

is the consequence? Why reading in the first stage was so delightful and easy a thing to him, that he taught himself to read romanically, and it would be a difficult matter to find one boy in twenty, of a corresponding age, that could read half so well as he can in any book." Am I not then under the mark, when I say that two years of school work in Canada are uselessly wasted, and worse than uselessly wasted in spelling.

But suppose some one thinks, "what is said is all true, but it would be a pity to spoil the etymology of our language." I shall then produce a greater authority than the thinker to settle his qualms. Max Müller, Professor of Sanskrit and comparative philology at Oxford, England, author of "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature," and of "The Science of Languages," shall speak: "An objection often made to spelling reform is that it would utterly destroy the historical or etymological character of the English language. Suppose it did. What then? Language is not made for scholars and etymologists, and if the whole race of English etymologists were really swept away by the introduction of spelling reform I hope they would be the first to rejoice in sacrificing themselves in so good a cause. But is it really the case that the historical continuity of the English language would be broken by the adoption of phonetic spelling, and that the profession of the Etymologist would be gone forever? I say no, most emphatically, to both propositions." On the same point, Professor Sayce, of Oxford, says: "We are told that to reform our alphabet would destroy the etymologies of our words. Ignorance is the cause of so rash a statement." Henry Sweet, President of the Philological Society, London, says: "The notion that the present spelling has an etymological value was quite popular twenty-five years ago, but this view is now entirely abandoned by philologists; only a few half-trained dabblers in the science uphold it." The regent of the "Illinois Industrial University," Gregory, puts it in this way: "Small men will still deery, and ignorant men will deplore the movement to improve English spelling, but it has within it the force of truth and the energy of a great want."

J. A. H. Murray, Past President of the Philological Society of England, and editor of the great Historical English Dictionary, the greatest compendium of English language lore ever projected, says: "The question of etymology was long ago settled and done with by philologists. It is pitiful to see an expression of Archbishop Trench—uttered, when English philology was in its prescientific babyhood, and scarcely anything was known of our language in its earlier stages save the outward forms in which it had come down to us in manuscript or print—quoted