

will not attempt to describe it. We have nearly all of us been lovers at one period of our lives—we know how we met the loved one after a temporary separation. 'Tis the old, old story once more repeated, and we will leave them to enjoy their happy meeting, merely saying that when Arthur left Adele it was with the understanding that he was to take the first train the next day for B—, his parting words being that "he would do all in his power to secure the liberation of Adele's mother."

(To be continued.)

SPELLING REFORM.

BY PROFESSOR FRANCIS A. MARCH, PH. D., LL.D.

[The following article is from the *Princeton Review* for January. It is reproduced in the exact spelling in which it appears in that work.—Eds.]

(CONCLUDED.)

On the whole, it may be safely said that the general change to fonetic spelling will not subject the etymological sagacity to any great hardship, or obscure any considerable facts of history. It may be a further comfort to those who are disquieted on this subject to remember that whatever is embodied in the old spelling is now safe enough in innumerable books. These will not be annihilated by any revolution in spelling. Scholars like nothing better than to hunt them up and give their secrets to the public, who may find them in the dictionaries. The past at least is secure.

The scholars proper have, in truth, lost all patience with the etymological objection. "Save us from such champions," say Professor Whitney, "they may be allowed to speak for themselves, since they know best their own infirmity of back and need of braces; the rest of the guild, however, will thank them for nothing." "If anybody will tell me," says Max Müller, "at what date etymological spelling is to begin, whether at 1500 A. D., or at 1000 A. D., or at 500 A. D., I am willing to discuss the question. Till then, I beg leave to say that etymological spelling would play greater havoc in English than fonetic spelling.... If we write puny *punny*, we might as well write *post-natus*. We might spell *coy quietus*; *pert*, *apertus*; *priest*, *presbyter*; *master*, *magister*; *sexton*, *sacristan*, etc."

Mr. Sweet, sometime President of the Philological Society of England, and the recognized chief of Anglo-Saxon scholars in that country, closes his remarks on this subject in his "Hand-book of Phonetics" in this wise: "The idea, too, that because etymology is an amusing and instructive pursuit, it should, therefore, be dragged into practical orthography, is about as reasonable as it would be to insist on every one having Macaulay's 'History of England' permanently chained round his neck because history is an improving study. In conclusion, it may be observed that it is mainly among the class of half-taught dabbles in filology that etymological spelling has found its supporters. All true filologists and filological bodies have truly denounced it as a monstrous absurdity, both from a practical and a scientific point of view."

Dr. Murray, President of the Philological Society, and editor of their great Historical Dictionary of the English Language, now about to be printed by the University of Oxford, says that there are some thousands of English words the spelling of which goes directly against the analogy of their history and derivation. "Every one will admit that these words ought certainly to be altered." The plea for our spelling as historical is, in his view, wholly a matter of feeling.

Professor Leunsbury, of Yale College, speaks of the reform as one "which numbers among its advocates every linguistic scholar of any eminence whatever, and which, in addition, includes every one who has made the scientific study of English a specialty."

It may be taken, then, as certain, and agreed by all whose judgment is entitled to consideration, that there are no sound arguments against fonetic spelling to be drawn from scientific and historical considerations. These all make in its favor. But suppose they did not. The prevailing interest in spelling is not to be found in historical or etymological considerations—a hundred etymologists, a million men and women. There never was a more unwholesome sentiment than that often attributed to Archbishop Trench, that it is unscholarly to yield the popular advantage of the student in the old spelling for the sake of the ignorant and uneducated, stigmatizing it most untruly as leveling down and not leveling up. That is not the way in which American scholars think or speak. "It is not worth while," says Professor Hadley, "for the benefit of scholars to impose a heavy burden upon the world at large." "It is much more an aristocratic luxury," says Professor Whitney, "than a popular benefit.... Such a satisfaction is a selfish one, and improperly and wrongly obtained if bought by a sacrifice of any measure of convenience or advantage to the great public of speakers and writers." Nor, in truth, is the language of Englishmen different. "If we can save the toiling multitude," says Sir Charles Bell, speaking of this matter at the London Conference, "we are bound to do it." And so Matthew Arnold, Dr. Angus, and the rest; and Professor Max Müller, who, whether he be German or English, knows how to write English

and express the thought of Englishmen; "Surely the loss of some historical and etymological sources would be little against the happiness of millions of children and the still higher happiness of millions of Englishmen and Englishwomen, growing up as the heirs to all the wealth and strength of English literature, or unable to read even their Bible."

There are practical objections to the reform, drawn from the inconvenience of so great a change. But there is nothing abstruse or appalling about them.

The spoken language is the product of man's social necessities, and is in great part the result of the unconscious working of his mind and organism. The great changes by which the sounds of a whole language are moved are brought about or modified by causes working often on the physical constitution of whole nations, which we know little of, and with which we could do little if we did know them. Peculiar changes of single words are tricked by whim. We may well shrink from the attempt to control spoken language. But the spelling, the written speech, is an altogether different matter; that is a contrivance, a set of tools, machinery to record and communicate the speech. The objections to change in it are the same in kind which meet the introduction of any improved machinery for common work, the sewing-machine, the type-writer, or the metric system of weights and measures. Everybody knows the old way, nobody knows the new. The new apparatus is at first imperfect and costly. The old must be mostly lost. Some powerful classes must be found who have an interest in pushing the improvement. Teachers and publishers are the natural supporters of spelling reform. The most irksome and fruitless labors of the teacher will be lightened. The publishers may hope to win in the new field of adventure in books. With them will be found the cultivators of social science and many of the leaders in church and state.

In the actual use of fonetic spelling there are several stages to be noticed. The first, as being the least obtrusive, is the revival of good old spellings, such as the past in *in* verbs like *wisht*, *trickt*, where the sound is that of *t*.

2. Next akin is the dropping of silent French endings, so as to bring the words near the Greek or Latin originals; the *-ue* of *programme*, the *-e* of *coquette*, *chiquette*, the *-ue* of *dialogue*, *catalogue*, and the like.

3. Then there are the three new words of the Spelling Reform Association and the eleven of the American Philological Association—*ac*, *entalep*, *definit*, *gard*, *gir*, *hac*, *ingait*, *lar*, *tha*, *thra*, *wisht*.

4. Then there are the "Five Rules" of the Spelling Reform Association.

(1.) Omit *a* from the digraph *ca* when pronounced as *e* short, as in *bed*, *helt*, etc. (2.) Omit silent *e* after a short vowel, as in *har*, *gic*, etc. (3.) Write *i* for *ph* in such words as *albat*, *fantom*, etc. (4.) When a word ends with a double letter, omit the last, as in *shal*, *clif*, *eg*, etc. (5.) Change *ed* final to *t* where it has the sound of *t*, as in *lush*, *impress*, etc.

5. Spelling with modified types on Dr. Leigh's plan. The ultimate alphabet of the Philological Association uses only three new types; but it requires much change of spelling. Modified types can be used in many publications in which the spelling cannot be changed.

6. Finally, pure fonetic spelling.

An important movement is going on in English in favor of an agreed spelling, purely fonetic, for scientific purposes primarily.

The National Association of Great Britain for the Promotion of Social Science had this matter before them in a paper by Professor Newman, read to the congress at Cheltenham, in October, 1878. It was referred to the Education Department, which raised a special committee upon it, who have given it much attention, and finally passed unanimously a resolution in favor of an alternative method of spelling. They say:

"Such an alternative method would be at once useful:—1st. For indicating the pronunciation of any word or name that may not be familiar to ordinary readers. 2d. For teaching the proper pronunciation of words in schools, and thus curing vulgarisms. 3d. For representing different dialects of individual peculiarities. 4th. For showing the pronunciation of foreign languages. This alternative method, if generally approved, would gradually become a concurrent method, and perhaps eventually would displace the present irregular spelling (just as the Arabic numerals have generally displaced the Roman numerals.) In the meantime it would serve to indicate the direction in which any partial reforms of the current spelling should be made."

The dropping of silent letters has had a much wider trial than the new types, and naturally: it costs nothing; it saves space and time. It has met with special favor from the craft, and has been tried in one way or another in most of their organs. The eleven words of the Philological Association are the favorite change. Many articles with letters dropped and other changes have appeared in the educational journals and in the correspondence of the popular newspapers. The "few rules" are often used in these, or still more extensive droppings. The eleven words do not occur often enough when one begins to drop. They are little more than a protest against the old spelling.

Fears of express least independent action will lead to the loss of all uniformity, to the introduction of all sorts of dialectic pronunciation into the literary speech, and to the destruction of literary property. Once given over to fonetic spellers, they say the written language and pro-

nunciation will change very few years and chaos will reign perpetual.

It has been seen, however, that the scholars formally recognize that there is and ought to be standard speech and standard writing. Fonetic spelling does not mean that every one is to write as he pronounces, or as he thinks that he pronounces. There are all sorts of people. We must have something else written than "confessions of provincials." Every literary language is an ideal. Nobody speaks it perfectly. "No man in Germany speaks German." The literary or standard language is a collection of the most of the best words and forms prevailingly spoken by the most of the best of the race.

A clear distinction is to be made between orthography and orthoepy. The work of the orthoepist is to observe the ways in which all sorts of people pronounce, and to decide which is the prevailing pronunciation of the most cultured—to decide which is the standard pronunciation. The orthographer tells how to represent this pronunciation in writing. Worcester, Webster, Walker, Phelps, or orthoepists. They have certainly many nice and difficult problems to solve. But the spelling reformers enter into their labors. They take for granted that there is a standard pronunciation. They wish to see it represented by simple and reasonable alphabetic signs. They have to do with writing, not pronunciation.

We are not to be left without a standard, nor are we in danger of a state of perpetual flux. On the contrary, fonetic printing will soon establish a fixed relation in the minds of the people between the written and spoken forms, so that each will steady and maintain the other.

It is, of course, desirable at such a time to concentrate as much authoritative action as possible upon the changes proposed by leading scholars. The reformers have accordingly proposed to add to the authority of the Philological Association whatever can be gained by government sanction. They petition Congress to move for a joint commission of the English-speaking nations to report upon the amendments.

As for loss of material by rendering books valueless, there is little to be feared and something to be hoped. The press teems always. Newspapers, periodicals, unbound lighter literature, pass away like dry leaves in the wind; books pass rapidly into tetracy. Change in spelling will hardly be rapid enough to quicken the movement very much. The old books could of course be red in the libraries, just as old books are now. The President of the Philological Association said in the annual address in 1874 that "it would be no small gain from such a movement that it would consign to scholars and bookworms a large mass of old books, and give the new generation a manageable selection of choice authors and, perhaps, produce a new era of creative energy in working over the old material into new forms. Something good would be sure to come from such a struggle for life." That is the hope.

There will, of course, be inconveniences. A language is not perfect, and no spelling will cure its defects. It is a defect, for example, that the same sound has different meanings, for we may not know sometimes which meaning is intended. If one says that he gave a boy a box, it may not be plain whether it was a Christmas-box or a box on the ear. This defect may be remedied in the written language by writing the word differently for each different meaning. The Chinese is written in that way, and English has many examples of it: *wholly*, *holly*, look quite different; *so*, *four*, *flower*; *sole*, *soul*; *wright*, *rite*, *right*, *write*. Whether this is a gain, on the whole, depends on whether the embarrassment caused by the ambiguity is greater than the trouble of learning the variant spellings and the exposure to using them wrongly. It may be agreed that *box* shall be written for a slap, *bocks* for the Christmas gifts, *bochs* for a hunting-seat, *boes* for a chest, *bechs* for the tree. Will the gain be greater than the loss of time in fixing all this in memory? One thing is clear: the learning of different spellings is long and hard work, and necessary. Every one would be sure to be puzzled by the distinctions a hundred times before he escaped his spelling lessons. One might not be puzzled in a lifetime by the ambiguity. The connection almost always makes the meaning plain, and when it does not a synonym of explanation is added, as teachers, in giving out such words to be spelt, mention the meaning of each. This is nothing strange; we have to define, limit, repeat all the time as we write, if we wish to be clear.

As soon as many persons will accept with indifference a considerable amount of amended spelling, a business of printing newspapers and general literature in it will be established. The removal of duplicate consonants saves 1.6 per cent. of silent *e*'s, 4 per cent. According to Mr. J. H. Gladstone, in the New Testament printed by Mr. Ellis in purely fonetic spelling, in 1849, 100 letters and spaces were redud to 83. Seventeen per cent. is a living advantage.

And so we shall go on. The change must come. No one wishes there should be no change. Language is everywhere and always changing. But many say: "Let the change be gradual as it has been heretofore." Let such remember how the world has changed in the last fifty years—how rapidly we communicate. What with our railroads and telegraphs and newspapers, and our societies with their meetings and conventions, a wider and more powerful concentration of the assent of thinking persons can be effected in a single summer than would have been possible in a hundred years three centuries ago. But the assent of thinking persons in all that is needed for this reform. Why should we not move on as far in a summer as the old folk did in a century?

Even as lately as two or three years ago the leaders in the present movement spoke out, mainly in behalf of future generations, and as a necessary utterance of their convictions as to the right and the desirable. Scholars seem to have a natural turn toward the fields of Giant Despair. They were pledged, moreover, to other work, and could give little more to this reform than assent and advice. But a great body of men of action seem now to be interested in it, and ready at least to urge inquiry and effort. A rising hum is heard all thru the press, the schools, and the centres of popular influence, which seems to herald a good time coming. The air is full of hope.

No More Hard Times.

If you will stop spending so much on fine clothes, rich food and style, buy good, healthy food, cheaper and better clothing; get more real and substantial things of life every way, and especially stop the foolish habit of employing expensive, quack doctors or using so much of the vile humbug medicine that does you only harm, but put your trust in that simple, pure remedy, Hop Bitters, that cures always at a trifling cost, and you will see good times and have good health. See another column.

OUR CHESS COLUMN.

Solutions to Problems sent in by Correspondents will be duly acknowledged.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

- J. W. S., Montreal.—Papers to hand. Thanks.
Student, Montreal.—Correct solution received of Problem No. 261.
Amicus, Montreal.—Solution received of Problem No. 261. Correct.
G. A. R., Ottawa.—Correct solution received of Problem No. 261.
T. S., St. Andrews, Manitoba.—Correct solution received of Problem No. 260; also of Problem for Young Players No. 257. Thanks for Problem enclosed.
H. R., Buffalo, U.S.—Postal card received. Will answer by post.
E. H.—Solution received of Problem for Young Players No. 259. Correct.
H. & J. McG., Cote des Neiges.—Correct solution received of Problem for Young Players No. 259.

We published a short time ago the prospectus of the Hamilton Correspondence Tourney. We are now enabled to insert the following notice which has been sent by the Conductor, Dr. Ryall, to each of the players taking part in the contest. We have only further to remark that the Tourney is now in operation and we commend each competitor to give heed to the important suggestions which have been so carefully, and at the same time so kindly prepared for his consideration.

THE HAMILTON CORRESPONDENCE TOURNAMENT.

The list for the Tourney now contains nineteen names which are six short of the number contemplated. As the entrance fees are all for prizes, a reduction in their value from that originally proposed must be made as follows: 1st prize, \$50; 2nd prize, \$25; 3rd prize, \$10; 4th prize, \$10; 5th prize, \$5. I would respectfully inform the players that nothing but a keen for our noble game could induce me to undertake the work of getting so many players to engage in a Correspondence Tourney, coupled with the fact that Mr. Shaw's Tourney has afforded great pleasure and satisfaction to all parties.

To render the present Tourney as agreeable as possible, at the same time, to be as strict as when playing over the board, I would impress upon you the desirability of taking great precaution in writing out your moves, let every player, before sending his move, make it a point to see that it is correctly written. With regard to Rule 4, I expect that no false delicacy will prevent any player from notifying me when delays occur in transmitting the moves. I would not like to act in an arbitrary manner on this rule, but on receiving these intimations of default, I would feel bound to enforce it. This rule is the only one I might have trouble with, and I can only carry it out by players giving me their hearty support.

The time limit of forty hours is more than sufficient; many moves can be answered by return mail, and I expect that no unnecessary delay will occur. There is nothing at all unnecessary apart should be as prompt as possible. I would also suggest that when several moves can be safely sent at one time (as in the opening of a game) advantage should be taken thereof. I would also request that when a game is manifestly lost to a player, he should not prolong it, and when it arrives at such a stage, I would be glad to have the position sent to me. I hope that the present undertaking will not prove of as arduous a nature as was anticipated by some of my friends, and that nothing more important will be required of me than to set the Tourney in motion. I can devote only a portion of my time to Chess, nevertheless I intend that the programme shall be carried out to the letter.

J. RYALL, Conductor,
Hamilton, Ont.

LIST OF PLAYERS.

1. Anderson, M. J., Allantown, Pa., U.S.
2. Boivin, C. A., St. Hyacinthe, P.Q.
3. Barque, Rev. Mr., do
4. Brathwaite, W., Unionville, Ont.
5. Cawson, J., St. John, N.B.
6. Ferris, W. J., New Castle, Delaware, U.S.
7. Forster, T. M., Lansing, Mich., U.S.
8. Henderson, J., Montreal, P.Q.
9. Hendricks, C. E., Charleston, S.C., U.S.
10. Hicks, W. H., Montreal, P.Q.
11. Judd, W. H., Hamilton, Ont.
12. Kitchin, H. N., Hamilton, Ont.
13. Mohle, C., Hoboken, N.J.
14. Narraway, J. E., St. John, N.B.
15. Robertson, T. C. N., Hamilton, Ont.
16. Rogers, D. C., Detroit, Mich., U.S.
17. Ryall, J., Hamilton, Ont.
18. Shaw, J. W., Montreal, P.Q.
19. Wyld, J. T., Halifax, N.S.

According to the *Glasgow Weekly Herald* the annual contest for the championship of the Glasgow Chess Club has just ended in favour of Mr. Sheriff Spens, who only lost two games out of ten played. The same gentleman carried off the first prize last year.

An important chess meeting is to take place shortly at Boston, Lincolnshire, Eng. Among the prizes to be played for is one offered by Mrs. Romington Wilson in memory of her late husband. Problems, or end game solution, competition, simultaneous and alternative games, and a billfold exhibition are to be part of the programme.