

and it makes *cow*; but add *l* to it, and it is *low*. *On* is *on*; and here again we are quite safe. But take one little—the very least step farther; and we are plunged into the middle of one of our south-western dialects. Add *e* to *on*; and it becomes *wun*. But put *all* in front of it, and it is revived; it recovers its ancient habit, and becomes the regular and respectable *alone*. But front it with a *g*, and it is *gone*; with a *d*, and it is *done*. *Ere* is *ere*; add *h*, and it is *here*; add *th*, and it is *there* again. *Yes* is *yes*; but place an *e* in front of it, and it becomes *eyes*. Such is the manner in which our language keeps faith with the expectations of the child; at every third word it alters its course—it perpetually ‘breaks the word of promise to the hope,’ because it can keep it neither with eye nor with ear.

He expects, moreover, that the letters should be a guide to him in the recognition of the word. A letter, too, he thinks, will always stand for one sound; and one sound will be represented on paper by only one letter. If a letter stands for several sounds, it will be in the confusing condition of the signal that may call for several things; if a sound is represented by several letters, then the second malformation attaching to a code of signals could be asserted of this procedure. But, if one letter stands for only one sound, and one sound is always represented by only one letter, the child gradually accustoms himself to associate the one with the other; his expe-