

hours! You may believe it or not, as you like, but I am confident that not more than that amount of time was spent on him, and that was in snatches of five minutes at a time, while tea was getting ready. I know you will be inclined to say! 'All that is very well, but what is the use of reading phonetic books?' He is still as far off, and may be farther from reading roman books.' But in this you are mistaken. Take another example, his next elder brother, a boy of six years, has had a phonetic education so far. What 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 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 to reform our alphabet would destroy the etymology 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 decry, 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 against the rational reconstruction of our spelling. But it is also unfair to Dr. Trench himself, who then stood so well in the front of philology, that we may be perfectly sure that if leisure had been given him to keep pace with the progress of the science, he would now have been second to no one as a spelling reformer. For philology has long since penetrated the mere drapery and grappled with the study of words 'not as dead marks,' but as living realities, and for these living realities it first of all demands, 'Write them as they are; give us facts and not fictions to handle.'

The late Professor Whitney, of Yale, says: "Of all forms of linguistic conservatism or purism, orthographic purism is the lowest and the easiest. * * * The

real etymology measure to a strict phonetic

Three years months would and artisan of them can fact largely endured by time. But it in learning for value to them associated with in our course science teaching reason-training recruits for ad

The first new have declared

But it may effort can come false system of sents it, leaving around and say and nothing ar artificial than scriptions of law is some author an authority mu authority to pre fied confusion" our children.

Artificial au phonetic. In 1885, into all the English people h who have really Academy has com of learning the la thereby to facilit are not yet movin neglect to utilize acquire the Englis under the directio 1,200 common wor degree change the any less legible to