It gives a transcription of the fifth scene of the first act of *Twelfth Night*, not without debatable decisions. Still it has a sensible interest in actors, which is more than can be said for nineteenth-century American writers on Shakespeare's pronunciation (such as John B. Noyes and Charles S. Pierce in *North American Review* of 1864 or Richard Grant White's "Memorandums of English Pronunciation in the Elizabethan Era" in a volume of his edition of Shakespeare's *Works*, 1861) or the writers of German articles (such as Eduard Müller, "*Shakespeares Aussprache*," in the *Jahrbuch* VIII (1873), 92-137) or modern English ones such as W.J. Churchill, Bernard Dawson, H.C. Manning, Kenneth Muir, and H.C. Wyld) who think of the plays as texts, or pretexts, for criticism but not for production.

[4]*A Pronouncing Dictionary of Shakespearean Proper Names*, "by Theodora Irvine, Director of the Irvine Studio for the Theatre, New York City," p. xi. Quotations are from her preface.

[5]Pp. xvii and xix. Kökeritz mocks Miss Irvine for treasuring actors' idiosyncrasies as "nuggets," but I am glad to have evidence of what late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Shakespearian actors sounded like. Serious linguists can turn to Kökeritz for more accuracy and such summary information as this:

> English pronunciation at the end of the 16th century was on the whole not very different from present-day speech, even though individual names and words may have differed a good deal from what we are now accustomed to say or hear. Of particular importance is the coalescence of *ea* in *seal*, *a* in *sale*, and *ai* in *sail* ...

Elizabethans made them all sound alike (with a vowel like the "e" in *get*), "at any rate in the speech of upperclass people." (I gather that designation did not apply to my relatives - through the member of the Campernowne family who married a John Ashley - the West-Country-speaking Sir Walter Ralegh and Sir Humphrey Gilbert, who never sounded like their London-born Oxford contemporaries William Camden, Richard Hakluyt of a Dutch family long settled in the West Country, and Sir Philip Sidney. Sidney must have sounded less like Kent than Shrewsbury, where he went to school before Oxford.) More on Elizabethan English:

> The diphthongs in *like* and *house* had not yet reached the present stages [ai] and [au] but had as their first element a vowel akin to [ə] in *bishop* [biʃop] or /ʌ/ in *cut* ... On the other hand, modern [əi] in *tail* and [ou] in *no*, *know* were still monophtongs, namely the long vowels [e:] and [o:]. It is almost impossible to determine whether or not preconsonantal and final *r* as in *farm*, *far* had ceased to be

pronounced about 1600.

(Kökeritz 1959, 17)

Kökeritz uses, you will have noted, the International Phonetic Alphabet, still another way in which his book is superior to Miss Irvine's. I recommend it (though no critic will ever agree completely with any author, I suppose) as the standard for modern actors and scholars. It even keeps up with The Bard, as the number of syllables pronounced varies in names such as *Abergavenny, Abraham, Actium, Aeolus, Albany, Albion, Alcibiades, Andromache, Antiochus,* and even *Asia,* and as the stress varies in (say) *Pantheon* and *Stephano.* It can explain why *Leontes* is stressed on the second syllable, but *Leonatus* on the third.

[6]Recordings by Argo, Caedmon, Spoken Arts, Spoken Word, Living Shakespeare, Shakespeare Recording Society, and other companies are listed in discographies of spoken arts and in some bibliographies such as McManaway and Roberts' *A Selective Bibliography of Shakespeare* ... (1975), as well as specialized lists of Shakespeare plays and excerpts, audio-visual aids for classroom use, etc. There is a journal of *Shakespeare on Film,* and a number of companies have produced film strips, video tapes, etc. The BBC undertook to put all of Shakespeare on television, as Public Broadcasting System has brought to America's attention. The "house styles" of the BBC, the Royal Shakespeare Company, and other repertories need study.

[7]Irvine, p. xxxii. Viola Allen, "who uses the name in public and in private, says: 'I prefer vee-o-la, each syllable *equally* accented.'" But this seems to be one with the "correctness" so beloved by Victorians such as Charles Kean, who has less interest in Shakespeare's text than in "historical accuracy" in costume, researched in The British Museum. (The younger Kean was plodding, compared to his father, watching whom Coleridge compared to "reading Shakespeare by flashes of lightning," and Charles Kean rejoiced when he was made a Fellow of The Society of Antiquaries and praised, and violently attacked, for his "profuse scenic arrangements" and worrying about the historicity of a dagger design that could not be "read" by the audience in any case.)

[8]Shakespeare's audiences heard "Say-zar" not "See-zer," but they also saw Romans in ruffs and doublets. A seventeenth-century book (Richard Hodges' *The English Primrose* (1644)) testifies that Englishmen were in the habit of saying "Jay-sus" for *Jesus,* which later meant only the popular stereotype of the Stage Irishman. Shakespeare rhymes *Bianca* with *stay, Helena* with *away,* and (giving it three syllables, as Marlowe did in *Tamburlaine) Asia* with *day.* Certainly modern productions must lose the rhyme, along with puns on *Rome* and *room* and perhaps Pistol's confusion of French *moi* and *moy* and so on, just as modern audiences lose the point of some of the jokes and allusions which Shakespeare's contemporaries enjoyed. I favor cutting material that must be unintelligible to modern audiences (since most productions cut Shakespeare to some degree or other), and stand against "mispronunciations" to preserve puns and rhymes. At the same time, modern audiences can accept the

anglicizing of French that the Folio records: *Callis* (Calais), *Foyes* (Foix), etc., as easily as they permit the occasional trisyllabic pronunciation of *England, Ireland, Christian, Douglas*, etc., where Shakespeare's verse demands that. Use the British rule: when in doubt, anglicize.

When characters are speaking foreign languages less than fluently - even Henry V has trouble with French - there is no reason why we cannot let Shakespeare rhyme *pardonne moy* with *destroy*. *Milan* has the accent on the first syllable in the British tradition of *Paris*. Americans accept "Par-iss" (though "Par-ee" came into colloquial use in World War I). The British rendition of Cervantes' *Quixote* (kwick'-zote) Americans do not like: they prefer three syllables and something more Spanish, just as they dislike Byron's rhyming *Juan* with *ruin*. However, the demands of the verse must be met if a jolt is to be avoided.

[9]The boy companies declined in popularity (despite plays written especially for them by John Lyly) in the 1580s, just about co-temporal with Shakespeare's arrival on the London theatrical scene. Their success and their style (much influenced by their schoolmaster and choirmaster directors, and by contemporary books on rhetoric, oratory, and the Latin grammar they studied, as well as the lyrics they so formally sang) could not but have had some effect on professional acting. However, that was probably less stiff and formal than the (amateur) acting of the university drama, where pedants ruled, and convention dictated exactly how to "suit the word to the action, the action to the word" and to "speak the speech." Lyly's novels and plays of the 1580s, with their precious, prissy, even ostentatious euphuism, gave the stage as well as the court a new language as heavily embroidered with pearls of rhetorical device as were the Queen's dresses with seed pearls. Shakespeare copied both Lyly's comic conventions and his rhetorical inventions, though he came to satirize the latter; the artificiality as well as the sprightliness in both had their effect upon the speaking of lines, and euphuistic comedies, smelling of the lamp in their allegories and verbal tricks, oddly brought a youthful freshness and sparkle to the public as well as the court stage, the synthetic language calling for a more effervescent acting style, words more "trippingly on the tongue."

A certain Lyly-that-festers quality of high camp is still to be seen in certain (mostly English) schools of Shakespearian acting. The schoolmasterish element has almost disappeared; modern professional performances are seldom directed by pedants.

[10]Mitchell & Leys, 133.

[11]Abbott, (*A Shakesperian Grammar*, 1874): "The spelling (which in Elizabethan writers was more influenced by the pronunciation, and less by the original form and derivation of the word, than is now the case), frequently indicates that many syallables which we now pronounce were then omitted in pronunciation." This was especially true for toponyms (the First Folio shows *Daventry* was spoken *Daintry*, in the tradition of *Lancashire* (Lancastershire) and *Lemster* (Leominster), and for polysyllabic names (whether derived from

placenames or not) at the ends of lines. Thus. "Saw'st thou the melancholy Lord Nothumberland?" (*Richard III*, V:3.68); "My dear Lord Gloucester and my good Lord Exeter" (*Henry V*, IV.3.9); "To our most fair and princely cousin, Katharine" (*Henry V*, V.2.4).

[12]All that man knows on earth or needs to know about the printing of the First Folio has been explained by Charlton Hinman. The First Folio was set in 1622 and 1623, after Shakespeare's time. For Shakespeare's lifetime, R.B. McKerrow's little piece on "Booksellers, Printers, and The Stationers' Trade" (1916) is a good introduction. We must temper all judgment in light of the fact that though some texts are "good" and some "bad," in no case do we have a play by Shakespeare exactly as he wrote it in his own fair copy. We cannot treat the best texts of Shakespeare as if they were the dramatist's unaltered work. All sorts of factors, from the legibility to printers of Shakespeare's handwriting and scribbling by book-holders to the vicissitudes of the playhouse and the printing shop, have to be considered. "Proofs" of critical positions derived from texts that were never carefully proofread must always be suspect.

John Dover Wilson on his "new way with Shakespeare's text:"

> Try to read Shakespeare in the ... facsimile of the First Folio and you will be held up in almost every line by misprints, or unintelligible punctuation, or mislining of the verse, or missing stage directions, to say nothing of the old spelling and a dozen other puzzling features.

The orthography of the earliest texts in those days of unsettled spelling, etc., may contain the fewest errors of the text, except for punctuation. A.C. Partridge in *Orthography in Shakespeare* defines his subject as "that part of writing, peculiar to author, scribe, editor or printing-house, which is concerned with accidentals such as spelling, punctuation, elision, syncope and contractions generally."

[13]If we accept the premise that Elizabethan spelling was phonetic (though subject to variations: *house* or *howse* would do, but not *hoose* because of the vowel shift of the previous century), the spelling of names in the First Folio may be said to give evidence of how Shakespeare's fellow actors pronounced proper nouns. Here are some of the First Folio spellings that indicate a different pronunciation then and now:

Achademe (Academy)	*AEgyptian* (Egyptian)
Anthonio (Antonio)	*Blumer* (Blomer)
Bullingbrooke and *Bullinbroke* (Bolinbroke)	
Bouciquall and *Bouchiquald* (Bouciqualt)	
Burbon (Bourbon)	*Capuchius* (Capucius)
Cathness (Caithness)	*Centerie* (Sentry)
Clotten (Cloten)	*Cordelion* (Coeur-de-Lion)
Curtizan (Courtesan)	*Edmond* (Edmund)

Proper Names

And so on. Folio spellings such as *Bardolfe, Auffidious, Caska,* etc., make no difference to us, any more than does Shakespeare slipping and calling Sir Thomas Erpingham by the name *John* once in *Henry V.* Presumably mere scribal errors are *Bassiano* (Bassanio), *Calchas* and *Chalcas* and *Calcas* (Calchas), *Dollabello* (Colabella), *Le Beu* or *le Beau* (Lebeau), *Mountioy* (Montjoy), or *Shylok* (Shylock), etc.

The best brief comment on the complex matter of the relationship of English spelling to pronunciation is probably found on pages 144-48 of Robert Burchfield's "brilliant ... both scholarly and human" (Anthony Burgess) *The English Language* (1985). Please read it; only space considerations keep it from being quoted here.

The printing practices and standards of Elizabethan England and the faulty texts of the quartos and folios prevent us from being able to discourse on Shakespeare's ear, though not having Shakespeare's plays in guaranteed chronological order does not seem to have deterred critics from discoursing at great length on the development of Shakespeare's mind and art.

[14]In the absence of phonograph recordings - though there are more actual Audio Rarities and other records of older Shakespearian actors than most moderns realize - her book is also a guide to the practice of stars of old. She based her work on these (among others):

Viola Allen (1867-1948). She played in the United States with John McCullough (who arrived in New York at fifteen in 1847). Late in her career she played Viola in *Twelfth Night,* etc., and in her last season or so appeared with James K. Hackett (born in Canada in 1869 but to an American acting father) as Lady Macbeth. She was last seen as Mistress Ford (1916).

Sir Frank (Robert) Benson (1858-1939). This famous touring actor-manager began while still at Oxford playing Clytemnestra (in Greek), and made his debut in Shakespeare as the County Paris in Sir Henry Irving's 1882 production of *Romeo and Juliet.* His "Old Bensonians" somewhat imitated his artificial if noble ("antique Roman") style of acting at Stratford and elsewhere.

Edwin (Thomas) Booth (1833-1893). Of a famous acting family, Edwin Booth made his debut at sixteen as Richard III, and was best in melodramatic roles such as Shylock and Lord Lytton's Richelieu. His Hamlet (1864) may have been hammy but it ran 100 consecutive performances in New York, a record not broken until John Barrymore chalked up 101 (1922) with Blanche Yurka as Gertrude.

Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson (1853-1937). Learning his careful elocution from the famous Samuel Phelps (1804-1878) at the end of that tragedian's career, Forbes-Robinson had a less harsh voice and more dignity, and excelled in *Hamlet* (first attempted 1897 after about twenty years on the stage). He left the stage in the same role (Drury Lane, 1913). He had such grandeur that better than his portrayal of Hamlet was that of Jesus Christ (the Stranger, in the cast line) in Jerome K. Jerome's hit *The Passing of the Third-Floor Back* (1908).

Ashley

Sir Ben Greet (Philip Barling, 1857-1936). Starting on the provincial stage in 1879, he soon went to London and there succeeded with another non-Londoner, the American star Lawrence Barrett, who had taken over the Lyceum while Irving visited America (1884). Two years later he gave the first of many open-air Shakespeare productions. He was one of the Old Vic's founders, but was known chiefly for open-air and children's performances, and the many actors he trained worked in the broader style that such productions tend to encourage.

Sir Henry Irving (John Henry Brodribb, 1838-1905). Of Cornish family but born in Somerset, this actor adopted a (generally consistent) grand elocutionary style. He pronounced "each vowel as if he had just invented it." Wilde called his famous *Hamlet* "funny without being vulgar." But he was a stunning melodramatic actor - his greatest triumph was probably Leopold Lewis' *The Bells* - and a wonderfully successful manager. His pronunciation and walk can only be described as peculiar, and he overcame an uneasy accent and voice by what the *Oxford Companion to the Theatre* calls "queer intonations." Critics and audiences attested that his performances were riveting, even if only "Henry Irving as Henry Irving in *Hamlet*." Irving's pronunciation of names was unpredictable.

Richard Mansfield (1854-1907). The son of a London wine merchant, Richard Mansfield (though born in Berlin to an opera singer mother and educated on the Continent and in England) counts as an American star. He spent the years 1882-1889 becoming a New York matinee idol before first playing Richard III in London. He played Shylock, Henry V, and other Shakespearian roles in a dashing style more suited to the parts he created in American in Shaw's *Arms and the Man* and *The Devil's Disciple*.

Robert Bruce Mantell (1854-1928). Born in Scotland and active on the Belfast and London stages (as Robert Hudson), Mantell, like Mansfield, was counted as an American actor, having first come here with Modjeska (1878) and in the 1880s settling here for good. His style as a young man gave conviction to Dion Boucicault's romping *Corsican Brothers*, and his later road-company efforts in Shakespeare were more sincere than sensational. Like Barrett, he was unusually scholarly for an actor and would study to get details (such as names) right.

Julia Marlowe (Sarah Frances Frost, 1866-1950). Also born in Britain like Mansfield and Mantell, Julia Marlowe even more deserves to be called American. She was brought to the United States at age four, went on the stage at twelve, married (as her second husband) E.H. Sothern, and played Juliet to his Romeo (1904) in the time-honored tradition of being far too old for the part. She first played Lady Macbeth less than a decade later. She made her last farewell appearance in 1924.

Ada Rehan (Ada Crehan, 1860-1916). Irish-born, she reached American by age five, went on the New Jersey stage at fourteen, was working for Mrs. John Drew at Philadelphia's Arch Street Theater at fifteen. Her forte was comedy; her greatest part was Katherine in *The Taming of the Shrew*. The *Oxford Companion* says that "unfortunately the turn of the century demanded a new style of acting, and after Daly's death in 1899 she found herself,

while still young, somewhat outmoded." She retired in 1905. Her stage name, incidentally, had the same origin as George Russell's pen name *AE*: a typographical error.

Otis Skinner (1858-1942). After an 1877 debut in Philadelphia, this American actor played with Edwin Booth and Barrett, starred in companies of Daly and Modjeska, and was famous in Edward Knoblock (Knoblauch)'s *Kismet* (1911). In the Twenties he played Falstaff in *1 Henry IV* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in the Thirties Shylock and Thersites.

E(dward) H(ugh) Sothern (1859-1933). American actor but son of the English eccentric comedian Edward Askew Sothern (Lord Dundreary in *Our American Cousin*), and educated in England. This affected his accent and his comic style in such roles as that of Malvolio. He and his wife Julia Marlowe played Shakespeare together 1911-1924.

Dame Ellen (Alice) Terry (1847-1929). Made her debut at age nine as Mamillius in Charles Kean's production of *The Winter's Tale*. Years later, after being Irving's leading lady, she celebrated her theatrical jubilee with twenty-two members of the Terry clan assisting. Her Lady Macbeth was her best tragic role; she excelled in light comedy. She was the mother of the illegitimate Edward Gordon Craig; Sir John Gielgud is her grand-nephew.

Sir Herbert (Draper) Beerbohm Tree (1853-1917). Amateur dramatics while he was working in his father's London grain trading office moved him to go on the stage in 1878. Less than a decade later he was a star of the first magnitude, and began a series of lavish productions of Shakespeare (eighteen up to the outbreak of World War I). *Richard II* was his best; perhaps it was for the same reason that Richard II was the finest role of Maurice Evans, who, much later, was called by acting teacher Stella Adler "the world's best cantor of Shakespeare." Tree founded The Royal Academy of Dramatic Art (though his own version of "Stage English" was highly individual). That institution did much to establish a kind of received standard pronunciation for the English stage in the era in which Lord Reith (who never spoke it himself) was demanding "BBC English" for radio broadcasting. The BBC established the pronunciation of toponyms in 1983 in the *BBC Pronouncing Dictionary of British Names*, second edition, edited by G.E. Pointon. The standard of British pronunciation is *The English Pronouncing Dictionary*, fourteenth edition, Daniel Jones, revised by A.C. Gimson in 1977. J.C. Wells' *Accents of English* (3 vol., 1982) covers overseas as well as British English.

[15]Frances Anne (Fanny) Kemble (1809-1893), of the famous acting family, visited America first in 1833, and lived here 1849-1868 and 1873-1888. Her readings of Shakespeare had considerable effect on American acting and pronunciation, as did recitations by Tavernier (1859) and others up to Gielgud and others in recent times. From such sources as well as from staged, recorded, filmed and televised plays we have received our ideas of how Shakespeare should be spoken. The non-theatrical sources of information, such as readings, recitations, and (to some extent) recordings have been too little studied in this connection.

Ashley

[16]G.C.D. Odell's *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving* (1920) has less on pronunciation than one would expect, but he gives details of some actors attacked for their speech. Charles Calvert put on a series of Shakespeare revivals in Manchester (from 1864). One of them (*Henry V* of 1875) was copied in New York by George Rignold and was a great hit (100 performances at Booth's Theatre in 1875, an annual event until 1878); however, the *New York Herald* "commented," say the editors of the play in The New Cambridge Shakespeare (1947, p. lxi), "on his faulty accent, his sing-song effects, and his unintelligibility. Yet his fame in the part surpassed all others, and from New York he carried his production triumphantly to London in 1879 [Drury Lane, 1 November] ... and afterwards to Australia."

[17]Fussell, 166.

Peter Trudgill in *Sociolinguistics* (1974, revised 1983) discusses the high prestige of Standard English and the RP (Received Pronunciation), noting that "speakers who are paying considerable attention to their speech" (as actors do) "will move linguistically in the direction of these statusful varieties." William Labov found clever ways to circumvent the tendency of interviewees to adopt more formal "phonological styles" when asked questions or given matter to read aloud. Researchers were able to distinguish between casual speech, formal speech, and the way interviewees read word lists and set passages. One movement in modern acting has been in the direction of being more "natural," and this has to some extent affected Shakespearian as well as less formal acting, though regional and social dialect tend to be chosen to suit the part rather than being those of the actor. Acting is a special case of situational switching between dialects. There is from period to period and from country to country some diglossia between the actor's "natural" pronunciation and the way of speaking he or she adopts to play Shakespeare. It is wrong to imagine that whatever is considered right for the Shakespearian hero is right for the upperclass person. No upperclass person would want to sound like a self-conscious tragedian. The acting and the pronouncing of Shakespeare, though the "bardolatry" delivery has been largely replaced by The Method and such schools of performance, must always be quite different from normal, formal speech offstage.

[18]We do not have space here to collect the details on pronunciation in such works as Bertrand L. Joseph's *Elizabethan Acting* (1951) and those devoted to Shakespeare's theatre, company of players, and audience. Now it is time for Alfred Harbage's early article ("Elizabethan Acting," *PMLA* LIV [1939], 685-708) to be replaced by one that incorporates the scholarship of G.B. Harrison, Gerald Eades Bentley, Bernard Beckerman, and Muriel C. Bradbrook, among others. The way in which "masterless men" of the common theatre "without a craft" were gradually recognized as having an "arte and facultye" (1574), a "trade" (1581), a "profession" (1582), and a "qualitie" (1593), is a fascinating subject.

Actors' pronunciation is a small part of it.

Rather tangential, but not wholly unrelated to the question of how actors speak, is the

equating of a British accent with not only the wealthy (listen to the tones in which expensive items are touted on television, the accents of "executive assistants" to upper-eschelon executives in some businesses, portrayals of the rich in films and soap opera, etc.) but also with the affected and effeminate male. Such a "cultivated" accent would by no means serve for (say) a sportscaster. When Joe Garagiola took to sports announcing (1955), he was criticized for dropping his *g's*. He reported in a television interview (*Hour Magazine*, 9 January 1987) that he told those who carped that "if I don't say *passin'* and *runnin'* and *kissin'* - I won't be *workin'*." As actors became more "natural" and *macho*, their speech, even in Shakespeare, became less "cultivated." But this had less effect on proper nouns than on most words, a precision with which is never equated with such unmanly traits as pronouncing the "h" in *when* and *where*. Today the Mayfair accent of the Twenties and Thirties even among actors has largely been replaced by the manly Cockney of actor Michael Caine or even the desperately low-class speech of television commentator Robin Leach. In such accents as those, correctly pronounced proper nouns would sound extraordinary, stranger than Mickey Rooney as Puck in the movies or Richard Dreyfuss as Brutus on stage.

[19]*Mummersetshire* is one of those terms in The Profession (as actors call it) that might well have usefully been included in *The Oxford Companion to the Theatre*. It is actor's slang, clearly based on *mummers* and *Somerset*, for a general rustic dialect useful for clowns and hicks. Whether Shakespeare's clowns played in their personal low-class accents or contrived a special comic accent (usually and somewhat inaccurately called "Cockney") is unknown. Shakespeare's Will Kempe was a famous actor in London and on the Continent. Whether he was a "dialect comedian," copying or creating a "funny accent" as did the "dialect comedians" of British Music Hall and American vaudeville, it is impossible to say. How to play the "Cockney" gravediggers of *Hamlet* in a performance done in modern American accents, even modern American dress, is difficult to determine. Where comic points require an actor to get names or other words wrong, the test must be (I guess): does it get a laugh?

[20]Pp. 9-10.

Not wholly unrelated to our topic is the excellent section on "Shakespeare's Aural Craft" in Styan's *Shakespeare's Stagecraft* (1967), 141-92, q.v.

John Russell Brown on "Shakespeare and the Actors" (1964) is a brief introduction to acting styles in Shakespeare through the centuries. For our century, listen to phonograph records: John Barrymore (Audio Rarities LPA 2281), Sir John Gielgud (RCA Victor LM 6007), Paul Scofield (Shakespeare Recording Society M232), and other leading actors as Hamlet; and compare the readings with such films as those of Olivier (J. Arthur Rank, Two Cities Film, 1947), Richard Burton (Electronovision version of the Broadway play, 1964), Derek Jacoby (the BBC/PBS television Shakespeare's Plays series), etc.

Ashley

Note that if acting styles must be varied to suit the media, to some appreciable extent so must pronunciation. (With the microphones and cameras so close, the elocutionary style of the Victorian stages is neither necessary nor pleasant.) When Olivier played for the cameras, filming his *Othello* as if he were performing in a theatre, the result was odd. That his Othello sounded more "black" than Paul Robeson's was also striking, also explicable. There has been much written on the need for actors to "project" from the stage, but nothing useful, so far as I know, on the ways in which the presence or absence of a microphone can or should affect an actor's pronunciation.

That is still another of many investigations into the interrelation of acting and pronouncing, a large matter of which this paper on the small detail of pronouncing the names in Shakespeare is a part.

Bibliography

Abbott, E.A. 1894. *A Shakesperian grammar.* 3d ed. London, etc.: Macmillan.

Ayres, Harry Morgan. 1916. The question of Shakspere's pronunciation. In Brander Matthews and A.H. Thorndike, *Shakesperian studies.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown. John Russell. 1964. Shakespeare and the actors, In *Shakespeare: A celebration, 1564-1964*, edited by T.J.B. Spencer. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Burchfield, Robert. 1985. *The English language.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Cercignani, Fausto. 1981. *Shakespeare's works and Elizabethan pronunciation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Danielsson, Bror, ed. 1955-1963. *John Hart's works on English orthography and pronunciation* (1551, 1569, 1570). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells.

Dibelius, Wilhelm, et al., eds. 1925. *Anglia: Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie: Alois Brandl zum siebzigsten Geburtstage überreicht.* Leipzig: Mayer & Müller.

Dobson, E.J. 1957. *English pronunciation 1500-1700.* 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press.

ellis, Alexander J. 1869-1889. *On Early English pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakespeare and Chaucer.* 3 parts. London: pub. for the Philological Society by Asher & Co., and for the Early English Text Society and the Chaucer Society by Trübner & Co.

Fiedler, H.G. 1936. *A Contemporary of Shakespeare on phonetics and on the pronunciation of English and Latin.* London: Oxford University Press.

Fussell, Paul. 1983. *Class: A guide through the American status system.* New York: Summit Books.

Granville-Barker, Harley. 1958. *Prefaces to Shakespeare.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Greg, Sir Walter Wilson. 1955. *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its bibliography and textual history.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harbage, Alfred. 1939. Elizabethan Acting. *PMLA* LIV, 685-708.

_____. 1941. *Shakesperae's audience.* New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1963. *William Shakespeare - a reader's guide.* New York: Octagon.

Hart, John. 1850 repr. *An orthographie*

Hartnoll, Phyllis, ed. 1983. *the Oxford companion to the Theatre.* 4th ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hinman, Charlton. 1963. *The printing and proof-reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Irvine, Theodora U. 1919. *How to pronounce the names in Shakespeare.* Reprinted 1944 as *A pronouncing dictionary of Shakespearean proper names.* New York: Barnes & Noble.

Jespersen, Otto. 1907. *John Hart's pronunciation of English* (1569 and 1570). Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Jones, daniel. 1919. *An English pronouncing Dictionary, using the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association* .... London: Dent.

Joseph, Bertram L. 1951. *Elizabethan acting.* London: Oxford University Press.

Kenyon, John S., and Thomas A. Knott. 1944. *A pronouncing dictionary of American English.* Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Co.

Kökeritz, Helge. 1953. *Shakespeare's pronunciation.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

_____. 1959. *Shakespeare's names: A pronouncing dictionary.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Levith, Murray J. 1978. *What's in Shakespeare's names.* Hamden, CT: Archon Books.

Lounsbury, Thomas R. [1909] 1970. *English spelling and spelling reform.* Reprint. New York & London: Harper.

Marschall, Wilhelm. 1927. Shakespeares orthographie. *Anglia* LI, 307-22.

Matthews, William. 1943. English pronunciation and shorthand in the early modern period. In *University of California publications in English* IX, 135-214.

McKerrow, R.B. 1917. Booksellers, printers, and the stationers' trade. In *Shakespeare's England.* 2 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McManaway, James G., and Jeanne Addison Roberts. 1975. *A selective bibliography of Shakespeare* .... Charlottesville, VA: pub. for The Folger Shakespeare Library by University Press of Virginia.

Mitchell, R.J., and M.D.R. Leys. 1958. *A history of London life.*

Odell, G.C.D. 1920. *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving.* 2 vol. New York: Scribner.

Partridge, A.S. 1964. *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan drama.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Pollard. Alfred W. 1923. English spelling as a literary and bibliographical clue. *The Library*, Fourth Series, IV.

Richmond, Henry J. 1905. *The pronunciation of Greek and Latin proper names in English.* Ann Arbor, MI: G. Wahr.

Sansone, Clive. 1949. *On the speaking of Shakespeare.* London: London Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts.

Sievers, Eduard. 1925. (on King Lear) in Debelius, ed., *Festschrift for Alois Brandl*

Spevack, Marvin. 1968. *A complete and systematic concordance to the works of Shakespeare.* Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms.

Styan, J.L. 1967. *Shakespeare's stagecraft.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sugden, Edward H. [1925] 1969. *A topographical dictionary to the works of Shakespeare and his fellow-dramatists.* Reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Sweet, Henry. 1888. *A History of English sounds from the earliest period.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1891-1898. *A New English grammar.*

Trudgill, Peter. [1974] 1983. *Sociolinguistics.* Rev. ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

van der Graf, W. 1936. Review of Zachrisson, *The English pronunciation at Shakespeare's time as taught by William Bullokar*, in *English Studies* XVIII.

Viëtor, William. 1906. *Shakespeare's pronunciation: A Shakespeare phonology in the old spelling.* Marbury: H.N.G. Elwert.

Viëtor, William. 1906. *Shakespeare's pronunciation: A Shakespeare reader in the old spelling.* Marbury: H.N.G. Elwert.

White, Richard Grant. 1861. Memorandums of English pronunciation in the Elizabethan era. In *The works of William Shakespeare,* R.G. White, ed. 12 vol. Boston: Little.

Wilson, John Dover, ed. 1947. *The new Cambridge Shakespeare.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, Louis B., and Virginia LaMar, eds. 1969. *The Folger guide to Shakespeare.* New York: Washington Square Press.

Zachrisson, R.E. 1927. *The English pronunciation at Shaekspeare's time as taught by William Bullokar.* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.