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Rules adopted in Spelling of this Work:

1. Use e for ea when equivalent to short e. Ex: hitth, mitth, etc.
2. Omit silent e after a short vowel. Ex: hav, giv, liv, etc.
3. Use f for ph. Ex: jiffer, juntron, etc.
4. Omit one letter of a final double. Ex: owel, shal, etc.
5. Use t instead of ed, when it represents the sound. Ex: might, slakt.
6. In the first pages the z sound [z] is represented by j or s.

Some exceptions to these rules have been found necessary where their rigid application would lead to difficulty or misunderstanding.

L. Taft.

- J. D. H., Champaign, Ill. June, 1879.
The English Language of the 20th Century.

Eternal, unceasing change is the law of material nature. Ceaseless growth, continual improvement—men's highest privilege and possibility. If he refuse this privilege he sink, for, as in the moral world, but these two paths are open before him.

It is not strange then, but it is indeed a pre-requisite of this development or rebirth, that the world of ideas in which man long should also vary, keeping pace with the march of man's own altered character. The situation of man, nature, climate, the physical conformity of the country, etc., give us, but slight indication of their influences. But the shadow of a superstition, the dim-glimpse of a reformation, or in a less degree any of the spiritual influence that away men's passions or touch the intellect, an age sharply stamped upon the character of the age as the each individual had been originally endowed with this final, resultant disposition and mode of thought.

Language is the instrument of expression — the mean by which these many of imparts and belief are wrestled forward from the originating to the recipient mind, and evidently must likewise away with the title of human activity. Nor could we wish it otherwise, even if permanency were possible. Our ever widening apprehension of nature, whether physical, mental or moral, demands ever more by which to cherish the fruits of its conquests, requiring finite, more accurate symbols to express the newly discovered qualities of objects and ideas, already partially familiar. Impeach with this zeal, Science may claim them as her proper progression and summon them as occasion requires; without this mark
of ownership they soon go astray and are lost to all purposes of usefulness, while progress must cease in the confinement of an eternal restraint.

The changes in any language, exclusive of additions, losses, and structural growth or of two classes, corresponding to the two modes of expression, — that of 1. Pronunciation, and 2d. Orthography.

The first is a living, transient form, and not being preserved in its utterance can hardly be verified in the languages of the past, especially in our own where the written word bears so little resemblance to the articulated sound. One extended remarks will not venture beyond the field of Orthography, this being — at least — to me — the limit of plausible or profitable prediction.

Pronunciation will vary slightly, but probably not to any great extent except under the influence of some foreign force as yet unforeseen.

No indication of any radical or near change in the structure of the language as now apparent. Indeed the remarkable preservation of the early forms until the present time, seem to promise an unshaken continuance of these far ages yet to come. The difficulty in reading Shakespeare, Spenser, or even the older writers as far back as Chaucer, is principally caused by orthographical differences. The constructions of that-time, the frequently quaint and cumbersome would offer but few exceptions to our present principles of composition. The other minor point which characterizes the literature of that-time is the large number of words now obsolete or but little used. This must evidently be a distinguishing feature between the literature of considerably separated periods of any
progressive nation, not nearly so marked
however is this extension of effort symbol-
words and idioms, as if the grasping assim-
blating power of our language. The off-shoots
of parents so dissimilar, it seems too unpre-
not-unmixed with fruits—the good qualities
of both, and has grown with an ever in-
creasing vigor; omnivorous, receiving and
adapting with ease the treasures of every tongue.
This as we may the few pretty expressions of
Chaucer now impossible to us, we have
in their stead, a world of symbols by which
many every thought, fancy, as well as the
regrets of his pasting beneath the dark veil
of nature, may be summoned at-will
before the mind. As science in time becoming
popularized, with the spread of education, these
living, once so strangely unfamiliar to our
ear, enter as a part—of the living active-
language. In this way the development
of our language, corresponding with the
grand development— and blooming of
practical knowledge of the present-century, has
been immense during that-time. The capabil-
ities of a language must ever keep pace
with its demands. With this fact before us, we
can unhesitatingly predict an even more
wonderful growth in the future. The com-
ing century will see the perfect-development
of power as yet-undreamed of, or seen
only "now a glass, darkly."

I notice these facts of the past-
history and present-condition of our lan-
guage as the basis of my predicting of its
future. They are, it is true, hardly comprehended
in the scope of the work here attempted, but
must be at-least—mentioned as forming
prominent—and essential points that should
be considered in a broader view of the Eng-
lish language of the future.

How can the imagination scarce restrain
itself from entering a still more enchanting
for discussion, i.e. Orthography, the written English of the coming century.

"Spelling Reform."

I do not purpose occupying this space with arguments for Spelling Reform. They are already sufficiently familiar. Indeed in the face of the present interest and conviction, widespread through the land it would be unnecessary if not foolish. The final success of the change is already assured. At noon becomes only a question of time. We grant twenty years. Who can doubt that many of the present generation of students will see the happy day when the written English language shall be made worthy of the prominence which it has gained in its spoken form because of its might, its wisdom, its energy and utility?

The three years that have elapsed since the organization of the American Spelling Reform Association, saw witnessed such a growth of interest and enthusiasm, such
an uprising of public and intelligent forces

in Vermont. The whole land is now more than ever

in the name, in every department of the

professions, for we universally their

encouragement and freely of their aid; when

when colleges, presidents, professors and stu-

dents, pledge allegiance to the new and

better method; when our school-teaching and

educating Vermont the United States await; and

pray anxiously for the day that shall

see their labor so lessened and their

efficiency and visible reward so greatly in-

crease; when we find petitioning in the

legislature of our most advanced and

intelligent states praying for redress by

legislative means of this the greatest of

our grievances; and finally and most-

potent of all, now that the common

people of every profession and every

situation are beginning to awaken to their

own responsibility and feel that this is

a good that can only be accomplished by

their hearty cooperation, then — and that
time is the present — we can not but feel

that yet another great revolution is soon
to show its power over our old, time-
dounded, but even varying mother tongue.

That the impulse of honest, the field

of possible one and the object well con-

sidered, we can not doubt. Great men

do indeed frequently have their hobbies,

which they ride rough-shod and blind-
folded over hedges and swamps and precipi-
tices. Dubbels, the accurate student-and
specialist is more prone to this indiscretion than generally harmless eccentricity than his less proficient but more evenly balanced brother of the plow or anvil. But the singular anomaly of scores of such acute scholars and devoted specialists as Prof. Meek of La Vergne; Whitney, of Yale; Haldeman, of University of Pennsylvania; Drummond of Hartford, and Goodman of Harvard; and from a yet wider range, Max Milder, Alexander Bain, Wm. E. Gladstone, and, now deceased, Dr. Thewall and Lord Lyttelton, with many another distinguished English name, write and actually evincing with a single aim, not only Hutching a great-power, but a most-worthy object. If important criticism or intelligent opposition were possible, it surely would have been made by those most interested, most capable, and most keenly alive and jealous on the point, it being their own proper territory. The unlawful or improper invasion of which it behooved them to resist.

The following paragraph clipped from the report of the Wisconsin Legislative Commission on school text-books, besides its valuable statement of the present condition of the crusade, will well illustrate the sentiment of the more intelligent class of American critics. The ever swelling flood of literature on this subject could furnish us with thousands of similar testimonials and candid expression of belief on the subject:

"The agitation of this question is not promoted at the present time under such auspices as to begat any timidity on the part of those who favor legitimate means of improving public and to the proposed reform. The weight of scholastic opinion is positively on the side of every wholesome effort in this direction; and
organizing in this behalf in this country and in England at this time, embrace scholars and statesmen of the highest personal attainments and public repute. In England more than one hundred school-boards of the kingdom, including that of the city of London, petitioned the Crown for the appointment of a commission to institute measures of reform in this department. Similar commissions have been appointed by one or more legislatures of the United States, and the movement is being actively supported by philologists of distinguished character in American and foreign universities and colleges; also by organized bodies of citizens and by widely conducted publications. During the past season, nearly four hundred residents of Wisconsin, officers and professors in our colleges and teachers in our public schools, have united with Prof. Marsh, Goodwin, Drumheller, Whitney, and Haldeman, in a memorial to Congress asking the appointment of a national commission, and representing that the irregular spelling of the English language causes a loss of two years of school time to each child, and is a main cause of the alarming illiteracy of our people.

Such then is the present condition and strength of this movement, with its now rapidly multiplying momentum. Who can doubt that the early decades of the next century, during the lifetime of many of us young apprentices in the modern world, will find our present barbarous antiquated system of spelling replaced by an approximate of not perfectly phonetic system of written language in which "every sound shall have its own un-varying sign, and every sign its own un-varying sound"?

- Proposed Scheme.

Like the Wisconsin commission, "It is not our duty to devise a new alphabet," but I shall
claim the privilege of considering, and from my point of view, attempting "to pass judgement, upon the composite merits of alphabets devised by others." I shall not assume here the unlimited role of a prophet, but will cautiously review a number of the leading schemes suggested, which promise to be most valuable, and discuss the recommendations which each letter may present for admission to the alphabet of the English language of the 20th century.

There are some cases, as in the choice of most of the consonants and some of the di-graphs that can probably be quite certain by decided precedent, while others, the representing of the different sounds of the vowels with a number of consonantal sounds, will doubtless occasion considerable discussion and the final result is hard to predict.

Still altho' for the time a little confusing, this multiplicity of proposed ploys and "carefully arranged schemes" should be hailed with all possible welcome, as not only indicating awakening, and earnest thought, on the great subject, but as being the only means by which final satisfaction and the most valuable and practical results may be reached. Each may, in the choice of "necessary letters" and "completely functional alphabet," the product of an inexactianist enthusiast, may contain some little suggestions entirely overlooked by the wise architect of our language. Thought will be awakened, study and research brought to bear, argument and rebuttal presented and exchanged until finally the perfect work, the product of the united intellects of all English-speaking scholars, will rear itself for the admiration, and, in time, the common use, of all nations. Time indeed the leader of all things will decide this for us, or better still, and more in keeping
with our national spirit, when interest has sufficiently culminated an international committee of this country and other English-speaking nations will probably be chosen, by which the comparative claims of the different proposed systems may be considered, and a final wise decision reached, which will be accepted as conclusive by the nations represented.

This we believe will be the final mode of adjustment, and national arbitration will again have won a bright phial in the arena of peace. Modern strength, development, brains, require no long years for action. The continuous, matured plan, the feasible, irresistible plan - these are the characteristics of the progressive age in which we live.

To quote America's greatest enthusiast on spelling reform, him who has more right to be enthusiastic,

"Year by year the power of reason increases in every form of activity, as year by year the mass increases of collecting and concentrating the amount of thinking power. What with our railroads and telegraphs, and newspapers, and our societies and associations with their meetings and conventions, it is not extravagant to say that a wider and more powerful concentration of opinion can now be effected in a single summer than would have been possible in a hundred years three centuries ago. Changes of pronunciation, general changes of spoken language depend in great part on little known causes which work upon whole nations than their physical organization, and which we may well despair of controlling; but etymology is independent machinery over which the consent of reason has full control. Several modern nations have had their spelling reformed by the influence of learned academies, or by gov-
The English Language needed reform more than ours, and no race or race more redy reformer than the English Language. The Requizits.

Prof. Latham in his profound and comprehensive work on the English Language (1852) assumed the following six points as the chief conditions of a full and perfect alphabet. Altho' the good work for which he strove was not destined to succeed in his day, the principles which he adopted are as valuable now as they were 75 years ago.

1. For every simple, single sound incapable of being represented by a combination of letters, let there be a single, single sign.

2. Sounds within a determined degree of likeness may be represented by signs within a determined degree of likeness; whilst sounds beyond a certain degree of likeness should be represented by distinct and different signs, and that uniformly.

3. No sound should have more than one sign to express it.

4. No sign should express more than one sound.

5. The primary aim of orthography is to express the sounds of words, and not their histories.

6. Changes of speech should be followed by corresponding changes of spelling.

Our Coming Alphabet.

(Vowels.)

Ä å, — — az in Fate.
A a, — — Fat.
Ä ä, — — Father.
À à, — — Chance.
É e, — — Nate.
E e, — — Met.
È e, — — Ermine.
I i, — — a in Pin.
I i, — — " Pin.
Ö ö, — — " Old.
O o, — — " Not.
Ö ö, or ÖÖ öö or Ü ü, a in Moen.
Ö ö, " ÖÖ öö " Ü ü, " " Foot.
Ü ü, — — a in June.
U u, — — " Ind.

(Diphthongs)
Au au, (or Ys, or au) *
0l oi, (or oì, or Os or oì) *

(Consonants)
P p,
T t,
CH ch, *
C c (=k),
Ff,

Th, (in thin), *
S s,
SH sh, *
HW, (in which), *
Ll, M m, N n, NG (=Ng)

Yy, Rr.  *(Require new characters.)

We will now consider these letters, with their appropriate symbols, in the above order, taking first the vowels as a group.

Aa.
The letter A, the first of our alphabet, as indeed in nearly all - is with us used to represent 7 distinct sounds. These are denoted by Webster by the following signs:
1. Ä, ä — long — — a in Pete.
2. Ä, ä — short — — a in Pete.
3. Â, a — short — — a in Shope.
4. Ä, ä — Italian — — a in Father.
5. Â, a — short — — a in Ask.
6. A, a – broad – as in All.

Of these the last two can evidently be dropped entirely from the list, as being already represented by proper sounds of O, giving us: What, wonder, wobble, etc. It may be objected that the short sound of O does not stand for two distinct quantities, (6) being simply a prolongation of (7). This gives us occasion to state one more well-acknowledged principle of orthography, which might well have been incorporated in the above six rules. This is, "Quantity of sound is not a matter for alphabetical representation." We find this true in all tongues. Even the most perfectlyintoned have their customary gradations and degrees of pronunciation which can only be learned by practice. A few schemes have professed not only the representation of each sound, but the second division of nearly all of those into the long and short, as met with in actual spoken language, each with its proper character. But such a plan is perfect would give us an immense number of characters, confusing and perplexing to the extreme, and expressing but the slightest variation. Nor is this perfection of accuracy at all necessary. A little study reveals to us the fact that the quantity of the vowel sound is in most cases already determined for us by a sign far more certain and only in that off on account of its constant familiarity and servis, i.e., the consonants of the syllable. By a rule the syllable requires a larger quantity, or greater duration of the preceding vowel sound, than do the as.

By 1. In the great majority of cases, as regards these letters at least, the simple inclination to do things in the easiest manner will be a correct guide. At any rate, whatever the arguments of the more fanciful scholar, we can not believe that so slight a difference will prove of sufficient moment to induce publishing to provide
distinct type for their representation, nor that
the mass of the people will be able to distin-
guish—much less practice—this accurate dis-
rimination in writing.

It would be easier to learn the few
wordsy outright—one by one even without other
aid, as we have been obliged to in so much
larger measure elsewhere, than to involve
so great a complexity of characters as this
would require if carried out than all the
sounds of variable length.

A secondary argument applying to all
increase of the number of alphabetical char-
acters is that—there must by their multipli-
ation not only become difficult to re-
member, but—that they must at the same
time increase correspondingly in com-
plicity of form. For applying our rule
that sounds within a determined degree
disuise should be represented by char-
acters of a near resemblance, we would
be forced to make very slight—variation
of form suffice, or transgressing the rule
entirely, design original characters. The
first alternative would necessitate the great-
est care in printing and reading, to prevent
confounding the different—letters, while the
second would prevent—rapid progress in
acquiring the language, offering no asis-
tance than analogy or evident relation
of sounds to letters. — But this more, when
one turn one attention to the charactering paper,

For the reason already given (2) — Short a
and (3) — Æ will be represented by a single let-
ter, being simply different—quantity of an iden-
tical sound. Orthography relates solely to the
expression of sound by writing, and we
know no right—to trespass on other fields, es-
specially when there are variable and the sub-
jects of explicable change.

A. — (3) — the not mentioned in Latin's
summary of the sounds of our language,
key since so grown in popular use and favor,
in spite of many fellows opposing, that it must
now be acknowledged as an essential element of the spoken language.

This then leaves us the above four distinct sounds of A: - ā, ā, ā, and ā.

Another matter of interest - the most of particular importance in the substitution now frequently employed. Not only must one letter serve us at present for seven sounds, as in the case of A just reviewed, but in perfect the discards in which we have arrived that many single characters and combinations are freely interchangeable and often substituted in spelling, for the original, proper letter, in opposition to Rule 3 (above) - and all common sense. Here for instance we find in common employment - two substitutes, - ei, and ey, for ā; and it is said that we have in actual use the combinations of mine letters producing thirty-three different modes of denoting a long! ā, ā, also is represented by credential é in there, and bound ā is often replaced by 6, eg it will be entirely in time.

Of course all occasion and possibility for such devices will be done away with in the good time coming; and the infinite variation of this incomprehensible language, and the unbounded patience and ingenuity of the English speaking peoples of the 19th century will in a few years be contemplated and studied with an amazed curiosity, but a doubtful admiration.

Proposed Characters - Aside from the numerous suggestions, and schemes devised by private schools and communities, and Walpole's Semifonetic plan which was thus far more but little attention or favor in this country, there are now three leading alphabets prominent before the public, from whose number the final selection will probably be made. These are (1) the 'Shilling Reform Alphabet;' (2) the 'American Phonetic Alphabet;' and (3) the system of Webster and Worcester's dictionary already mentioned, - and indeed necessarily so, as all these alphabets as obliged to return finally in their explanations to the characters before ren.
familiar to me by use.

The Am. S. P. A'In and the Cincinnati school
has prepared alphabets most perfect—in deed
in representation of every sound or shade
of sound, and most ingenious in construct
ion and form of characters, but—neverthe-
less too complicated and unfamilar in ap
pearance, we fear, to be favorably received
by the common people of this country. This
is especially the case with the Cincinnati
alphabet, which might—however, if adopted
has the compensating benefit of fixing its
characters on the mind by virtue of this
very oddity of appearance.

Space will not permit me to discuss
the comparative merits of these alphabets
to any greater extent, but I will present
them as I proceed and leave the reader
to make his own judgement; I must con
fess personally to a “leaning” toward the
Websterian system— with a few modifi-
cation, and a number of additions, e. i.
piscially of digraphs, or better— (what must
 certainly be the result— in time) — the combi-
nation of the several elements of slighings
into single characters uniting the promi-
nant-characteristics of both. Possibly for
this reason, the use of these furnished
by the Am. S. P. A'In with a sprinkling from
Cincinnati, may be adopted thus giving us
the better elements of all three systems.

But for the simple words we believe nothing
can exceed the simplicity and distinctive
of these diacritical markings and particula
ly the ease of their formation in writing.

Webster — Ăă, Ăă (or simple Ăă) Ăă Ăă
Am. S. P. A'In — Ăă, Ăă Ăă Ăă
Cincinnati — Ăă Ăă (short) Ăă Ăă

If the final choice be, as I think it
must, — a use of diacritical marks rather
than new characters, the regular- will doubt-
less be in favor of the Ăă or Ăă above, already
familiar to us by the dictionary.
as already stated, there are some limiting factors in this adoption and a few important changes must ensue before it becomes perfectly suited to the popular demand. Of this more anon.

We find in the use of the mark-phrase that it is capable of further simplification, i.e., omitting the mark entirely from the short vowel. It has been pointed out before that the Italian language is considered the normal form and is therefore left without further indication. Eventually this mark may be spared from me, but several arguments incline us to favor the reservation of short a and the remaining short-vowels in the simpler forms.

First is the fact of its greater frequency than either of the other sounds. The short-phrase preceding this has nearly twice as many short-vowels as all other vowel sounds put together. Better then reserve the additional marking that adds so much to the labor of writing, for the same sound. In this way above the saving of time is great. Another fact most important of all, is that we as for habit led to consider a single vowel before a consonant short- unless the syllable ends in e. "Med" we are accustomed to, but considerable practice would be necessary to enable us to promptly recognize the word of medicine or mat without the diacritical marks. "Cord" we pronounce readily but we would never call it code without some indication of its new pronunciation and significances. A third argument is in the shape of the marks, the stroke adopted for the indication of the long sound is both a natural expression of length and a simple stroke that can be made very quickly, while the circumflex can not be made perfectly in hurried writing, and hence is more liable to lead to confusion than if entirely absent. Likewise in printing a slight defect would suffice to make it unrecognizable or at least indistinguishable from the dotted form...
of ë or ë.

This may seem a very small matter with which to occupy time and space, but it is only by the careful consideration of these minute points that final agreement and harmony of action may be reached, and upon this depends truly the final success of the work.

The two forms ("ë") and ("è") are in very common use for various purposes with most nations and need not recommend.

\[ Ee \]

\[ E \] has five sounds, as follows:—

1. \[ ëe \] long — — as in Meta.
2. \[ ëè \] short — — as in Mèt.
3. \[ ëæ \] the ñ — — as in When.
4. \[ ëë \] ñ — — as in Pay.
5. \[ ëæ \] — — as in Peer.

Of these ë and ë as proper sounds without equivalents and therefore to be retained.

\[ Ê ] and \[ E \] having their equivalents, the former in the long sound of ñ, and the latter in ñ, will be omitted.

\[ Ê \] will occasion some discussion. It is the sound occasionally assumed by \[ E \\]

\[ E \] and \[ Ê \] nearly by \[ ñ \], before R. The distinction between \[ ñ \] and \[ ñ \] is practically so slight that all phonetic alphabets, as far as I have seen, come in the case of a single letter there is however a far weaker sound of the same element, heard in such words as murmurs, murmurs etc., varying into the absences, for which a new character has been proposed. But as far as it has not been incorporated into any of the new alphabets, nor is it probable that their already well-entrenched ranks will offer entrance to a new figure whose sole object is the representation of the infrequent vibration in quantity of a sufficiently denoted sound. It is much more likely that the acknowledged semi-vocal nature...
of R will in time become better recognized andsex alone for the obscure sound of these three words between Y and L. And even if we such change be accomplished, practice which has rendered all things possible to us in our language would even enable us to discourse by habit the force and quantity necessary in each particular instance.

But there has been no question as to the necessity of a proper character indicating the distinct sound of these three words between Y and L. The only occasion for dispute has been as to which of the three should take the place to the exclusion of the other. The S.R. H. in says U, (Ũ) - the Cincinnati school advising E, E, a character evidently claiming a final relation to E. I must also favor the claiming of E to the place; whether in the form already familiar to us - E, E, or as a modification alike E, as making little difference.

The reasons for this choice are two-fold. (1st) of words with initial E followed by r, we find about thirty; U, r, about two; I, r, only a half dozen or so. Of common usage or only a small proportion of the words containing this combination, but as an indication of the average this would give E and U equal prominence while leaving I out of the question. (2d.) The other consideration is in making the character U its distinctive, here E, undoubtedly has the advantage over U, being made considerably quicker in writing and being much more easily recognized when miswritten.

Proposed Characters -

Webster - E, E, E, E, E
S.R. H. - E, E, E, (Ũ), (ũ)
Cincinnati - ū, ū, E, E, E, E
E may also a remarkable substitution in û and ū, my ways and ways.
I

I long, say at present - as the representation of your sound -
1. Íí, - long - as in Pine.
2. Íí, - short - " Pin.
3. Íí, - like e - " Machine.
4. Íí - " e - " Thirsty.

The first two sounds remain. Substitute e for i; and in accordance with
decision in regard to e, drop e, making e instead.

Proposed Characterz,
Websterian - Íí, - - Íí = Íí.
S.P. Atn - Íí = ai - Íí.
Cincinnati - Íí, - - Íí.

Íí long, say one substitute; Íí long in
rhyme, Íí short, say four substitutes; e,
e, u, and o, as in hymns, England, busy, women,
O o.

Single stands for six distinct sounds,
and including the double, going eight forms:

1. Õ ó, - long - as in Note.
2. Õ ó, - short - " Note.
3. Õ ó, - like Íí - " Sea.
4. Õ o, - " long óo, " Pave.
5. Õ o, - " short óo, " Wolf.
6. Õ ó, - " broad Íí " Farm.
7. Õ o oó, - - " Moon.
8. Õ o oó, - - - " Foot.

O Íí (3) will be replaced by its equivalent
Ú ó, Ó a, like broad A, is therefore simply a few-
longation of short Õ, and will be properly
expressed by the same sign, the quantity
being determined by use (as shown above
in discussion of long and short broad
A.)

And seen Ó and Õ o, and Ó and Õ ó, as ex-
act equivalents, which fact would require
the constant use of one pair and the re-
jection of the other. Some fleshed must
accurately for the preservation of the dual
forms, but their arguments seem without-
sufficient reason to compensate for its
clumsiness, the space required, awkward
appearance when newly introduced into
words, and the length of time required
in writing. Others again demand the pos-
tion for U, the longer of the sounds being
the characteristic sound of that letter in
German, Italian and Spanish. This argu-
ment has some force, as the preparation
of the analogous between the languages
would be of considerable advantage, but
we find that this long sound of u (oö)
with no is to be met with only after R,
while 0 is much more frequent than its
equivalent U. Granted that this involves
the change required for perfection, the better,
and our decision must be immediate.
Some go still further, separating the two
entirely, using O or Ö for the longer form
and U or Ü for the shorter. This does not
seem reasonable, however, especially when
tried by the test of our second rule, for
surely no two distinct sounds are more
nearly related than öö and ÿö, while such
a sharp distinction as the proposed char-
acter would seem to indicate would be
ill-advised and indeed perplexing. A
further objection to the employment of
U, even if it were made consistent with
use in both, is that it is a letter so
liable to be confounded in writing with
m, n, 1 and others, that its frequent use
often leads to difficulty, such as are
never encountered in Ö in any of its forms.
For these reasons we would favor Ö or
some derivative, therefore, preferring Ö to
öö and Ö to Öö, as above. Finally as no
accredited sound of Ö has adopted the
dotting over the letter, and as this ar-
angement presents some evident ad-
vantages of convenience in writing per-
haps the change would be advisable,
giving no ö and ö.

We have thus eliminated four of the
eight, and it remains to consider the
Proposed Characters:—

Western-- ūū, ūū, ūū = ūū, ūū = ūū, ūū = ūū.
J.R. Asin-- ūū, ūū, ūū, ūū = ūū, ūū = ūū.
Cincinnati-- ūū, ūū, ūū = ūū, ūū = ūū.

It will be seen that while all three systems have kept carefully in view the intimate relationship of the last two sounds, the Cincinnati method has as usual the great disadvantage of a meaningless, less familiar symbol, without apparent resemblance to those denoting nearly the same sound. Our objection to ū in this place can not apply to the printed character and it is quite possible that this of the J.R. Asin may in time supersede the Westernian, and if this is the result some device will be invented for simplifying the written character.

Long ū has two substitutes; ear from the French, as in beau; and ear in seen.

Short ū has as already seen, one substitute; A in what.
U long, one substitute, ɛw in new.
U short, three substitutes, ɪ, ɪ, and ɔ, ɔ, in her, stir, son.

Ou, ou; ŏu, ŏu, or Ow, ow.

This diphthongal sound, a component of ɛ and ɪ - as in Out, House, etc., is now
represented by all of the above forms.
While it will be advisable to continue
to indicate the two characters from
which it is derived, it doubtless requires
a new single character of its own.
Several have been proposed:

Webster - (As above; no simple symbol)
S.R. Ain - AU au.
Cincinnati - ɔɔ.

The au of the S.R. Ain is consistent
with the sounds already assumed by its
component letters, but has the disad-
vantage of requiring much space;
while the Cincinnati ɔ ɛncountering
the equally serious objection of newness of form and dissimilarity in

appearance to the exponents of other
nearby related sounds. We have there
fore simply indicated the sound in
our alphabet and await the ingenu-
ity that will unite them into a single
character. Perhaps AU or AU would do.

Oi, oi, or Oy, oy.

Webster - (Unmarket, as above.)
S.R. Ain - 0I oi.
Cincinnati - O o.

Some object to OI, as to AU in preced-
ing case, while the Cincinnati alphabet
sure exhibits its common obstacle to
popularity. However, even the validity of
O would soon wear away by use, and
it is quite probable that this may in
time receive the favor of the scholars.
A character like AU, or OI, might serve
the purpose, the perhaps the disadvan-
tage of its size would overbalance the
benefit arising from indication of
its origin.
B b.

No substitutes; retained.

Cc (=Kk.)

Which shall be retained? It is already evident from the writings and debates of linguistic students that in this, as in all debatable points, there will probably be lively discussion and each letter will show for a time its ardent partisans. But I am inclined to favor C, and must believe that it will doubtless gain the mastery in this conflict for the "survival of the fittest."

That one will disappear is evident; for we find C simple serving for two sounds, that of K and that of S, both being already supplied with suitable characters. This fact of the uncertain value of C, in our present system, and the determined and fixed value of K might perhaps at first sight prejudice some in favor of the latter, but, as we will show further, there are other opposing arguments which will counterbalance this in favor of C as the representative of the hard K sound of the language.

The letter K having been derived originally and almost entirely from the Greek and secondarily from the Roman plays but a comparitively small part in our language. It is not found in the Anglo-Saxon, and does not make its appearance in Early English until a considerable time after the Conquest, thus showing that up to or near this time at least it had not become adopted to any great extent by the Teutonic races of the continent. The original stock, and - until the 11th century - closely allied cousins of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors.

In modern times the sympathy and similarity of German tastes and feel-
ings to the Greeks, their love and profound study of its literature and arts, and finally the remarkable identity of many of their constructions and forms, has led them to a greater familiarity and hence a greater use of the language as regards its surface quality, as well as the deeper characteristics—its spirit. Therefore one or not surprised to find in it a great number of Greek words, deriving and their Latinized descendants. Consequently, this Greek character—our K is to be found much more frequently in their language than in ours.

On the other hand, as true linear descendants of the Latin, instead of hybrids like our own, the Italian and Spanish alphabets are without K, C simple or in combination serving as purposed for the English, for all sounds of K, and S holding constant-

ly and alone its proper sound. In the French Likewise we find only a scarce or so of words with initial K, all these being of foreign origin, mostly Greek.

But the really great argument for the abolition of the letter K from our alphabet is its very apparent naiveties as compared with its competitor.

Words beginning with:

C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound of K</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>8133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - 661

K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound of K</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sh (from French)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Silent - (C3, from Russian) - 5

Total - 10,328.

These figures give the result of a car...
ful count of the words beginning with C and K respectively and furnish probably a fair estimate of the proportionate use of the two lettres.

As is well understood, the preservation of the old forms and familiarity of appearance of words and characters almost a secondary object in the forming of our alphabet, must still be kept constantly in view and preferred whenever consistent with our aims. In a case like this then, where there really is so little to change as far as the personal forming of the letter is concerned, is it not more than likely that the initial letter of 10,000 words would and should supplant that of G or D? In the case of the K the change would be so small comparatively, that the old appearance of a word altered in this manner would be scarcely noticeable, or at least very infrequent, while the complete transformation of 10,000 words (plus a much larger number embracing the prescribed letter in some part of their bodies) would be sufficient in itself to give to all our writings an unfamiliar and unnecessary strangeness of appearance that would certainly be at first sight repulsive.

Still another proof of the uselessness of C is that even in its proper stronghold, it is so often silent. We find that C as an initial was silent in only 5 words, and there all of Russian origin (Czar, czaromity etc.) but in the list of K's we find that 160 or over one-fourth actually serve no purpose, coming as they do before consonants. This is also shown in the many words where K is used simply as a double after C (Ex. Hack, smack, etc.)
I have said that there was scarcely any choice as regards the appearance, even here; however, I must acknowledge a personal prejudice in favor of C. While the C bears clearly upon its face the stamp of its late origin, there is almost a feeling of non-acquaintance after years of intercourse with the naturalized K. The sharp angularity of its limbs, the outline, like all descendants of the Jewish race, it can not lose the family feature of its early ancestry in the Hebrew and Phoenician alphabet.

Further than this, the letter C being made in writing with only one stroke, requires far less formation space a third the time employed in shaping the K.

D d. - in did.
F f. - fed.

G g.

G will not be permitted to encroach on the territory of its cognate J but should simply serve to denote its proper hard sound.

A transitional character G has been proposed by the Amer. S. T. As in as a symbol for the sound of J in words now spelled with G - (Gen. gentlemen, genius, etc.)

But this seems uncalled for. Although the number of such words is great, we have our definite character J j and any such attempt to erase the step to it appears a confession of our impotence to make desired changes.

H h.

Simple aspirate; no change.

J j

Retaining its present form and sound, turning in place of G soft - its own sound, (See G above.)
(K k.)

Expelled, - (In c)

L l - (In Let.)

M m - (In Let.)

N n - (In Let.)

Q q.

Q = kw, or c w, and in words of French origin k, or c, and is always written with u, - qu.

If it were a letter of frequent employment it would probably be retained in spite of its theoretical unisones, on account of its convenience, but met with so seldom as it is, its retention is not admissible. It is omitted from all proposed alphabets.

R r - (In Rat.)

S s.

S has two sounds. Substitute Z for soft sounds whenever found. Z a sort of go-between has been proposed as an aid in transition, but its utility is doubtful and like Q it would ad a new and uncalled for letter to our alphabet, serving no purpose except to relieve S of one superfluous sound. But to my mind C and S were better, one letter representing two sounds as to represent one sound by two letters. I believe that the proper choice will be Z directly.

C having been relegated to its place as representative simply of its present hard sound, S will take the position whenever the s or c sound is required - i.e., before e, i, and y.

T t - (zat)

V v - (In Vat.)

W w - (In Wc)

(X x.)

Will probably disappear except in its capacity of a numeral, its two values
as represented by ks (es), and g2.

Yy - (In ye)

It is properly mentioned here among the consonants as it is only in this form that it will be retained. As a vowel it has no sound not otherwise represented.

Z z - (In 3)

Vocal or sonant form of S. (See S.)

Ch - (In Chair)

Proposed Characters:

Webster — (Unmarked) Ch
S.R.A. — CH ch.
Cincinnati — C q

The Cincinnati character as good especially the capital. The ch of the S.R.A. might do, but some compound will be required for the capital.

Th - (In their)

Proposed Characters:

Webster — Th, th. (Unmarked)
S.R.A. — TH, th.
Cincinnati — B t.

As above the small compound of the S.R.A. is well suited to its purpose; the capital wanting, and Cincinnati meaning.

Th — (In the)

Webster — Th, th.
S.R.A. — TH, th.
Cincinnati — A d.

The Websterian character certainly have nothing to be desired.

Sh — (In she)

Webster — (Unmarked as above)
S.R.A. — SH, sh.
Cincinnati — S j.

Zh — (In azure.)

Webster — (Unmarked as above)
S.R.A. — ZH, zh.
Cincinnati — 3 3.

Hw — (In umen.)

Considered by some a compound consonant, by others treated as two simple sounds. No new character has been suggested.
Ng – (in Sing)
Webster – (long, unmarked; short \( N \ u \))
S.R.A. in – NG, ng, or \( \eta \).
Cincinnati – \( \eta \).

Those of the Cincinnati school are admirable, especially \( \eta \) – adopted also by the S.R.A. in.

What the final choice of English-speaking peoples will be, time alone can determine. I have merely attempted to designate such changes and improvements as to my limited knowledge seem probable. Those more familiar with the subject would doubtless find many errors in my treatment of it, but that a great revolution in our Orthography, somewhat similar to that shown sketched, is soon to make its self-manifest no scholar of the present day can doubt.

Welcome to yet another emancipation which this century of liberty and progress shall chronicle!

— Finis. —