

silent letters, and invented new characters to represent sounds not now associated with a separate letter. They struck at the roots of the difficulties, but in a way which neither scholars nor populace would accept; scholars, because it destroyed the history of the language, and the populace because it presented on the printed page a novel and forbidding appearance. They attempted the *right* thing but in a *wrong* way, and hence their failure. This must necessarily have been so, for Phonological Science was not sufficiently matured for so revolutionary a step. Any system of simplification, however well developed, which introduces changes in the shape and appearance of the letters must meet the same fate, because men will never consent to a mutilation of the accepted language, which all see can result in nothing but confusion for a generation, perhaps generations to come.

II. The second mode of simplification is that which has been universally adopted in Lexicography and pronouncing gazetteers, and universally recognised as legitimate. It is the use of *diacritical notation*. But when we say this, we do not intend at all to approve the complex, cumbrous, and incomplete systems of notation now in use.

Here, too, we see the *right* thing attempted but in the *wrong* way. In the systems of notation now used the trouble is this; the marks do not represent sounds but only relations, and the same marks are often used with different forces. The question then arises how can we obviate the cumbrousness and complexity of present systems of notation? The answer is simple. Its solution is gotten from the failure of Phoneticians. The principle of Phonetic notation is a good one. Phoneticians failed because they applied this good principle in a way which men would not accept. Let the marks be *Phonetic* and the whole question becomes simple. Let the same mark, in similar usage, represent the same sound, irrespective of the letter with which it is used, and we get all the advantages of the Phonetic system without its disadvantages. The marks will thus perfectly represent the forces of letters.

But in order to simplify the use of such a system of notation it is well not merely to represent the forces of letters, but also by forming a Phonetic Alphabet to adapt the Alphabet to Phonetics as well as Phonetics to the language.

The true theory of a perfect Alphabet requires that there should be one and but one representative of every sound of the language. This will apply perfectly to the vowels since the sign is the sound irrespective of the letter with which it is used. By placing the sign below consonants and above vowels, a double usage is gained, whereby the same simple signs may be used with both classes of letters without confusion. A single dot placed under any letter shows that it is silent, simple links connecting two letters which together represent one sound, and marks to indicate secondary sounds of consonants are all that are needed.

Then so soon as the Phonetic Alphabet is mastered, the ear will give the sound, whilst the eye learns the word as it appears on the page. The marks constitute so small a part of the word that the eye soon learns the word whether with or without the mark.

The vowel sounds in unaccented syllables may thus be easily represented by using the same sign as in accented syllables, making it in outline, i.e., with a hollow type, whenever there is a slight change of quality as well as quantity caused by rapidity of utterance. When there is no change of quality but only of quantity the absence of accent will sufficiently indicate the pronunciation with the full sign. The application of these principles are seen in the table at the end of this article. I need only call attention to the mode of simplification by an illustration. In the words *lip*, *been*, *busy*, and *women*, the same mark over the letters *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *w*, and *y*, indicates the same sound irrespective of the letters which it is used. Thus all the vowel sounds of the language are arranged in 19 classes. Only eight of the consonantal sounds have more than one regular representative. In four of these eight the sign represents the sound irrespective of the letter with which it is used. In the other four the letter invariably has the same sound; so that in learning by such a system of notation the difficulties of the learner are lessened just in the same way that the difficulty of counting the trees in an orchard are lessened, when the trees are planted in rows both ways, compared with that of counting the trees in a natural grove without arrangement.

The notation applies at once to every word in the language, giving the true pronunciation at a glance, whilst our dictionaries have to render a number of words on almost every page by equivalent spelling. It is so simple in itself and in its applications that it may be easily taught to a child, and so self-consistent and exact, that it completely removes the anomalies which so puzzle and astonish foreigners. The use of such a system of notation gives a premium to distinct articulation, enables the ear and eye mutually to assist each other in learning, and by striking at the root of the difficulties enables us to combine the different modes of teaching in a manner hitherto impossible.

In the representation of vowel sounds the marks may be made to do double, yea, even quadruple duty. Thus in every instance the mark represents the sound irrespective of the letter with which it is used: (2) its *shape*, the *class* of sounds to which it belongs, thus, straight and waved marks, represent *a* sounds; dots, *e* sounds; angles, *o* sounds; and curves, *u* sounds: (3) its *position* relative to the printed line, its quantity: and (4) the *corresponding long and short sounds* by the same sign in different positions. Add to these (5) a combination of elementary signs to represent diphthongal sounds: (6) hollow signs to indicate obscure sounds in unaccented syllables: (7) dots under silent letters: and (8) connecting links between two letters sounded together, and we see at a glance all the means used to produce simplicity, and their adaptability to indicate scientific relations of sounds now generally overlooked.

Such a system cannot but commend itself to educators, and prove of great utility in the school-room, in lexicography, in grammars of foreign languages, in representing the pronunciation of proper names in geography, in teaching foreigners our language, and in rendering practicable the publication of a pronouncing edition of the Bible.

JAMES W. SHEARER.

II. Miscellaneous.

1. CHANGES IN WORDS.

The exits and entrances of words must be constantly going on. Those who have lived through a generation or two must have noted how many have been introduced or have changed their ground in their own time. Allusions to their introductions and changes meet us constantly in our reading. Thus Banter, Mobb, Bully, Bubble, Sham, Shuffling, and Palming, were new words in the *Tatler's* day, who writes, "I have done my utmost for some years past to stop the progress of Mobb and Banter, but have been plainly borne down by numbers, and betrayed by those who promised to assist me." *Reconnoitre*, and other French terms of war, are ridiculed as innovations in the *Spectator*. *Skate* was a new word in Swift's day. "To skate, if you know what that means," he writes to Stella. "There is a new word coined within a few months," says Fuller, "called *fanatics*." Locke was accused of affectation in using *idea* instead of notion. "We have been obliged," says the *World*, "to adopt the word *police* from the French." Where we read in another number, "I assisted at the birth of that most significant word *flirtation*, which dropped from the most beautiful mouth in the world, and which has since received the sanction of our most accurate Laureate in one of his comedies." *Ignore* was once sacred to grand juries. "In the interest of" has been quoted in our time as a slang phrase just coming into meaning. *Bore* has wormed itself into polite use within the memory of man. *Wrinkle* is quietly growing into use in its secondary slang sense. *Muff* we have read from the pen of a grave lady, writing on a grave subject, to express her serious scorn. Most of these words are received as necessities into the language. Some, like "humbug," are still struggling into respectability. In the middle of the last century it was denounced as "the uncouth dialect of the Huns, the jabber of the Hottentots." Another writer puts it into the mouth of a party of giggling girls, who pronounce some one—whom he suspects to be himself—an *odious*, *horrible*, *detestable*, *shocking* humbug. "This last new-coined expression," he observes, "sounds absurd and disagreeable whenever it is pronounced; but from the mouth of a lady it is shocking, detestable, horrible, and odious." Yet so pointedly does it hit a blot in humanity, so necessary has it become to the vituperative element in our nature, that neither mankind nor womankind can do without it. The fastidious De Quincy is eloquent in its praise: "Yet neither is it any safe ground of absolute excommunication from the sanctities of literature, that a phrase is entirely the growth of the street. The word *humbug*, for instance, rests upon a rich and comprehensive basis; it cannot be rendered adequately either by German or by Greek, the two richest of human languages; and without this expressive word we should all be disarmed for one great case, continually recurrent, of social enormity. A vast mass of villany that cannot otherwise be reached by legal penalties, or brought within the rhetoric of scorn, would go at large with absolute impunity were it not through the Rhadamanthian aid of this virtuous and inexorable word."

And so words come in, so for no obvious reason they go out. Why has that excellent word "parts" become obsolete—

"The rest were rebels, but to show their parts?"

Why is "merry" quaint, and scarcely to be used in its best genial sense of friends in cheerful converse? And "gust" for "taste"—