A TRACT

On the Present State
of

ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION

By

ROBERT BRIDGES

First published 1910 in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association collected by* A. C. BRADLEY; now reprinted by permission with Notes and Explanations

---

OXFORD
At the *Clarendon Press*
1913

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK
TORONTO MELBOURNE BOMBAY
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFATORY NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

On the Phonetics of English one could scarcely hope to write an essay which should be both interesting to the general reader and satisfactory to the expert.

The chief difficulty lies in the impossibility of representing sounds in the ordinary English spelling; because our spellings have no phonetic rule, and our alphabet is consequently ambiguous and scientifically useless. It is therefore necessary to use some symbols: but the general reader will not, and—owing to the defects of our general education—most often cannot easily master the significance of speech-symbols, nor follow any argument which employs them. And though he would admit the desirability of the letters having some fixed correspondence with sounds, yet he likes to think that ours in a manner share the pride of English liberty, and he would consider it almost an impertinence to enquire too narrowly into their behaviour. He has moreover a suspicion of all fine distinctions, and a prejudice against anything which threatens the comfort of an accustomed convention. He gets on, so he thinks, amazingly well as he is, and does not wish to be disturbed or have new paths opened to him.

I am not therefore ashamed of the friendly indulgence with which my essay was received, for it was intended above all things to be as generally readable as the subject allowed. Its attempt to persuade was, it is true, aimed equally at the experts, but they were left to supply the qualifications which my purpose did not allow me to provide.

Again, even for my limited scope, I found my editorial limits very inconvenient; and now that those are removed, I would willingly, out of respect for my readers, have recast my Essay before republishing it; but after due consideration I feared to muddle it, and have thought it best to alter only a few places that needlessly offended, and to amend only where I could do so without impeding the original current of my argument: and I have answered my critics in some notes at the end, referring to those at the foot of the page whereon the controverted matter occurs.

The following summary may be of service.

SUMMARY

The Argument of the Essay

The main argument of the Essay is as follows:

(*a*) That the present state of English pronunciation is critical: and that the conversational speech of southern England is fixing a degraded form.

(*b*) That it is probable that for educational

purposes some form of phonetic spelling will soon be introduced into our primary schools.

(*c*) That these two things taken together constitute a serious danger, because there are evident signs that the method of the new Phonetic is to stereotype the degraded conversational forms. The result of that would be a needless and complete artificial break between our modern English and all older literary forms of it: and this no reasonable person can desire.

The Object of the Essay

The object of the Essay was to urge that our phonetic spelling should be more conservative and less conversational than that which our phoneticians actually favour; and to exhibit a system which should demonstrate that it is possible to write all forms of English (from Chaucer to Kipling) phonetically without disfigurement, and in one scheme, and so that everyone, however he pronounced, would be able to read them all equally well without any special knowledge of phonetics; while, if he studied the system in detail, he might pronounce them all as correctly as any phonetic alphabet that is suitable for common use can indicate.

Whereas it is usually held that any form of phonetic writing must be so dissimilar from the literary script as to be illegible without special study of its special symbols, I contend on the other hand that, by choosing the new symbols from

among the various forms of the old alphabets, it is possible to construct a phonetic script which can be read by anyone who is acquainted with the ordinary literary scripts of English: and the literary and æsthetic advantages of such a system are pointed out.

I assume that a practical system of writing for ordinary use might be founded on such a phonetic; but I exhibited no scheme for this, and was therefore suspected of advocating that all books should be printed, and that everyone should *write* in the full phonetic as shown in my transcriptions, etc. This I am very far from thinking: but I had not gone so far as to work out any scheme, or even to have a decided preference for any one solution.

I have, however, now added one or two examples of solutions (see App. H, p. 75) which may indicate the *amount* of change which I suppose would be found convenient in common use, and the effect of it to the eye in a cursive writing; and I have added a note on the subject, which will make my attitude intelligible.

DEC. 1912.

CONTENTS

ON THE PRESENT STATE OF ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION

Is English pronunciation at the present time on the road to ruin? and if so, can anything be done to save it?

The object of this paper is to exhibit and advocate a remedy. As to the preliminary question, whether there is need for such a remedy, the answer is manifest, and I should not have put that question if I were not purposely appealing to many who may never have considered the matter.

It is natural that one should be unconcerned so long as one is not alive to the situation: to expose the situation to those who have never considered it, and to awaken their necessary concern I am content to take what I think is the most evident example, that is the degradation of the unaccented vowels; and will take only the commonest form.

Degradation of Unaccented Vowels

A great number of our unaccented vowels, which have been for centuries losing their distinction, are coming now perilously near to being pronounced all alike, i. e. with the sound of the second syllable of the word *danger*, wherein neither the *e* nor the *r* is sounded, but in their place a sort of indeterminate vowel, which may for identification be denoted by a reversed e, thus, ə. In Victorian spelling it would be written *er*.

This sound may be long or short. If it is unaccented, as in *danger*, it is short; if it is accented it is long, and might be circumflexed, thus:

Do not ə̂, my beloved brethren,

or it might be written double, thus :

Do not ɘɘ, my beloved brethren,

and had I been writing a sermon, I might have chosen those words for my text.

To show how far this short *er* is in some unaccented places ousting all the proper vowels, it will suffice to take a book issued by the University Press at Oxford—the *Phonetic Transcriptions of English Prose*, by Daniel Jones—and to examine what is there described as the 'Pronunciation used in careful conversation, or in reading aloud in private', which is 'the pronunciation recommended for the use of foreigners'.

On the first three-quarter page of these examples (p. 10 of the book) I find the following pronunciations: N.B. The italicised *er* in all these spellings is the short *er* of danger, not the long *err* of err.[1]

MONOSYLLABLES

English word.	*Present pronunciation according to Mr. Jones, expressed in Victorian spelling.*	*As written in Mr. Jones' phonetic.*
a	*er*	ə
of	*erv*	əv
and	*ernd*	ənd
as	*ers*	əz
from	*frerm*	frəm
at	*ert*	ət
to	*ter*	tə
but	bert	bət
for	*fer*	fə
must	merst	məst
than	thern	ðən
that	thert	ðət
the	*ther*	ðə
are	*er*	ə

[1] See Appendix B, page 39, etc.

POLYSYLLABLES[1]

English word.	*Present pronunciation according to Mr. Jones, expressed in Victorian spelling.*	*As written in Mr. Jones' phonetic.*
suggest	sergest	sə'dʒest
idea	ideer	aidiə
produce	prerduce	prədjuːs
sublime	serblime	sə'blaim
terror	terrer	'terə
common	commern	'kɔmən
equally	equerly	'iːkwəli
pleasure	pleaser	'pleʒə
affection	erfecshern	ə'fekʃən
arising	erising	ə'raiziŋ
character	charercter	'kærəktə
subordinate	serbordernate	sə'bɔːdənɪt
gradations	grerdations	grə'deiʃnz
prevalent	preverlernt	'prevələnt
above	erbove	əbʌv
supposed	serposed	səpouzd
again	ergain	ə'gein
efforts	efferts	'efəts

The word *experience* is given thus: ikspiəriəns, which victorianized to the eye would be something like this: *ixpeeërierns*. I should not have been surprised if Mr. Roosevelt, when he visited the Clarendon Press the other day, had pointed out to the Delegates that *so long as Oxford countenanced the pronouncing of Latin as English, they are bound to uphold a better standard of English pronunciation than this.* Certainly the current pronunciations given above fully expose the position of those who defend the English pronunciation of Latin on the theory that every nation should pronounce dead languages according to their native practice. What Latin and

[1] The Victorian spellings regard only the *erfected* syllable. Note again that the *er* is the short *er* of danger.

Greek will become with us on this principle is its *reductio ad absurdum*.[1]

All the above examples are on one short page of Mr. Jones' book; the whole text of that page is given on p. 32.

Now please observe, most gracious reader, that this is not a dream nor a joke. It shows the actual present condition of things, as formulated by an expert, promulgated by the University of Oxford, and recommended *ter* foreigners. Foreigners are really being taught that the pronunciation of *to* (tŭ), which is hundreds of years old, is now changed to *ter* (tə), and that in our 'careful conversation' we say *ter* and *inter* for *to* and *into*. And this is no doubt the common pronunciation in London and a good many counties. Nor is it to be questioned that *ter* is to illiterate persons a more easily recognized spelling than *to*: Berkshire villagers use it in their letters.

My friend, the late Dr. Gee, going his round of the hospital wards one day, came to the bedside of a newly-admitted patient. After examining him carefully, and finding little the matter with him, he called for the bed-card, and in his deliberate manner prescribed thereon a diet with a *placebo* to be taken three times a day. The man, frightened by his gravity and silence, feared the worst (he may perhaps have been reading Mr. Stephen Coleridge's letters in the newspapers), and was no sooner left alone than he snatched down the board, and seeing cabalistic signs, and at the foot of them the awful words *ter die*, and reading them, this learned man, with much the same kind of pronunciation as the Public Orator[2] will use at Oxford, he saw as he thought his death-warrant: so he whipped out of bed, and fled for his life; to add, no doubt, a new tale to the *terrers* of the hospital.

[1] Here is their ANTONINUS PIUS already (Jones, p. 71) sentenaines paies.

[2] This is quite impersonal. At the moment of penning the above reminiscence there was no Public Orator at Oxford. I seized the occasion of a distinguished interregnum. See Appendix B, note on p. 40.

The only question can be whether Mr. Jones exaggerates the actual prevalence of degradation. Some will acquit him of any exaggeration. Others I know very well will regard him as a half-witted faddist, beneath serious notice, who should be left to perish in his vain imaginings. Any one who thinks this, and believes that his own speech is above reproach, should at once examine it: if he cannot trust his own ear, let him ask a friend to note what sounds he really utters when he talks. I should say that he may congratulate himself if he does not pronounce more than seventy per cent. of his words as Mr. Jones represents them.

But, however you may yourself pronounce, if for instance you say *pronounce*, as I still hope that I sometimes do, and not *prernounce*, as Mr. Jones would have it, his book should convince you that things are moving, that they are in a process of actual degradation; that is that they are steadily getting worse: and in that fact lies the hope of remedy. We are dealing with something that is not irrevocably fixed; it is shifting.

Indeed many of these corrupted vowels are still carefully pronounced in the north of the island. We have only to recognize the superiority of the northern pronunciation and encourage it against London vulgarity, instead of assisting London jargon to overwhelm the older tradition, *which is quite as living*. If one of the two is to spread at the expense of the other, why not assist the better rather than the worse? A Londoner will say that a Scotchman talks strangely and ill: the truth is that he himself is in the typical attitude of vulgar ignorance in these matters. He is disposed to look down upon all that he is unaccustomed to, and not knowing the true distinctions he esteems his own degraded custom as correct. I should send foreigners *ter* Scotland *fer* their *ixpeeerierns*.

The example that I have given should be absolutely convincing. I have taken but one example, may be the com-

monest of all; yet there are many other like degradations going on. *Nature*, for instance, is now always *Neycher*. *Tuesday* is generally *Cheusdy*, and *tune* will very soon be *chiune*. And perhaps it is worth observing that I have not chosen my examples for my purpose, but have culled them all from the first few chance lines of a book that is above suspicion.

So I am now free to pass on to the main question.

Is there a Remedy?

There is one remedy, and one remedy only, and that is that, at least for educational purposes, if for no other, we should spell as we wish to pronounce; and then our school boards would have the children taught to pronounce words as they are spelt, which is at present impossible. The spelling must of course be fixed at a standard very different from Mr. Jones'; that is we must fix it as we judge words *should be pronounced*, and not as we foresee or guess they *are coming to be pronounced*[1] in the normal process of unimpeded degradation. If we took this step, we should not only prevent further decay, but could actually restore sounds that our phoneticians assume to be irretrievably lost. If, for instance, our recognized phonetic spelling spelt *pronounce* with *pro*, and *affection* with *af*, then the *o* and the *a* would be saved. If left to the phoneticians and the Fates they will soon be gone for ever.

Phonetic Decay

Some persons will not readily believe that such a stealthy natural process as phonetic decay in speech can be stayed by so simple a machinery as correct spelling and primary education can contrive. But this is a *doctrinaire* notion.

[1] A friend tells me that he knows a professor in Germany who is now actively teaching his pupils to pronounce English in the extreme cockney dialect; because he is convinced that that is the pronunciation of the near future. I can vouch for the truth of this. [Note to 1st ed. I have since received fresh confirmation.]

The *litera scripta* has an enormous power; and compulsory education is a modern engine that is still waiting for its tasks.

The reason why our books so little affect our speech is exactly because they are out of relation with it. So long as words are spelt independently of their pronunciation, it is plain that their spelling cannot be appealed to. Indeed the appeal, when it is made, often leads to bogus pronunciations, which are altogether the worst form of mispronunciation; and this is another danger of our present spelling, and though small in quantity, yet an actual evil of a horrible kind, and not to be disregarded among the arguments for reform.

Degradation of speech has no limit but its own actual unintelligibility. Decay is always pushing in, because of the laziness of the speaker, who will take no more trouble than is necessary. Phonetic laws meanwhile only decide the manner of his corruptions. But when his negligence reaches the point where he becomes unintelligible to his hearer, he has to repeat again what he has said; and the fact that it is more trouble to speak twice than once is what practically fixes the limit of degradation. Only, when a speaker does repeat himself, he will in his repetition probably make some attempt to amend his previous mispronunciation, and there is no knowing what he may then do. Phonetic laws guide him no longer, and his original contributions to the language would be deprecated even by the advocates of natural decay. Tricks and fashions of speech are most infectious, and our language is too precious to be abandoned to the experiments of this kind of free trade. It would seem much simpler to agree beforehand how words should be pronounced, and to make it a part of our primary education to teach that pronunciation.

Advocacy of Natural Decay

Scientific philologists will often argue that phonetic decay is a natural process, which has always been at work, and has

actually produced the very forms of speech that we value most highly; and that it is therefore a squeamish pedantry to quarrel with it at any particular stage, or to wish to interfere with it, or even to speak of decay or corruption of language, for that these very terms beg the question, and are only the particular prejudice of particular persons at a particular time. But this scientific reasoning is aesthetic nonsense. It is absurd to pretend that no results of natural laws should be disapproved of because it is possible to show that they obey the same laws as the processes of which we approve. The filthiest things in nature are as natural as the loveliest: and in art also the worst is as natural as the best: while the good needs not only effort but sympathetic intelligence to attain and preserve it. It is an aesthetic not a scientific question. It would indeed have been far better to have paid a little conscious attention to it earlier: we enter the field rather late: we can now see plainly that it would have been wiser to have kept much that is irrevocably lost: but that should not teach us to despair of all, but rather to save what can yet be saved. And it is no fancy to see a beauty in human speech, and to prefer one language to another on account of such beauty, and to distinguish the qualities that make the beauty. Learning that forbids such an attitude is contemptible.

Phonetic Spelling

Phonetic spelling is full of horrors, and if it could not be made more agreeable than has hitherto appeared, I would not advocate it, at least I do not think that I could. But there is one argument in favour of adopting at once anything rather than nothing which overwhelms me. For, supposing the world to go on existing, it appears to my judgement absolutely certain that, if the English language continues to be spoken, it will come, at least for educational purposes, to be written phonetically: and therefore, since our speech is in a condition of advancing decay, the

sooner it is phonetized the better. One must remember too that the process of decay is daily *removing the pronunciation further and further from the spelling ;* so that the utilitarian argument for phonetic writing will get ever stronger and stronger as the years go by. By the time that three-fourths of our unaccented vowels are always pronounced ə, even that sign will be unnecessary ; most words will be able to be perfectly written with only the accented vowels and consonants. For instance, I suppose *accumulate*,[1] being pronounced *erkiumerlert* (əkiumələt) would be written ˈkiumˈlˈt, or perhaps ˈqumˈlˈt, or even ˈq̓mˈlˈt : and the word having reached this stage would presumably be unable to resist the tendency of our speech to reduce everything to an unpronounceable monosyllable. It seems to me a less distressing mouthful than *sixths*, which Robert Browning went out of his way to introduce into his verse. Indeed one may say ˈq̓mˈlˈt several times while another is trying to say ' sixths ' ; and if this were the general condition of our words, then obstinate adhesion to the cumbrous Victorian fashion of misrepresenting them by Elizabethan spellings would have no chance. It is difficult to get the living to recognize that their own time is but a passing phase, which, as soon as it is past, has no more significance than any other. Our fond Victorian conventions and fancies will very soon be out of date, and our peculiarities as obsolete as Queen Anne's.

The aesthetic objections to phonetic spelling can only be met by showing a good-looking phonetic alphabet : and, though I consider that possible, such an alphabet will need much experiment to adjust it to all the various conveniences and inconveniences of practical use. The practical objections, which are easily raised, are of course serious ; but if phonetic spellers are left to themselves they will get over any difficulties in their own detestable manner : and that is a reason for not discouraging the efforts of those who wish to avoid

[1] See, again, note to Appendix B, p. 41.

disaster. There is, however, one strange objection to the adoption of even a good phonetic alphabet, which illustrates the situation so strongly that I cannot omit it, the contention namely that the English written language should altogether renounce any pretension to conformity with spoken speech, and be content to be a picture-writing, like the Chinese. He was a polyglottal student, and a learned philologist who gave me this opinion, and his reason was that he read English very fast, and did not think that he would be able to read it so fast if it were written in phonetics. It would be annoying, no doubt, to a motorist to have to slow down his machine in order to read the *précis* of the *Sportsman* or *Daily Mail*, as he sped through the towns: but as for students, I do not gather whether my friend thought that it would be impossible to master phonetic spelling as he had mastered all the varieties of the picture-writing, or whether he believed that the coexistence of two entirely different systems would be embarrassing. With the involved literary objections I am, of course, in complete sympathy; but the answer is twofold. First that, willy nilly, the phonetics will come. Secondly, that an aesthetic phonetic would be easily legible; indeed such a phonetic spelling as I advocate would make even Chaucer comparatively easy to read, at the same time that it would exhibit his pronunciation.

It was, I regret to say, late in my life when I first came to have any perception of these things. I had been brought up, to my great disadvantage, like the rest of us, to pronounce Greek and Latin as English; and by the time that one has got thoroughly hardened to this, it is difficult to open one's eyes. I had, moreover, that strong prejudice against phonetics which ignorance and their horrible deformation of literature are bound to cause in an artistic mind: but as soon as I began to see, I eagerly amended my ways as well as I could, and making a sort of phonetic writ-

ing for myself, I quickly came to the opinion that it was possible to write English phonetically on the basis of our old alphabet, both in an aesthetic and legible manner. The incredulity which this assertion encountered among experts provoked me to justify it by completing and formulating my experiments; and taking for my basis the best European script, that is the half-uncial of the eighth century, I produced a script that converted many of my friends, and I was persuaded last year to produce a specimen of it in printer's type. Since there is no half-uncial type in existence, it was necessary, if for no other reason, to relinquish the original form of my alphabet (I give, however, one facsimile of it, in the Appendix, described at p. 75), and I chose for my new basis an old Anglo-Saxon fount, which was lying disused at the Clarendon Press. Adopting this alphabet as far as it would carry me, borrowing from other founts, and making a few new letters to match, I got a result which betrays of course its mixed origin; and the makeshifts give it a very inferior appearance to what it would have if it were all designed for the object in view; for no matrices have actually been made, nor has the correction and verification of the type been pushed beyond what a very small expenditure allowed: and beside this there are certain difficulties, the best solution of which I do not pretend to have arrived at, and later suggestions and modifications that are not incorporated;[1] as it stands, however, I am willing to offer it as an experiment in a sufficiently advanced stage to be criticized and judged, if due allowance be made; for the main devices are considered, and give the scheme whatever practical merits it can ever claim.

[1] I have done nothing to the alphabet since the first edition of this tract.

Scheme for a Literary Phonetic Alphabet

Before setting out the alphabet in full, I will give a sentence of four words, chosen to exhibit the sort of difficulties that have to be encountered, and the method with which my alphabet is designed to meet them.

In the little sentence

All mankind are slaves,

there are four different vowel-sounds denoted by the same symbol *a*. I write it as follows,

ɔl mankɨnd ar slavz:

and this shows my solution of the phonetic ambiguities at present occasioned by our use of the first letter of the alphabet. I will take the *a*s in the order in which they occur in the sentence.

ɔ. The diphthong *au* is pronounced variously in the same words in different European languages. In English it is always broad open *o* (the long of the short *o* of *hot*), as in *authority*. Also *aw*, as in *awful*, has the same sound. My symbol ɔ covers both, and is used in all words in which *au* or *aw* are at present used; also in all words in which this long *o* is represented by an *a*, as *all*, *fall*, &c. These words will thus keep their *a*, though to preserve its length I write it ɔ (=au): thus, ɔlmɨhtɣ, fɔll, wɔk (walk). The reason will be given under O in the full alphabet (p. 25 ʌ), where the equivalent *o* of *forth* and *glory*, &c., will be found.

a the *a* of *hat*, hat.

ɑ the *a* of *father*, fɑther.

a or ɐɣ } the sound in *they* and *slave*. This symbol is the *e* of *bed* ligatured with the *i* of *hit*, or with the vowel *y*. This sound is properly written in *vein* and in *they*, and

such correct spellings are not interfered with: but both combinations *ei* and *ey* may be ligatured, thus giving four forms of the same symbol.

(1) ɛi, as in *vein*, vein.

(2) a (ei ligatured), as in *slavery*, slavery.

(3) ɛy, as in *they*, they.

(4) ey (ey ligatured), as in *day*, dey.

[These ligatures a and ey are used to give the appearance of *a* and *ay*. In many words where we now say *ey*, the old pronunciation was a true *a*, so that there is not only the convenience of legibility, but an obligation that the literary spelling should be with some form of that vowel. Thus in my phonetic the words ending in *ation* would have their penultimate in Chaucer with ɑ, in Shakespeare with a, and in modern English with a; and the appearance of the word would be so far unchanged to the eye, while the altered value of the vowel would be correctly denoted.]

This same sentence (All mankind, &c.) may introduce the sibilants thus:

ṡ = *s* as in *this*, ṫhiṡ.

ṡ = *z* as in *his*, hiṡ.

ś = *sh* as in *sugar*, śuger.

ź = *zh* as in *pleasure*, pleźur.

These symbols do not forbid *z*, *sh*, and *zh*, which, if they are received spellings, may stand where they are phonetically correct.

Also the *rs*.

ṙ = trilled *r* as in *rot*, ṙot.

ṛ = untrilled *r* as in *are*, ɑṛ.

Also the new symbol in *kind*.

i = the diphthongal sound in *blind*, *kind*, &c.

Ellis (vol. i, p. 107) has a long examination of this sound, and concludes that there are two forms of it in English, one of which would be properly written *ai*, as

in *Isaiah*, the other not, since the first element of the diphthong is not so decidedly an *a*. It will be therefore proper to allow the *ai* or *ay* to remain in the few instances in which it is correct (though there is no *a* in our alphabet which exactly represents the sound), as in *Isaiah* and *ay* (yes), and to invent some symbol for the *i* of *kind*, *eye*, &c. : and for this sound I have made the symbol i̇ [and I wish to use it here as the subject of a parenthetical digression].

On Multiple Symbols

The main objection which phoneticians will at the outset very plausibly and rightly urge against my system is that I allow sometimes more than one symbol for the same sound, as may be seen in the description above, especially in the case of the *ey* sound. The practical inconvenience of having a large number of symbols will be considered later, when the full extent of my extravagance can be tabulated ; I will here only deal with the theoretical consideration of the practice of allowing the same sound to be differently expressed, and contrast it with the practice of allowing the same symbols to represent different sounds. There is in the first of these practices no confusion, because, whichever of the allowable symbols be chosen, the sound will be the same ; the liberty of choice is for practical convenience, no one of the various symbols makes a wrong spelling, though it may make an inconvenient one (as, for example, I think that the word *day* is more conveniently represented by 𐑛𐑱 than by 𐑛𐑧𐑦 or 𐑛𐑩, or even by 𐑛𐑧𐑲), whereas on our present system, where the same symbol means one thing in one word and another in another, there is nothing but confusion, nor any means of knowing from the spelling what pronunciation is intended. The sound of i̇ will give a good example : it is written in some twenty ways in English, and almost all are of uncertain interpretation : here is a table of them :

EXISTENT SPELLINGS OF ī

1	ic	*as in*	indictment	*compare*	diction
2	ie	,,	tie	,,	field
3	y	,,	fly	,,	happy
4	ye	,,	dye	,,	ye
5	i-e	,,	tile	,,	granite
6	ig	,,	sign	,,	signature
7	igh	,,	sigh	,,	Denbigh
8	ighe	,,	Tighe	,,	pigheaded
9	eigh	,,	height	,,	eight
10	ui	,,	guiding	,,	fluid, cuirass
11	ui-e	,,	guide	,,	juice
12	uy	,,	buy	,,	
[1]13	ais	,,	aisle	,,	dais
14	ey	,,	eying	,,	they
15	eye	,,	eye	,,	obeyed
16	i	,,	kind	,,	windy
17	ei	,,	cheiropodist	,,	vein
[1]18	is	,,	isle	,,	dismal
19	oi	,,	choir	,,	choice
20	ai	,,	Isaiah	,,	gain
21	ay	,,	ay (yes)	,,	day

[1] *Aisle* and *isle* are not quite fair examples, but they were in the phonetician's book whence I took over the greater part of this table into a paper that I wrote some six or seven years ago. I will here transcribe another paragraph from the same article to enforce my general position. 'From this condition of our alphabet it results that it is of no practical use to us in its interpretative capacity. A traveller who wishes to give the names of places in some country of savages where he may be voyaging, or any word in their vocabulary, has in English no means at his disposal: it is impossible for him to do it: for whatever he may write is open to many various interpretations, as we find every day when we bungle at the Oriental names in our foreign news: nor can we in our own language read any unfamiliar word into sound. *Bush-ranger* is familiar; but shift the position of the initial consonants of its components, and what is *Rush-banger*?' One practical objection to phonetic spelling in English is that there is a whole class of words that are only known to the eye. They are common in all forms of literature, but so rarely used in conversation that their pronunciation is practically unknown, and if they were represented phonetically they would many of them be unrecognizable.

Considering that there are seven new or newly defined symbols in that little sentence, I think that it reads very easily. I have never found any one to stumble at it. I will now give the whole alphabet, starring the letters that have been already described, so that the reader may be reminded where to look for their explanation.

The Alphabet

Vowels.

* a = *a* of *man*, man.

* ɑ = *a* of *father*, fɑther.

* a / *ey = *a* of *slavery*, slaveʀy; and the *ay* of *day*, dey.

ɛ = *e* of *bed*, bɛd.

ɐ = the degraded vowel sound of *er* in *danger*, spoken of above. This symbol has therefore plenty to do (the untrilled *r* allows *danger* to be written danʒɐr). I distinguish it from the vowel sound in *but*. Where this sound ɐ, or a sound practically indistinguishable from it, is very small, almost asyllabic, nor more or hardly more than the vocalization of a liquid, I represent it by a dot, as thus, bat·l, abʒ·m, hɛv·n (battle, abysm, heaven). This dot does duty also for the impurity which the vocalization of *r* casts back on a preceding long vowel, as in the words *care, ear, ire, ore, our, your*, which appear in my script as ca·ʏ, ɑ·ʏ, i·ʏ, o·ʏ, au·ʏ, ʏu·ʏ; or if followed by a vowel, ca·ʀ, ɑ·ʀ, &c. Something better might be devised; see under *l, m, n*, below.

ɪ = the vowel of *the* when the next word begins with a vowel, as in *the almighty*, ðɪ ɔlmiɧtʏ. It is of course equivalent with the *i* of *hit*, and is made as much like an *i* as possible, and if doubled it is long, thus

ɑ = the long *ee* of *feel*, fɑl.

The above two symbols are plainly makeshifts to show the identity of our *ee* with the continental and Latin long *i*.

ɪ = the short *i* of *hit*, hɪt.

* ɨ = the English long *i* of *bite*, &c. See above, p. 21.

ɵ = long *o* of *omen*, ɵmen. This impure *o* (= ou or ow) may be followed by a *w*, as in *bowl*, bɵwl.

o = the short *o* of *hot*, hot.

ơ = the long of the last, as in *forth*, *glory*, fơrth, glơry.

* ɔ = the same sound as the last (as in *authority*; see p. 20).

ʌ = the short of the last, and therefore equivalent with the short *o* of *hot*. The need for this extra symbol is that there are a good many words now written with *a*, where the *a* is pronounced *ŏ*. This is due to a preceding *u* sound, either in *w* or *qu*, as *want*, *squalor*. To write these words with *o* makes confusion (e. g. wander, wonder; want, wont), and as the *a* is naturally changed in sound by its position, there is only a warning needed that it is so changed: and this ʌ being part of the broad *o* sound ɔ, it is a consistent and suggestive symbol. It is therefore the vowel of *want*, *quantity*, *wander*, &c., wʌnt, qʟʌntɪty, wʌndɐr.

u = short *u* of *full*, ful.

ɷ = long *u* of *fool*, fɷl. It is a doubled *u*, made like a doubled *o*, or omega.

ʉ = the impure *u* of *universe*, ʉnɪvɐrs. It is equivalent with yɷ (*you*) and with the ligature ɯ (q.v.).

ɐ = the impure vowel of *but*, bɐt, really a degraded *a* made by an inverted *a* simulating *u*, which might be recovered in some words.

y = same as short *i*, as in *happy*. These final *y*s are of indeterminate length, and somewhat uncertain pronunciation. It is much more correct to keep the old *y* than to identify them all (as all modern phonetics do) with the short *i* of *hit*.

ɣ is also used as a consonant as at present. It is often impossible to decide which it should be called; experts do not agree.

CONSONANTS.

b
d
p
q
t
v

These are all unchanged: except that *q* is ligatured with its complement *u*.

The following letters, c, f, g, h, j, k, l, m, n, w, x, y, z, are also unchanged, but need some remarks.

c hard, as in *fact*, fact.

ç 'soft c'=*s*, as in *facing*, façiŋ.

f rather than write *ov* for *of*, I have used another f, viz.

[ꝼ] (=v), from the Anglo-Saxon fount, thus oꝼ. (This is a needless luxury; I prefer *ov*.)

g hard, as in *begin*, bigin.

ʒ 'soft', as in *gin*, ʒin.

j This being the same sound as the last (ʒ) is *de trop*. Words with this *dzh* sound make queer-looking objects in common phonetics. Ellis, for instance, writes *gentle* dzhen·t'l, and *justice*, Dzhust·is (Elizabethan). I think it useful to have the two symbols ʒ and j, and would leave their use to be determined by practice. The word *judge* might still be written jvdʒ.

h same as at present. I keep it in words like *night*, niht, because it is useful to distinguish homophonous words as *bight* and *bite*, *right* and *rite*, &c., and if its presence led to its being recognized in pronunciation that would be a gain. In *which* it is ligatured, and occurs in other ligatures. See below, p. 28.

k same as c. Though a duplicate and theoretically useless, it is very grateful in such words as *king* and *kind*.

Moreover, I would retain it as a mute initial before *n*; it cannot be accused of any offence and distinguishes several homophones. It is also useful to strengthen *c* in stressed ultimates or monosyllables, as *back*.

l, m, n, ŋ — These liquids are unchanged, except that *n* has another form ŋ, = the *ng* in the *ing* of present participles, &c., thus *having*, haviŋ; also *l*, *m*, *n* must be recognized as semivowels, and capable of making a syllable after another consonant, as in *battle*, *abysm*, *heaven*; bat·l abyꞩ·m, hev·n. At the present stage of my type this is indicated by a preceding dot.

* ɾ, * r = the trilled *r* of *rot*.

* r = the untrilled *r* of *are*.

* s = the true *s* of *sin*.

* ꞩ = *z* as in *his*.

* ʃ = *sh* as in *sugar*.

* ʒ = *zh*, as in *azure*.

w unaltered. [It is used in ligature, (1) as a consonant in its *w*-form with *h*, and (2) with a preceding vowel to make a diphthong, when it has the form of a doubled *u*. See the ligatures.]

x = *ecs* of *extreme*, ɛxtɾum.

χ = *egs* of *example*, ɛχamp·l.

z unaltered, but has an equivalent symbol in ꞩ, which is used where *s* is now written but pronounced *z*.

LIGATURES.

ɯ = ĭu, made of ɪ ligatured with doubled *u*. This symbol is intended to preserve the spelling of words like *dew* and *few*, dɯ, fɯ: and I should use it in *beautiful*, bɯtiful.

ɑɯ = *ow* of *cow*, and the *ou* of *round*, made of *a* ligatured with *u*, so as to resemble the old *ou* spelling, the sound being truly an *au* diphthong, thus, cɑɯ, ɾɑɯnd.

oy = the diphthong variously sounded in *boy*, *noise*, &c., boy, noys.

ti used where *t* is palatized, as in words ending in *ation*, usually represented by phoneticians as *sh* : the sound of the *i* should be heard ; *shn* is to be deprecated. This termination in various forms is very common, and is best represented by a symbol which preserves its accidence, and may guard it from threatened extinction. Thus, *nation* will be nativn, and I should write greaçivs, averśivn.

th = the unvoiced *th* of *thin*, thin.

th = the voiced *th* of *this*, this.

ch = *ch* of *chin*, chin.

çh } = 'soft' *ch* in *machine*, maçhun.
sh }

wh = the initial sound of *why*, *which*, &c. There is a difference of opinion as to the analysis of this sound, and the words are pronounced differently by different speakers. The old spelling is quite reasonable, and is retained.

On the Extravagant Number of Symbols in this Alphabet

As there are 58 symbols in the above table, exclusive of capitals—which are a terrible complication in any phonetic type[1]—my alphabet will be rejected at once by the guardians of the 'lower case', as clumsy and impracticable : but, though the objection is not altogether to be obviated, it can be reduced to moderate dimensions, as I hope to show : and yet in making that defence I would not be thought to be advocating all the details of my system ; I do, however,

[1] It is my opinion that capitals may be disregarded. As they are chiefly ornamental, they might retain antique forms, and be interpreted by the reader's knowledge.

wish it to appear that something on the lines of my experiment is practicable.

First of all, counting ꭤ, ɑ and ꜳ, ꜵ and ꜷ as ligatures, there are 15 ligatures. Now in old founts, when the appearance of the text was more consulted than the convenience of the type-setter, there are often from 15 to 20 ligatures, which had no phonetic significance. Those who have studied the art of printing have concluded that it is impossible to compete with old printing unless a fair number of ligatures be admitted: and, as my experiment respects artistic excellence, the champions of the lower case must not pretend that it has 26 letters to my 58. It has, or should have 40 to 46 against 58; and that is a very different ratio. Deducting my 15 ligatures from the total 58, I am left with 43 symbols against 26. Now, among these there are 10 pairs of duplicates, viz.:

ʒ = j	ç = s	ś = sh
i = ɪ	c = k	σ = ꭤ
o = ʌ	ʒ = z	
ɯ = ɯu	ʒ́ = zh	

so that of the total 43, 10 are literary conveniences, resulting from the principle of maintaining the existing spelling as far as possible: and if for economy's sake one form of each of these pairs were excluded—the ligature-forms being preferentially retained—then my 43 would be reduced to 33, and, if that number be compared with 26, I shall not be accused of any extravagance except as regards these duplicates.

If then the ligatures be allowed, the question is merely this: are the spellings in the fourth column of the following table so preferable to those in the third column as to justify the use of the duplicate letters? The table can give no indication of the number of words affected. This must be guessed at from the sample passages printed later.

English word.	*In Jones' script.*	*My script without duplicates.*	*Same with duplicates.*
gentle	'dʒentl	jentl	ʒentl
jug	dʒʌg	ʒʌg	jʌg
decay	di'kei	dikei	dcey
wander	'wɔndə	wonder	wander
news	njuz	nuz	nuʒ
faces	'feisiz	feisiz	façʒ
king	kiŋ	ciŋ	kiŋ
class	klɑ:s	klas	clas
pleasure	'plegə	plezhur	pleʒur
sugar	'ʃugə	shuger	ʃuger
lawyer	'lɔ:jə	loyer	luyer
glory	'glɔ:ri	glʊry	glʊry

My preference for the spellings in the fourth column is due not only to their legibility, but to the literary fitness which is the cause of their legibility: and this is a main feature of my scheme. And it is, I hold, a great advantage to have an alphabet which retains historical spellings as much as possible, and which shows a modification of sound by a modified symbol, rather than by an altogether different one. For instance, the word *salvation* is thus printed in all our common texts of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Shelley; and I can write it approximately in the three phonetic values corresponding to those three periods without disfigurement, thus salvaçiɔn, salvaɛun, salvaɛvn, or the ç may be written in all three: whereas in Mr. Jones' script, the last of these would be sælveiʃn. In order to test my system, I will give examples below of English of all these three periods written in it. No system will teach how Shakespeare pronounced, but if Elizabethan English were printed as I suggest, it would be as legible as modern English, and any one would be able to read it with right pronunciation *as far as*

the distinctions (i.e. *the symbols*) *allow*. And one need not be meticulous about lesser distinctions, although of course they existed as actually as the greater distinctions: for they are often of very uncertain evidence, and so delicate that few could observe them, even if they could be accurately known and without ambiguity exhibited to the eye. The broad distinctions, however, are of the utmost importance, and without approximately observing these there is no true scholarship. Though in no sense myself an expert in these matters, I will still venture to remind those experts who jealously object to half-way methods, that our speech of to-day teems with various pronunciations, which render any representation of it open to the same sort of objection as they might raise to such an imperfect scheme as I advocate. Indeed any scheme of scientifically accurate phonetic writing, scientifically valuable as it may be, has the misfortune of being deterrent in proportion to its delicacy: for as the distinctions become more delicate, they become at the same time not only more difficult both to indicate, to identify, and to observe, but also more uncertain to establish: so that the learner finds his powers most taxed in matters of least importance and authority. One has only to read the authorities to see how often they are nonplussed; nor is their lack of precision and certainty confined to speech of past time, where perfect record is impossible and conjecture dubious, but even about contemporary phenomena there is variety of opinion: and it is not alone that ears differ, mouths differ also, and even the same expert will not always certainly pronounce the same sound, or what he intends to be the same sound, exactly in the same manner. The amount of distinction which is useful and practical I do not pretend to determine: but I believe that it is a proper field for experiment, and that one must look to use and practice to proceed gradually, in the presence of expert guidance, to the best solution.

The fact still remains that there are fifty-eight symbols in my alphabet.

Examples

I. Mr. Daniel Jones, p. 10.

bɪ'saidz 'ðouz 'θiŋz witʃ di'rektli sə'dʒest ði: aidiə əv 'deindʒə, ənd 'ðouz witʃ prədju:s ə 'similər r'fekt frəm ə mr'kænikl 'kɔ:z, ai nou əv 'nʌθiŋ sə'blaim witʃ iz nɔt 'sʌm mɔdifi'keiʃn əv 'pauə. ənd 'ðis 'brɑ:ntʃ raiziz, əz 'nætʃ(ə)rəli əz ði: 'ʌðə 'tu: 'brɑ:ntʃɪz, frəm 'terə, ðə 'kɔmən 'stɔk əv 'evriθiŋ ðət iz sə'blaim. ði: aidiə əv 'pauə, ət 'fə:st 'vju:, 'ai:mz əv ðə 'klɑ:s əv ðouz in'difrənt wʌnz witʃ mei 'i:kwəli bɪlɔŋ tə 'pein ɔ: tə 'pleʒə. bət in ri'æliti, ði: ə'fekʃən ə'raiziŋ frəm ði: aidiə əv 'vɑ:st 'pauə iz ɪks'tri:mli rr'mout frəm ðət 'nju:trəl 'kərəktə. fə 'fə:st, wi: məst rɪ'membə ðət ði: aidiə əv 'pein, in its 'hairst dr'gri:, iz 'mʌtʃ 'strɔŋgə ðən ðə 'hairst dɪgri: əv 'pleʒə; ənd ðət it prɪzə:vz ðə 'seim sju:piəri'ɔriti θru: 'ɔ:l ðə sə'bɔ:dənɪt grə'deiʃnz. frəm 'hens it iz, ðət wee ðə 'tʃɑ:nsɪz fər 'i:kwəl dr'gri:z əv 'sʌfəriŋ ɔ:r ɪn'dʒɔimənt ər in 'eni 'sɔ:t 'i:kwəl, ði: aidiə əv ðə 'sʌfəriŋ məst 'ɔ:lweiz bi 'prevələnt. ənd in'di:d ði: aidiəz əv 'pein, ənd əbʌv 'ɔ:l əv 'deθ, ə sou 'veri ə'fektiŋ ðət, 'wailst wi: rr'mein in ðə 'prezns əv wɔt'evər iz səpouzd tə hæv ðə 'pauər əv in'fliktiŋ 'aiðə, it iz im'pɔsəbl tə bi 'pə:fiktli 'fri: frəm 'terə. ə'gein, wi: 'nou bai ɪks'piəriəns ðət, fə ði: ɪn'dʒɔimənt əv 'pleʒə, 'nou 'greit 'efəts əv 'pauər ər ət 'ɔ:l 'nesɪsəri; 'nei, wi: nou ðət 'sʌtʃ 'efəts wəd gou ə 'greit

II. The same, in my script.

Besides those things which directly suggest the idea[1] of danger, and those which produce a similar

[1] idea. This word may serve for an extreme example of my Quixoteries. I do not pretend that any one now says a at the end of *idea*: but the final *a* of Latin words have got to be pronounced. Every one now says *Ameriker* (Matthew Arnold apparently said *Amerikey*), and if we would only say *America*, which is very easy and altogether better, and if boys also learnt Latin at school (to say Augusta, e. g. not Ergerster), then these final *a* would come to be sounded sufficiently near a to justify this spelling. I should myself prefer remember, preserv, and decey.

efect from a mecanic'l cus, i know of nuthin sublim which is not sum modificatiun of puur. And this branch rises, as naturaly as the uther tuo branches, from terur, the comun stock of everythin that is sublim. The idea of puur, at first vau, sums of the clas of thos indiferent wuns which may aqualy belon tu pein or tu plesur. But in reality, the afectiun arisin from the idea of vast puur is extremly remot from that nuutre'l caracter. For first, wi must remember that the idea of pein, in its hihest degru, is much stronger than the hihest degru of plesur; and that it preservs the sam superiority thruu ul the subordinat gradatiuns. From henç it is, that whatr the chanças for aqu'l degrus of sufrin or enjoyment ar in eny sort aqu'l, the idea of sufrin must ulways be prevalent, etc.

The following transcriptions from Chaucer and Shakespeare will reveal that my alphabet was not adjusted for the purpose, and might easily be improved for general use. Nor have I pretended to judge any of the vexed questions of Elizabethan pronunciation: I wish only to show the kind of thing that might be done if there were agreement; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that experts may come to agree about the main sounds, and be content to give to the others their more modern interpretations. One of their present contentions (which I yield to in my transcription), that the *r* was always trilled, appears to me certainly wrong.

III. From Chaucer.

Whan Zefirus ēk with his swete brēth
Inspired hath in every holt and hēth

The tendre croppes and the yunge sunne
Hath in the ram his halfe cours ironne,
And smale foules maken melodie,
That slepen al the nicht with open ye—
So pricketh hem natiir' in hir corages—
Than longen folk to gon on pilgrimages,
And palmers for to seken straunge strondes
To ferne halwes kouth' in sundry londes;
And specialy from every shires ende
Of Engelond to Caunterbry they wende,
The holy blisful martyr for to seke
That hem hath holpen, whan that they wer' seke.

IV. From Shakespeare.

All the world's a stag,
and all the men and wimen merely players:
They hav their exits and their entrances;
And on man in his tim plays many parts,
His acts being sev'n ages. At first the infant,
Mulling and puking in the nurses armes.
Then the whining schoolboy, with his satchel,
And shining morning face, creeping lik snail
Unwillingly to scool. And then the luver,
Sighing lik furnas, with a wofull balad
Made to his mistres ibrow. Then a souldier,
Ful of strainge oths, and bearded lik the pard,
Jelus in onur, sudain and quick in quarel,
Seking the bubl reputacion
even in the cannons mouth.

Consideration of the matters discussed in this paper would, I believe, lead to an overwhelmingly strong feeling in favour

of some action to secure our speech from further deterioration: and there can be no doubt that if any definite move were made, it would lead to the recovery or restoration of a good deal that in Mr. Jones' book appears to be absolutely lost.[1] It is not yet lost; it exists alive and undamaged amongst us. Whether there would be any agreement that a phonetic script is the only remedy and security is doubtful; but the prejudice that the proposal of phonetic spelling always raised twenty years ago is now wonderfully subdued, owing, I suppose, to so many people understanding the situation; and it is certain that a good phonetic script, if there was one, would be used at once by a good many authors. If such a script be not made, Mr. Jones', or something like his, will soon be in our board-schools. In any case such a pronunciation as Mr. Jones exhibits should be repudiated with all the authority that can be marshalled against it. The great assistance which I looked to come from the reform of Latin pronunciation in our public schools has been sadly lessened by the attitude of the masters, who have in many cases (at least so I am told) taken up the matter so half-heartedly, if not unwillingly, as to render the reform almost nugatory. I wish that I may convert some of them to a different view. If they could be brought to see what they themselves lost by wrong education, they would, I am sure, shrink from the responsibility of inflicting the same distasteful damage on the succeeding troops of youngsters who come to them for the best instruction. There can be little doubt that to teach a careful pronunciation of the unaccented vowels in Latin would lead boys towards doing the same in English, or at least enable them to do it, and to know what was intended when it was recommended to them. But the old habit is so fixed in the teachers that it is

[1] I am glad to say that Mr. Jones, at least to some extent, agrees with me as to the possibility and desirability of recovering some of the more literary pronunciations. See Appendix, p. 37.

difficult to move them. Even those who have gone willingly to work have not wholly understood the matter. I would recommend to them the exhortation of St. James—they give the consonants and accented vowels their proper values, but neglect the unaccented vowels. Where they used to say *redgəret*, they now say not *regeret*, but *regəret*: the *er* will invade even their accented syllables, and some who get the word *die* right, will pronounce *ter* like the hospital patient.

APPENDIX A

I owe an apology, or at least an apologetic explanation, to Mr. Daniel Jones, who complained that I misrepresented his teaching. I am sorry to have caused this impression, but I was as much surprised, because I quoted him as an unimpeachable authority; and I needed such authority badly; for that English is actually spoken as he represents it, would not have been believed by my readers on my own assertion. I agree with him entirely in this matter, and consider his transcriptions as absolutely faithful. But I was writing mainly for those who would not agree with us, nor believe him; and in my appeal to them I took advantage of their prejudices in so far as I could sympathise with them: and this attitude, no doubt exaggerated, and my quarrel with him that I held him somewhat guilty of teaching this conversational style as 'correct' and without seeking to improve it, led him to misinterpret me. I am glad to find that in this latter particular I was mistaken. I ought to have pointed out that in his book he distinguishes three styles of pronunciation and teaches them separately (see App. C), and also that I wholly appreciate the logical difficulty of a teacher in his position. If you have to teach foreigners to speak

English as the English speak it, then, if the English speak indistinctly, you must teach foreigners to practise indistinctness of speech. Everyone who has tried to teach a Frenchman to talk English must have made this shocking discovery for himself.

I have carefully amended the passages that Mr. Daniel Jones thought likely to mislead the reader as to his teaching: and, though my opinion can be of little service to him, I wish for my own credit to say that I consider him such a trustworthy expert that I should be ashamed to appear to disagree with him. I am also glad to be able to state that he concurs with me in my opinion that some of the decaying sounds may be saved, and in my wish that they should be restored: so that there is really no disagreement whatever between us. I recommend his book most heartily to all who are interested in this question of English pronunciation: for there the truth can be seen set out very plainly: and if anyone would buy a copy of it, and compare his own way of talking with the transcriptions, he would be in a position to consider my contention that it is desirable to cultivate a better style.

For an optimistic historical account of the English Language all learners should go to Dr. Henry Bradley's book 'The Making of English' (Macmillan).

APPENDIX B

On *er*.

I WAS accused of having confounded the short unstressed vowel of the second syllable of *danger* with the long sound in *bird*. What then is the distinction that I made between them? I said that one is unaccented and short, and that the other is accented and long: and I contend that this is the true differentiation. I will examine this point by the example of the word *sir*.

There is an amusing passage in Max Müller's 'Science of Language'[1] in which he supposes a rediscovery of the English language at some future time among the descendants of the American slaves returned to West Africa. I cannot fathom his hypothesis, but he writes thus:

'*A missionary might surprise the scholars of Europe by an account of that new African language. He might describe it at first as very imperfect—as a language, for instance so poor that the same word had to be used to express the most heterogeneous ideas. He might point out how the same sound, without any change of accent,* meant true, *a* ceremony, *a* workman, *and was used also as a verb in the sense of* literary composition. *All these*[2], *he might say, are expressed in that strange*

[1] Vol. I, lect. 6.

[2] Max Müller omits one of the most inconvenient ambigui-

dialect by the sound rait (*right, rite, wright, write*) * * * * *He might then mention an even more extraordinary feature, namely, that although this language had no terminations for the masculine and feminine genders of nouns, it employed a masculine and feminine termination after the affirmative particle, according as it was addressed to a lady or a gentleman. Their affirmative particle being* yes, *they added a final* r *to it if addressed to a man, and a final* m *if addressed to a lady: that is to say, instead of simply saying* yes, *these descendants of the American slaves said* yesr *to a man and* yesm *to a woman.*'

It cannot perhaps be determined exactly in what manner Max Müller supposed this suffix *r* to be pronounced: but if it were pronounced as a south-countryman would read it, then this *r* of *yesr* (which he also prints *yes'r*) is the shortest form of the indeterminate vowel ə or *er*. And the next shortest form which one can indicate would be a pronunciation which we could write as *yésser*. Next it is possible to say *yesser* with the accent equally distributed upon the two syllables, and this might be written *yes-sir*, the *sir* still remaining short.[1] But

ties, that of using *right* for *dexter*, to distinguish one side of the body from the other, viz. from the *left*, which is also unfortunately another homophone. It is this that makes the sailor's *port* and *starboard*, and the stable-boy's *near* and *off* so convenient.

[1] The *er* in this *yes-sir* might be taken for the value of the *ĕr* in my story of Dr. Gee: but my interpolated thrust at the English pronunciation of Latin was objected to on the ground

now suppose that you are addressing a deaf gentleman who has dropped his copy of the Proceedings

that my hypothetical Public Orator would have pronounced the Latin *ter* long, like the *err* in 'Do not ŧ, my beloved brethren'. I admit that he would have done so, whereas the hospital patient might have said *tɜ die*. Again it was objected that the word *die* would have been pronounced differently by them. I also grant the Orator this distinction. But my story was true, and, as an illustration of the illiterate spelling of *to*, quite apposite. So far as the pronunciation of Latin is concerned it may be supplemented by the following, which is told of the Cowley Fathers. This tale is of a young high-bred novice, who having fled from the luxuries of the world was spending his first night on the straw mattress in his allotted cell. Being awaked at cockcrow by a knock at the door, and a mild voice crying *Dominus tecum*, he replied, 'Thank you, thank you! will you kindly set it down outside.' With the advent of the classical pronunciation the scene should be transferred to Yorkshire.

These stories are jocular; and I regret the need of having to explain that my *Delergerts* and *Derdederdy* were intended for jokes. I have erased them, since they have given almost more annoyance than I intended. I reluctantly confess to knowing that *Delegates* is really pronounced *Dellygits* and that there is a refined form *Dellygets*. But 'q̇m·l·t' is a defensible exaggeration. I purposely avoided considering the short *i* invasion (seen in *Ascended*, p. 47). This, since it is the shortest of sounds, is safe against *er*: 'accumulate' would have a terminal *it*. But that does not forbid my 'q̇m·l·t', since it would be understood that all final unaccented T's were vocalized with short *i*.

Hints for the crushing of polysyllables may, I am told, be gleaned from the practice of the guards on the Metropolitan Tube Railway. Subterranean travellers report the following: *Shongyó*, *Swórra*, *Torrmerró*, as representing Westbourne Grove, Bayswater, and Tottenham Court Road. I am also informed that there is a porter at Wolvercote who can speak the name of his station as a monosyllable.

of the English Association in the road, and that you have picked it up, and wish to call his attention that you may restore it to him; and you call out *Sir! Sir!! Sir!!!*, increasing the force of your call as you see him moving further and further away. These *Sirs* are all long accented *errs*, passing from the less to the most accented, and they might be represented thus, *Sirr! Sirrr! Sirrrr!*

We have now gone through a series of *er* sounds unbrokenly gradated from the very lightest to the heaviest; and I can find no point at which the vowel suddenly changes in quality: indeed of all the vowels which are held to have a long and a short form there is none in which I detect less qualitative tone-change than in this indeterminate vowel indicated by the topsy-turvy *e*.

If the above account of these sounds is correct, then I made sufficient distinction by differentiating the extremes; and I even indicated by the Greek circumflex accent that in the long *err* there was, or might be, a wavering of the voice pitch, which almost makes a disyllable of a monosyllable. In this edition I have inserted a special explanation, and altered the printing, so that there shall be no room for mistake. I did not see that confusion was possible, indeed in the polysyllables (p. 11) it is impossible, because all those words are accented on another syllable. But among the monosyllables (p. 10) are words that are sometimes accented. *From*, for instance, is strongly accented when followed by

an enclitic; but then it always has its O pronounced: in such a sentence as

And keep the Dévil fróm us

there is no question of *er*: every phonetician would write the word with an O. What I object to is that people say, as Mr. Jones also asserts,

I came frĕrm Óxford tĕr Lóndon,

whereas they should be taught to say

I came frŏm Óxford tŭ Lóndon,

and teachers will agree that the difficulty of teaching them to do this is that, while the average man says *ter* easily and unconsciously, he will say *tŭ* awkwardly and consciously, and the former condition is preferable to the latter. But the awkward selfconscious pronunciation of *tŭ* only comes from a want of facility in articulation; it is a clumsiness or sluggishness of the lips, due to imperfect training and carelessness,—to a want, that is, which the teacher has to supply: it is his affair to teach 'articulation', to educate the lips and tongue, and not to encourage slovenly habits. If children were taught from the first to differentiate the unaccented vowels correctly, they would do that as unconsciously as they now slur them. In French schools this is done: and that is the reason why their adults pronounce so well.

A Shakespearian enthusiast, a professor of English Literature, and a scholar of the highest attainments and ability, said to me apropos of my essay, 'How

can you think that these unaccented vowels can be observed or restored? It is impossible, (so he said, and he intended, I think, to be speaking of the stage,) It is impossible to say *Tu-bé or not tu-bé*, you must say *Ter-bé or not ter-bé*.' This he said, supposing the example to be irrefutable. 'But what does your assertion mean? (I replied to him). Actually this, that it is *impossible* to pronounce such an unaccented vowel as the *tŭ* in *to-bé* without accenting it. That is, that it is impossible to put your lips into the position for saying *ŭ*, without accenting and lengthening the *u*.'[1] Now that no one will take the trouble to do so is the actual dangerous condition of our slipshod speech. This is what I was protesting against: and there is considerable difficulty in formulating one's exhortations when one half of one's audience will not believe that any educated person says *ter* for *tu*, while the other half will not believe that it is possible to say anything but *ter*. Those who think that they say *tu* (or *to!*) are very much annoyed when the truth is plainly stated, and exposed by a spelling that they can read; but so long as it is disguised by symbols that are vague to them, and elude their comprehension,

[1] This is, of course, sheer nonsense. It asserts that no Englishman can pronounce any foreign language. It really means only this—but all this—that it is so *unusual* to pronounce *tŏ* in any way but *ter* that, if you should say *tŭ* it would not sound right. Can anyone deny that this condition of things calls for attention and reform?

they do not resent it so much. My friend was, I think, convinced by my answer to him, and saw (at least I think he heard) that it is as possible as it is right to say *tu be* and not *ter be*: and it is *almost* as easy. This 'almost' denotes the little trouble which seems impossible.

This discussion raises the question whether I have not confounded two other things, viz. the conversational and the literary pronunciations. I will now explain myself on that head.

APPENDIX C

THE CONVERSATIONAL STYLE

Mr. Daniel Jones in his 'Transcriptions' recognises three forms or styles of pronunciation, which he thus distinguishes. (A) That used in reciting or reading in public. (B) That used in careful conversation or reading aloud in private. (C) That used in rapid conversation. I approve of his distinctions; but in taking my example from the second or middle style in his book, I thought to avoid the complications to which the three distinctions gave rise. This was, no doubt, a rough and ready method, and I will now say enough to clear up any uncertainty as to what I intended.

I recognise, of course, that there are, and always have been, two main standards of pronunciation, one the literary, the other the conversational: and it is my belief that our present conversational style is not worse than it has been at some other times. I do not know whether I am right, but I am accustomed to think that conversational English must have been very badly degraded, perhaps even worse than now, at the time of the Commonwealth,—the degradation having begun in Elizabeth's reign,—and that it actually invaded literature. Then at the Restoration I suppose there was a conscious amendment and recovery. My chief motive in writing my essay was to arouse some such conscious reform at the present time; and it may be that my activity is only a sign that such a conscious reform is actually taking place. A friend told me to-day that he remembered learning out of a book which gave *Engine* and *Indian*[1] [Inʒm] in its list of homophones: and I do not think that this would be allowed now. Still my protest *against the conversational style becoming established as 'correct' by the phoneticians*, is against a new kind of danger peculiar to our day. To indicate the sort of thing that I protest against I will take a very mild and harmless example.

The original termination of a large group of our past participles is *ed*; but we almost always

[1] 'An Injerrubber idiot on the spree.' Kipling. Why not *ijjut*?

pronounce this *ed* as *id*: and this *id* has, I should suppose, probably been *the conversational if not the most generally received pronunciation in unbroken use from Chaucer's time*,—Wyclif and Purvey both write *id*;—and yet we still always sing *ed*, and if a clergyman reciting the creed were to say very distinctly 'Ascendid into heaven' he would be thought rather cocknified, or at least to have a vulgar way of speaking. Now I should protest against *id* being adopted into our *literary* spelling: there is no fear of our people saying *ed* too much, and to print *id* would destroy the existence of *ed* which is apparently still in the same condition as it was five or six hundred years ago. I wish it to remain as it was and is. The reason why *id* is said for *ed* is that it is a slighter sound: it is on account of its lightness that this short *i* creeps into so many terminals (Delligits) and other unaccented syllables: and it is for this invasive quality that it has to be consciously resisted. It is a great advantage to have *ed* as the recognised correct termination, not only for singing but for all the purposes of Mr. Jones' style A.

My attitude towards this example will show sufficiently what I mean in most other cases: and my contention here will probably be approved by most readers. I will now give a more important and difficult example.

The suffix *-ation*, which used to be pronounced as three syllables with a long vowel in the last, has

been most conveniently shortened by use, the *t* having become palatized, so that our phoneticians justly enough represent it as *-shən* or *-sh·n*. I would contend (see p. 28) that this termination should still be written with an *i*, and taught to be pronounced so that the *i* is still heard. I admit that strictly this may be called unscientific, and that it will appear quixotic. I must therefore explain myself.[1]

First why is it unscientific? Roughly speaking one may say that it was the change of the *t* into *sh* which got rid of the *i*: therefore it is unscientific and absurd to propose to pronounce both the *sh* and the *i*.

[1] I would point out that this question of how *-ation* should be *spelt* does not affect any scheme of 'simplified spelling': for I find that the more sensible advocates of simplified spelling agree with me that this termination should continue to be spelt as at present, and have its pronunciation explained in the grammars, on the principle given at p. 63.

I am arguing in the text that the old spelling should to some extent (as given in my script) be retained also in any full phonetic script made for educational purposes.

I do not suppose that the pronunciation which I urge in the text would have any chance of being accepted by the phoneticians, because, as I say elsewhere, they take the maximum of degeneration for their general rule: and though they have lately come to admit that there is a good deal to be said for the other more conservative method, yet I doubt if they would yield on this particular point. I do not the less feel it my duty to defend this outpost; and I wish to show the probable effect of deserting it. And I consider my position as logical and irrefutable unless the premisses can be overthrown.

This is the objection that I have to meet: but first I would point out that I do not propose to retain or introduce a full *i*, but merely a just audible glide, which, though it is a delicacy of speech, offers no difficulty[1]: and also that it is not essential to my scheme that the glide should be heard equally in all words.

What then are my reasons? Suppose it be agreed that we do not object to the present pronunciation of *nation* (neysh·n), and that this word cannot be altered,—let us look to what this particular kind of contraction is introducing. The common expression *Don't you* is in the same condition as *-ation*, and most people say *dōn·tsheu* or *dōnchew*; and thus we have *neycher* for *nature*, *Cheusdy* and *Choosdy* for *Tuesday*, while *chiune* for *tune* is a good example of the wedge caught in the act of inserting its thin end. There is no exact place where this process has arrived, or at which it can be said to have stayed: it is still active, and some words are still in the uncertain condition half way between two different pronunciations. For instance in the Oxford Dictionary the word *pressure* has two alternative pronunciations given for it, namely *presshiur* and

[1] The word *prescience* is an example of the sound which will be familiar to everyone. The pronunciation of it given in the Oxford Dictionary is *preeshience*. This last spelling, and others that follow in the text, are sufficient translations into common spelling of the phonetic given in the dictionary, which the reader could not interpret without the key.

pressher. The word *creature* is in the same shifting form, and has its two pronunciations recognised in the dictionary, viz. *creetiur* and *creetsher* (= *creacher*). Again the word *issue* (like *pressure*) confirms my contention that *sh* does not practically forbid *i*, for *issue* is given in two forms of speech, viz. *isshiu* and *issiu*.[1] It is plain from these examples that my description of the present activity of the degradation is true, and it appears to me that, unless some conscious check is applied, *pressher* and *creacher* will drive out *presshiur* and *creetiur*: and it is a FACT that our phoneticians already assume that prevalence. If this be allowed to go on, we shall soon arrive at vulgarisms that we now think incredible. But pronunciations which we now speak would have similarly sounded vulgar to our forefathers. In such a sentence as *You would not let your own children do that*, many educated people already say *letchyerown*: and wherever the interjectional *you know* follows an accented *t* or *d* we may expect *palatizing*: thus *It's getting late you know*, will be *leytcherno*, and *bad you know* will be *badjerno*. I should say that the common *I'll let you know* already wavers between *letchuno* and *letcherno*.[2]

[1] These words *prescience*, *pressure*, *creature* and *issue* are four test words that I took by chance. I looked up no others than these, so that if the dictionary be consistent it should abound with examples. *Fashion* is given as *fash-n*.

[2] I do not see that it is ridiculous or extreme to suppose that the vulgar *I'll beatcher* may become 'correct' for 'I'll beat you'. If I argue that on the analogy of *to* [*tu*] becoming *ter* then *you* [*yu*]

A professor of English talking to me the other day in St. John's Garden said *audjins* or *orgins* for *audience*; and when I immediately made a pencil note of it, he wondered what I was doing, and when I told him, he denied that he could possibly have said it. And it follows that if our English is to govern our pronunciation of Latin, then *Tityre tu patulæ* promises to pass very quickly from the present scholar's

Tittəry tiu patiulee

to

Tittəry chew patchouli!

Again, allied to this, all words ending in *sia* are degrading through *shyer* to *sher*. For instance *Asia* and *Persia* are always spoken *Eysher* and *Persher*; and though these are examples of words which demand the observance of the *i* glide, I shall dismiss them here, because I have another kind of objection to make to them.

Now my contention is that we *must* stop this process of palatizing degradation somewhere: it might eventually discredit itself, and consciously

will become *yer*, the only objection is that *you* will be saved by its length. But it is not long in such a position. Moreover *your* is much longer, and is fully pronounced as if circumflexed (*yôur*), which *you* never is; and yet the example in the text shows that *your* has given way. What with *teacher* and *feacher* (feature), and *creecher* (creature) and *beatcher* the Superman will have more rimes to Nietzsche than he will really want.

pull up; but that would not be until it had attracted general observation, and become jocularly exaggerated in slang-talk. Why not then observe it and arrest it at a more decent stage? why not actually renounce some of its latest indecencies? Certainly we can still recognise that it is better to say *actually* than *akshuerly* or *akshuly*,—which last is perhaps already the commonest form—*Teusday* (sic) than *Choosdy* (which is most prevalent), *Natiur* than *Nacher*, *Christian* than *Chrischin*, and *righteous* (raiteus) than *raichus*: and if one is to make any attempt to rescue such half-lost words, it seems to me that the simplest and most practical plan is to preserve and recognise, however slightly, the *i* in all these *-ation* words: and although it may sometimes be a fiction, yet always to write it; even though in words like *nation* there is no professed intention to alter the present pronunciation.

In most of the *-ation* words the glide may well be used: then there are words like *Christian* which may be wholly saved, and thirdly words which might be amended, of which I would give *mission* as an example. And unless it be possible to draw a line to distinguish words which may be regarded as 'lost' from those which may yet be saved, the only plan is to write them all alike on the better model (as I should write *ed* for *id*), and hope that by doing this we should at least check the further advance of the corruption.

The chief difficulty lies in the prejudice which

everyone feels so strongly against that which is unaccustomed, and consequently appears affected in speech; and the superiority which learned and well-educated people assume when they patronise vulgar notions. Our slipshod speech has accustomed us to prefer the conversational forms as we hear and speak them every day: only a conscious effort can detach us from this, and that is resisted as a pedantry by those who should know better. And it must be granted that we cannot now arrive at speaking well unconsciously without passing through a selfconscious and therefore somewhat awkward or affected stage. We should be sacrificing ourselves somewhat for the benefit of our children: but if everyone who is sufficiently instructed to consider himself the steward of a priceless inheritance would do his best, he might do something, and console himself with the selfsatisfactions of altruism.

My phonetic way of writing *ation* on p. 30, viz. ατιvn or αçιvn, was not therefore intended to do more than indicate the peculiarity of the sound, leaving the actual pronunciation of it open to competition. I have indicated the evil that has to be guarded against, and suggested my remedy. A better remedy would of course be better: but the essential thing is that it should plainly expose and call attention to the phonetic conditions.

My friend Dr. Menardos, our reader in Byzan-

tine Greek, was lecturing the other day on Φώτιος, and he naturally wished to pronounce his name properly, and nothing could have come easier to him: but he had another natural wish, and that was to do at Oxford as the Oxford men do, namely to say *Phoshyus* or *Phoshus*, which he managed pretty well. Now what was the use of this inconvenient ugliness?

I now return to *Asia* and *Persia*, and wish to say something for them versus *Eysher* and *Pershe*r. The question of the loss of the *i* is much the same here as in the *-ation* examples, but they are also pure examples of the *er* invasion: and on p. 32 I stated in a note that I wished and hoped that the *a* in *idea* might be pronounced as a Latin A, and not as *er* (ə), and I gave *Auguster* and *Ameriker* as parallel cases.

Now keeping the I in *Asia* and *Persia* will go hand in hand with restoring the A, which last is æsthetically necessary, and a very good and simple example of cultivated articulation. Why should we degrade all the beautiful names which we have taken over, or even coined in imitation of beautiful speech? names like *Arabia*, *India*, *Siberia*, *Mongolia*, *Russia*, *Australia*, *Roumania*, *Bulgaria*, *Algeria*, *Nubia*, *California*, *Georgia*, *Tasmania* and many more? And with them other final A's must be observed, *China*, *Java*, *Africa*, *Canada*, *Alaska*, *Florida*, *Sumatra*, etc. etc. And is it not really rather funny that we should take pleasure in choosing well-sounding

names for our children, like *Julia* or *Celia*, and be punctilious about their spelling, and yet speak them *Julyer* and *Seelyer* like the nursery-maids in 'Punch': and while the house resounds with the vulgarised appellations, resent the slightest insinuation that there is anything wrong: as if the child's name was not the sound by which it was called but the way in which it should be written on envelopes. In some kinds of literature it is not uncommon to distinguish the talk of uneducated people by phonetic spellings even where these have no significance. Thus if an illiterate man is speaking he may be represented as saying *hiz* and *iz* while if a 'gent' speaks it will be with *his* and *is*, though both speakers would pronounce these words in the same way. *Julia* is in the same box with *his*, and this queer flattery to the pride of 'superior education' neatly reveals the whole vanity of it.

Thus the beautiful name *Bel-amy* is degraded by us to *Bellermy*, and we discard the lovely *Himâ-lă-ya* to say *Himmerleyer*!

I think that my critic who said that I had *er* on the brain may be right, for I seem to find it everywhere. Of course in any language there must be one termination which is commoner than others, and if *er* were a beautiful sound one might rejoice at its frequency, or even seek to extend it; but it is not only too common, but also slipshoddy, and is ousting better sounds. I once wrote 34 *ers* in 14 lines of verse, which contained 200 syllables,

and that is perhaps a record: I did not see how to avoid them except at the sacrifice of the direct speech which was essential to the force of the passage.

This *er* is a frequent termination of many of our commonest nouns, *father, mother, brother, sister, summer, winter, river, finger, manner, gender, fever, anger, paper*, etc. etc. (which we call *etcetterer*). The pronoun *her*, and the prepositions *over* and *under* are omnipresent, as are *neither, either, other, another, together*, and many common adjectives, as *clever, tender*. Then it is the inflection of all adjectives in the comparative degree, as *larger, smaller, better*; and of all agents, as *butcher, baker, and candlestick maker*; and here it has a field of unlimited extent, since there is no verb to which it cannot be attached to make a noun denoting the agent.

In this last department it is recognised by commonsense as a foolish thing, and has therefore been deliberately adopted into slang in order to render speech comic; and mock roots are extracted from ordinary words and phrases, and made to take the inevitable *er* as suffix. Thus with undergraduates Football is *Footer*, Rugby Football is *Rugger*, Association football is *Socker*: a Magazine is a *Magger*: and though this fashion recently had the vogue of novelty, yet any list of these slang terms would contain many old ones among the new, as will be seen in these: *Rotter, Masher, Bounder, Topper, Fiver, Tanner, Peeler, Growler, Shocker, Macker, Gaffer,*

Buffer, Josser, Ripper, Nipper, Bonner.[1] A schoolgirl with a pigtail is now a *Flapper*, and 'viva voce in divinity' is *Vivers in divvers*. A professor of the humanissimae of the humaniores told me that in this last expression the *ers* in *vivers* was a different vowel from the *ers* in *divvers*; and he thought my ear very defective not to detect this delicacy; which shows how *er* can be said with the conviction that you are speaking the Latin *a*: and people who say *Afriker* really think that they say *Africa*, because they visualise the *a*.

There are no doubt different ways of pronouncing this short *er* of *danger*, and it should be made the best of. I cannot say that it may not eventually make some approach to the Latin A. If *Magger* (Magazine) should return to its older form *Maga*, it might assimilate its pronunciation to *Saga*. Professor Wright tells me that if we would only give up our prejudices and heartily accept *taib-l* for *teyb-l* (table), we should soon arrive through *taeb-l* to the old English *tabb-l* with the broad Latin A. *Lab-idy* and *gab-itz* are spoken now in London for *lady* and *gates*. But as for the unaccented short *er* (ə) I am disposed to defend the *er* spelling, because if we made a simple vowel of it we should lose the very convenient lurking trilled R which comes out in pronunciation before a vowel: as when we say 'the

[1] The memory of the bloody bishop and his bone-fires comes thus into a strange association with St. Guy Fawkes.

dangeR of folly'. I should object very strongly to the affected and really mincingly difficult

dangə əv folly

with which we are threatened: for if this became our spelling (in educational phonetics) it would soon be as vulgar to pronounce the R before a vowel as it used to be to say,

VictoriaR our Queen and Governour,

which was frequently heard in the Church prayers. People already say *faw it* and *faw us* instead of *fôrrit* and *fôrrus* (*for it, for us*), and I should myself wish for *forrhim* and *forrher* in preference to *faw him* and *faw her*. Moreover, I should like to believe that the untrilled r does actually represent the voicing of the lost trill of the full R, and remains as a vestige. If that were so, then the truncated form r, without its curve and tail, pictures it well to the eye. The sound that I mean is exaggerated and heard very plainly in the Gloucestershire way of saying such a word as *father*, which one might depict thus *fâtherrr*. Again in such words as *glory* there is a sound heard between the *o* and the R which is very like the remnant of the R in *thorn*; and if this were recognised it would distinguish the pronunciation of words like *lawn* and *lorn*. But I find that experts do not agree with me here, so that I suppose I must be wrong.

These remarks about *er* are rather intrusive; but I hope that they may help my contention for pro-

nouncing the Latin final A in words where it is proper; and I also think that the A might help to keep the I in the IA terminations, which are in great danger, if not already lost.

APPENDIX D

ÆSTHETIC FORMS

It was objected to my script that it is not practicable, that is, that it is not calculated to provide a good cursive, chiefly because the forms of the letters are too elaborate to write easily.

At the invention of printing, when a type had to be designed to suit the mechanical conditions, the forms of the letters were modelled on those of the best Manuscripts, which were so beautiful that the new art despaired of rivalling them. This æsthetic standard was soon lost sight of, and utilitarianism gradually arrived at our 19th century printing.

The relations of handwriting and printing are now reversed; so that it is common to say in praise of a man who writes a good hand that 'it is as good as print'. Though this is intended only of the legibility,—and little else is ever thought of,—it unconsciously betrays the revolution of our ideals; namely that the degraded printing is now

held superior to the writing, whereas when printing was more beautiful, the writing was its model.

Now when I showed my alphabet in an æsthetic writing on the old model,[1] I was writing as the scribes wrote before printing was invented; and I knew that any printer's type modelled on such a manuscript would have to be much adapted; nor did I suppose that it was convenient for a flowing cursive hand. And when I took the Anglosaxon type for the printing, it was not that such a fount was exactly what I wanted, but that the more modern types are so degraded that they gave the æsthetic quality of my alphabet no chance of exhibiting itself. This Anglosaxon type was, as I said, merely the best for my purpose that I could find at the Press. And anyone can see what its value was for my purpose; for after reading the passage printed in it on p. 34, when the eye returns to the text of the Essay, the meanness of the common type comes as a surprise.

It would seem an ignorant and contemptible objection to an alphabet that its best forms need degradation before they can be adapted to the commonest uses. And the objection to the Anglosaxon fount, that one could not write it, can very easily be shown to be captious: for you may take the common type of our newspapers and ask, for instance, whether the g is a convenient letter to

[1] In a facsimile of Mr. Ed. Johnston's hand. See Plate No. 1 with description in this edition (p. 75).

write. Since it lacks both beauty and economy whether for printing or writing, it is strange that utilitarianism should have produced it: but, elaborate as it is, it has a fluent cursive form; that is, a scribe can make a letter sufficiently like it and easily written in one stroke.

The first duty of man in making a new alphabet is to make a good one, and he may leave it for use to modify it. I meet my objectors here by offering some samples of my script written quickly. They are not above criticism; but they are one step nearer what is asked for, and will at least meet the objection that the differences which distinguish certain letters could not be observed in a cursive hand.

The really serious objection to any change in our spelling is, I believe, not sufficiently seen. We now read our handwriting by word-units and not by letters; and we recognise the units on the basis of the current universal spelling. *If once that spelling be interfered with, then all our handwriting will become illegible*: and we shall have to form our letters carefully, and attend to each letter in reading. It is in my opinion impossible to overestimate the immediate practical inconvenience of this; and so short a statement of it may escape attention.

This inconvenience would gradually disappear as we became accustomed to recognise the new spelling, and its new phonetic combinations of letters; which use and practice would accommodate with scribal

forms of ligature recognisable at first glance: but it would take some time to get over the change,—at least one generation would find it difficult to read their children's writing,—and in the meanwhile the only compensation would be that we should all learn to write, that is to form our letters instead of sketching our words. But there is a corollary which promises also another compensation; for if manuscripts should ever again become beautiful, then our new reproductive processes, by which we can multiply any manuscript in facsimile and cheaply, and to almost any number, would give us a new kind of book, much superior to what utilitarian printing has given us: and the works of our best writers might be in a worthy dress, and some of them even autographic. An author's handwriting might come to be reckoned among his other distinctive excellences, inseparable from his style. Manuscript has a hundred subtleties of expression denied to printing, and such resources of formal beauty, that there are ample materials for a new art in European writing.

APPENDIX E

SIMPLIFIED SPELLING AND PHONETICS

A VERY little consideration should convince anyone that any system of writing English phonetically would have to be very much modified before it could be adapted as the basis of a practical simplified spelling. That is, a useful simplified spelling must renounce many distinctions in pronunciation which a consistent phonetic spelling is bound to observe.

For instance, the article *the* is pronounced differently before a vowel and before a consonant: but no one would suggest that, in our ordinary writing or printing, the word should be differently spelt in these positions. The word would be written the same in all cases, and the rule for its pronunciation would be given and explained in the grammars.

Again, the sibilant which makes all our plurals and genitives is sometimes pronounced *s* sometimes *z*: but I should not propose to make a corresponding distinction in our literary spelling. It is always spoken correctly just because the varying pronunciation follows phonetic laws, which we unconsciously observe, and which would be tabulated in the grammars.

So again terminations which are common to many words would have their old form and recognised pronunciation.

I have come to no decision on the practical questions that such a reform of common spelling raises: except that I believe it would be absolutely necessary to have some new symbols. But since it was doubtless in my mind that some of my new symbols would be useful for this purpose, I unconsciously led many of my readers to suppose that I imagined that all English writing and printing should be in the full phonetic of my printed examples.

The examples that I now give of a cursive hand using some of my symbols will show the sort of use which I supposed could be made of them for common use.

The obstacle to simplified spelling is this: It is necessary to have some new symbols, and there is a real inconvenience in extending the alphabet. An easement of this difficulty appears in the fact that some of our present letters are phonetically useless, and if they were discarded from the lower case to make room for the new symbols, we should not need to increase very greatly the present number of letters for the purposes of simplified spelling. But on the other hand we cannot discard our phonetic duplicates, the scientifically unnecessary letters, without intolerably disfiguring the spelling of a great many words. It seems to me that most prejudices can be best overcome by gradual steps, and that simplified spelling is a fair field for experiment. If we were really free agents and might spell as we chose for a few years, then

I think we should soon evolve something satisfactory.

If all editors and publishers, or even a moderate proportion of them, were to agree to omit the final E in all spellings where it was both useless and misleading, and to print for instance, *hav*, *giv*, *liv*, *infinitiv*, *lov*, instead of the present *have*, *give*, *live*, *infinitive*, *love*, everyone would be accustomed to it in a week or ten days, and would regard the old spellings as wrong, and ugly. The success of such a first step would remove the prejudice against all innovation, and would clear the way for other reforms.

At the cost of reiteration I will restate my position. I disliked the modern phonetic systems of printing English because they were æsthetically ugly, and their symbols often so far removed from our traditional spelling as to be out of relation with it, and unintelligible to persons who could read all the historic forms of our speech. Experts in phonetics told me that these unpleasant conditions were necessary and unavoidable: I maintained on the other hand that their awkwardnesses came chiefly from want of artistic feeling and of ingenuity, and that it was possible to invent a phonetic alphabet for English which should be pleasant to the artistic sense, and readable on the lines of our historic spelling, and moreover that such a scheme might *preserve the Romance value of the vowels*,—a matter of first importance—and that

it would also serve to check the progressive deterioration of our pronunciation, and even restore some lost distinctions of practical value.

My friends derided my contention, and thereupon, to demonstrate it, I made the alphabet given in the Essay.

With this task before me it will be plain that, for the purpose of competing with the other 'phonetics', I was bound to exhibit the actual sounds as nearly as my devised symbols would allow. This enabled me also to set my script alongside any other purely phonetic script, so that a reader might compare them and judge how far I had succeeded in my attempt.

It was not a matter of simplified spelling.

Now the reader may look at a piece of English in the International phonetic script, used by Mr. Daniel Jones, and see what happens to it, and what it looks like.

Then he can turn to my version of it, and see what English looks like if written phonetically on my system.

I was never foolish enough to suppose that I had at first brush hit off the final solution of so intricate and baffling a problem. But I claim that my system may offer hints for a method by which English could be written legibly and phonetically (as far as phonetics are desirable) *without* renouncing the time-honoured values of the ordinary symbols. In my alphabet the vowels are still

a, e, i, o, u, as in Latin and in all romance languages, instead of ey, i, ai, ow, yu—and if this result is accomplished it should be remembered that it was authoritatively pronounced impossible.

APPENDIX F

PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN

I HAVE long thought that if we would amend our English pronunciation, the most hopeful means that we have is to teach a sound pronunciation of Latin in our boys' schools. It would seem that we could not possibly have a simpler method. The Latin vowels are so well-marked and so few, and the result of pronouncing them correctly is so convincing, and the age of the pupils makes their task so easy, that one cannot imagine better conditions.

I seriously maintain that an educational system which *neglects* this opportunity of teaching the true elements of human speech to the young is condemned of utter incapacity.

The opponents of classical education would have had no case if Latin had been taught properly.

But though the change to what is called the 'classical pronunciation' has been nominally made in many schools, yet, except in the hands of two or three devoted enthusiasts, very little real

progress has been made: and it is disheartening to remember how long it is since Milton advised the same cure for the same evil.

For their Studies, First they should begin with the chief and necessary rules of some good Grammar, either that now us'd, or any better: and while this is doing, their speech is to be fashion'd to a distinct and clear pronuntiation, *as near as may be to the Italian, especially in the Vowels. For we Englishmen . . . . are observ'd by all other Nations to speak exceeding close and inward: So that to smatter Latine with an English mouth, is as ill hearing as Law-French.*

The reason of the failure in our schools to-day is not only that so many of the old Foxes, who have lost their Tails, vaunt the advantages of being without them; but even those who can see the absurdity of speaking Latin as if it were English, think that the difference lies only in the pronunciation of the accented vowels, and in the value of some consonants: but these things give no difficulty, whereas the reform that needed all their attention to secure was the observance of the true vowel values in the *un*accented syllables. They still speak with 'an English mouth'; so that their Latin in the 'classical pronunciation' is, in this respect, no more like Latin than it was with the English pronunciation: the result being, as Milton says, as absurd in Latin as it is in French.

I will not enter into this question here beyond making my protest against this incompetent and

useless half-and-half method: and urging those who are engaged in teaching Latin to acquaint themselves with the true conditions of the problem, as these will appear plainly enough from the remarks on English speech in my Essay. But I would add that I think it a pity that the English W should ever have been mentioned as the sound of the Latin consonantal U, which came ultimately to be pronounced as V. The English W is altogether too harsh a sound, and its introduction into Latin has done more than anything else to alienate the old-fashioned Latinists. No one would respect a French teacher who told him to pronounce *oui* as *wee*. This Latin U was no doubt a very much softer sound than our W, and a more beautiful sound.

If the English W is used for the Latin V, and at the same time the English way of pronouncing unaccented syllables be uncorrected, we get (Anglice) *wane-ŭ*, *weed-ŭ*, *week-ŭ*, for *veni*, *vidi*, *vici*: and in that queer form I have heard these familiar words urged as a demonstration of the propriety of the English pronunciation of Latin, in a commonsense appeal to the general fitness of things. And yet if Julius Cæsar were to walk into Balliol College, would the Master really accost him as *Seezer*? and if he wished to remind him of his famous brag, would he dare to say *Veenai*, *vaidai*, *vaisai*? If he did, it is to be feared that even the magnificent intelligence of his guest would

altogether fail to identify the allusion: whereas his *waney*, *weedy*, *weeky* would most likely be generously passed as a barbarian's attempt to speak Roman: just as a Frenchman can recognise *wee* but never *vai* for *oui*.

Cannot the Psychical Society set its mysterious agency to work and secure an appeal unto Cæsar, and give us some firsthand information?

It is impossible to come to terms with the Anglicised scholastic mind. Another scholar of my generation wrote to the 'Times' on the occasion of the celebration of the foundation of St. Andrews University last year, objecting to the word Quincentenary. Since he allowed Bicentenary and Tercentenary, it was assumed by the University that he objected to the *c* and wished for a *g*, and they apologized, admitting that Quingentenary would have been better. But what is the state of the case? The Latins having got *quin* for 5 (*quinque*, quinquetus, quinctus, quin-tus), said *quincentum* pronouncing the *c* hard (quinkentum), but then, finding that in speech *quincentum* became *quingentum* (the mid-syllables being pronounced like our *Kent* and *Ghent*), they had the good sense to write what they spoke. But we say *Quinsentenary*; and why an *s* should in English be changed into a *dj*, as these scholars proposed, because *k* became *gh* in Latin after an *n* is unthinkable. *Centenary* is an English word, and words that have been taken over into English with their consonants and vowels changed

in the process cannot follow laws of Latin speech. A more phonetic spelling of English would dissipate these delusions. One can imagine that those who have written maccaroni rhymes may feel injured by having their little game threatened: Swift's *bite 'em* and *infinitum* is an example: but it is probable that these treasures of our literature would not only hold their own, but might even appear more comic if their absurdity and barbarism were more fully exposed. Latin words on the border-line, that is, not wholly Anglicised but yet in fairly common use, would be in the worst condition: but even they could be left to adjust themselves; and it would be an advantage to have the principles of adjustment fixed, and to distinguish between English and Latin.

The result of an Eton and Oxford education may be illustrated in the attitude of another contemporary of mine, who was a firstrate scholar in modern languages. He was immovable, not only in his conviction of the propriety of speaking Latin as English, but in his preference for the Victorian spelling of English. He would read Chaucer only in modern spelling, and contended that English of all dates should be reduced to a uniform spelling. When I reasoned with him and asked him whether he would make a like rule for French, and whether he would consent to read *Le Roman de la Rose*, for instance, in modern spelling, he replied that that was *quite a different thing*.

APPENDIX G

ELIZABETHAN PRONUNCIATION

In the transcription of the passage from Shakespeare on p. 34 I have given a friend's version of the pronunciation. It may be taken as learned and orthodox, but he pleaded that the conditions make any reproduction of the pronunciation in Shakespeare's time very doubtful.

On this subject I have myself no special knowledge, and no right to speak; nor do I wish to enter into any discussion of it: but I have a scruple in letting even this short transcript pass under my name without recording my conviction that English philological phoneticians much exaggerate the differences between our modern and older pronunciations: so that I believe that the common modern way of reading Shakespeare's plays has, in some essentials, more likeness to the actual speech of his time, than most of the learned reconstitutions which our antiquarians offer us.

For instance, in my transcript the common word *one* is given to be pronounced like *own*. Now in Tyndall's version of the Gospels 1526 this word is most frequently spelt *won*. Thus

> ... rather then he shulde offende won off this litle wons.

The spelling *one* also occurs, but my impression is that *won* is much the commoner. The positive evidence for a recognised pronunciation *won* is of course decisive.

Again Wace, who wrote, I believe, in the twelfth century, transliterates *Thorney* (Abbey) and *Thorn* into Norman French as *Zonee* and *Zon*,[1] exactly as a Frenchman would now: and, unless this can be explained away, it seems to me wrong to assert that our untrilled R is very modern. I see no escape from the conclusion that *thorn* was pronounced in London in the twelfth century very much as it is now: and yet I suppose the experts would put a trilled R into Shakespeare's *thorn*.

Again, in William Stone's 'Classical Metres in English Verse' I find that in the discussion between Dr. Gabriel Harvey and Edmund Spenser concerning the rules of a classical prosody, the second syllable of the word *carpenter* was taken as an example of a word in which 'position', as shown by spelling, did not lengthen a syllable: that is, Harvey ruled the second syllable in *carpenter* to be short. Now William Stone found exactly the same trouble: the cause being that the E is not pronounced, the liquid N serving for the vowel: and the natural conclusion from this and the preceding remark is that Shakespeare pronounced

[1] I pointed this out in my 'Milton's Prosody' in 1893. No one has thought it worth accounting for. It seems to be regarded as an unfortunate exception to an established law.

carpenter in such a way as to be undistinguishable from our version of it.

If my opinion given on p. 46 (and I have seen much evidence for it) is correct, that English pronunciation in Elizabeth's time was very actively degrading; then, it would seem to me, there is a strong case against the versions of Shakespeare's pronunciation which experts give us: and I am disposed to think that the unpopularity of their scholarship is greatly due to a commonsense prejudice, which I have always shared, against their results.

APPENDIX H

ILLUSTRATIONS

THREE plates follow: the first is in the full phonetic of the alphabet given on p. 24: the second and third show the alphabet used in simplified spelling. The description of the plates is as follows:

PLATE I. This is a specimen of Mr. Edward Johnston's calligraphy, reduced to about one-fourth of its original linear measurements, being 29 to 39. The reduction was necessitated by the size of this volume. It is a transcript of seven lines from my quantitive hexameter paraphrase of Virgil (Æn. vi.

703), together with two epigrams. These were chosen in order to take advantage of the opportunity of exhibiting the classical prosody in phonetics.

This plate shows my alphabet in the script in which it was first designed: but since the scribe has inadvertently altered the original tail-curve of the long English i (= ai), I have shown a correct example of it by insetting the word *bright*, cut out of an earlier MS. by him. This contains the original form of the letter.

PLATE II. This is an example in my own hand of the result of adapting my alphabet to simplified spelling. It is in a careful court-hand, and, though not very well executed, will sufficiently exhibit the effect of such writing to the eye and intelligence.

PLATE III. This shows the same passage as the last plate, but written in a flowing quick cursive. This was obtained by making three copies quickly with different pens and cutting out a paragraph from each of them.

About the spelling in these Plates II and III, I have not any decided opinion as to what conventions are actually desirable in simplified spelling. Some of the problems have several solutions, and the adoption of any one definite solution of any one problem affects and limits the possibilities in the solution of other problems. In these examples I have kept our doubled letters as showing accented short vowels: and the reader will observe other

points, as the doubled final s in happiness. I only wish to say that I do not consider my spellings as necessarily the best solutions, though I am inclined to use them; but I think that, whatever conventions were adopted for convenience, the whole result would be approximately equivalent to my example in the *amount* of difference from our present way of writing.

Oxford: Horace Hart, Printer to the University

On the levl busm ov this ve
grow, an' amid quiverin pop
LETHE's dreemy river throo
wharbi nau flited in vast swa
as when in erly simer hiny-b
pill the blosms, hirryin tu an'
revisitin the ravisht lily-c

Epitaph

When thau mi belvved dieds
And al erthly delit inhabitin

another

Fiht well mi comrads, and p
GOD cal'd aut, bvt crown'd a

l mor thickly the tal trees
ars & whisperin alders
peeçful sçeenery wyndech:
brms meny peep'l ov al lands,
ees on a flavery pastur
fro, innumerus ar they
ps & al the medow hvmms.

st, I saw hev'n op'n,
g Paradys.

prov yur bravery; met too
rly befor the batl.

amung the bizy I hav thut esily tu distin-
guish men who ar fulfillin their own natur
from thos who ar occupi'd in the acomplish-
ment of impos'd tasks: even tho the most
wil com hartily tu lik whatever they hav
lern'd tu do well. Conzenial plehur is
complect happines, & its tranquil enthu-
siasm & indifferenz tu opinion ar almost
a nobility of mind & provok as much ad-
miration. He too who getteth most de-
lit from his own pursuit wil be best abl
tu feel sympathy with anothers, & reedin
nun himself wil be a most zenerus com-
panion. Still may a narrow natur
thus enrapt reddily grow selfish & pedan-
tic: but tu luk for imeediat aplaus is nun
sin that it is undeserv'd; & the best ar
suspicius of it, & sav in the feeld of action
wil deem that they must hav miss'd in sum-
thin tu be so unadvizedly comprehended.

among the busy I have thought easily to distinguish men who are fulfilling their own nature from those who are occupied in the accomplishment of imposed tasks: even tho' the most will own heartily to life whatever they have learnd to do well. Conscious pleasure is compleat happiness, & is tranquil enthusiasm

[enthusiasm] & indifference to opinion is almost a nobility of mind & provoke as much admiration. He too who getteth most delight from his own pursuit will be best able to feel sympathy with readers & reading are himself will be a most generous companion.

Still may a narrow nature thus enrapt readily grow selfish & pedantic: but to look for immediate applause is sure sign that it is undeserved, & the best are suspicious of it, & saw in the field of action will deem that they most have miss'd in something to be so crudely comprehended——

amon the bizy I hav thut esily tu distin-
guish men who ar fulfillin their own natur
from thos who ar occupi'd in the acomplish-
ment of impos'd tasks: even tho the most
wil com hartily tu lik whatever they hav
lern'd tu do well. Conzenial plehur is
complect happines, & its tranquil enthu-
siasm & indifferenc tu opinion ar almost
a nobility of mind & provok as much ad-
miration. Hee too who getteth most de-
lit from his own pursuit wil be best ab-l
tu feel sympathy with anothers, & reedin
nun himself wil be a most zenerus com-
panion. Still may a narrow natur
thus enrapt reddily grow selfish & pedan-
tic: but tu luk for imeediat aplaus is nun
sin that it is undeserv'd; & the best ar
suspicius of it, & saw in the feeld of action
wil deem that they must hav miss'd in nun-
thin tu be so unadvizedly comprehended.

among the busy I have chiefly to distinguish men who are fulfilling their own nature from those who are occupied in the accomplishment of imposed tasks: even tho' the most will come hastily to like whatever they have learnd to do well. Connected pleasure is compleat happiness, & in tranquil contemplation

[contemplation] & indifference to opinion is almost a nobility of mind & provoks as much admiration. He too who getteth most delight from his own pursuit will be best able to feel sympathy with teachers & reading on himself will be a most generous companion.

Still may a narrow nature thus enwrapt readily grow selfish & pedantic: but to look for immediate applause is sure sign that it is undeserved, & the lost or suspicious of it, & saw in the field of action will deem that they must have miss'd in something to be so crudely comprehended——