

beautifully the relationship in each pair is shown by similarity, yet sufficient difference, in shape, close *a* (o) being but open *a* (a) with strait downright part removed. A like relationship exists between pairs of *e* and *i*-sounds; thus, *E*:*i* :: *a*:*e* where *e* and *i* are now open as compared with *e* and *a* which are close.

As Part I treats of fones singly, Part II explains their mode of combination into words, phrases, etc., with principles of accent, emphasis, pitch, cesura, etc. As sort of appendix to this part we find several attempts to indicate the spoken form of the three tungs. This is done by diacritic marks, not by letters of shape differentiated from existing ones. This is not offered as Orthography but to secure its object: scientific notation of actual speech—the raw material so far worked as to be plain to the eye as well as ear, material for Orthography, not Orthography itself.

Turning to his examples of our language, we find in them a reflex of certain ritters on fonology rather than a broad general view of the language. We cannot resist the conviction that after the evidence is all in it will much modify the verdict. Diphthongization is made by far too much of, for not only is it quite modern, as our author is aware (p. 32), but it is far from general—the preponderating majority using the three diphthongs in *now*, *my*, *boy*, only and do not diphthongize close *i* to *iy*, close *e* to *ei*, close *o* to *ou*, nor close *u* to *uw*. Our author is well aware that Ellis does not agree with Sweet, who is quoted (p. 50) as saying: "I certainly make no distinction between *mourning* and *morning*." Scotchmen do, as also arcaic speakers in London, but it is certainly extinct in the younger generation." The riter of the above shud come across the Atlantic and lern that there are a few millions good speakers neither Scotch nor old foggy Londoners. The standard speech is broad or general as distinguished from nara local: it is that of British Isles, N. America and Australia.

Turning now to Dr. Larison's book, we find no references to literature of subject unless mention of Webster, Worcester, Walker, *et al.* be such. It is intended for school use, actual classroom work, and may be said to be the theory of Orthography. If V.'s book was material for Orthography, this is such largely worked up; and, altho not completed, is a fairly close approximation to Orthography. These remarks are justified by its being in a 12-vowel alphabet in which *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, are properly given their powers in *pat*, *pet*, *pit*, *poet*, *put*, respectively. The new forms are differentiated from these. It being printed thruout in the 12-vowel alphabet gives pupil practice in proper pronunciation of words, the more common ones recurring frequently. So many words have the apparently personal pronunciation of the author that it is hardly a safe guide to follow in every word. This

mars its value. Of several such classes of words space will permit us to call attention to one only. Open *o* is given before *r* (without dropping his *rs* tho), where it shud be close *o*. Thus, (p. 77), *hoarse* is pronounced exactly as if it were *horse*! while *war* is pronounced to rhyme with *war* instead of with *shore*. One to several examples can be found on every page. What then shud be solved? The answer must still be "The Dictionaris," somewhat perplexing tho their notation be, and their orthoepy not uniform. A plain idea of how we speak is given by diagrams which may be explained as a sort of blackboard way of indicating breath-sounds. So-called mutes are taut to have no proper sound of their own. We believe that Wolf and Madam Seiler, independently, more than a dozen years ago, reached the conclusion that all our elements (yes, even *p*, *t*, *k*) have tones of their own, and no none are strictly mutes. In this respect, the teaching appears hardly up to date. The plan of key-words is folded. We fail to find accurate descriptions of how the several sounds are produced. Why? Are they too difficult for academic use? Surely not; that would add to the pupil's interest. Instead of accurate description once given for each, the statement "the oral vocal tube is so manoeuvred" is too much used. Manifestly, L. has courage of his very decided convictions. He must be a bold, brave man, who has launched out so far orthographically and expects to get a pecuniary return from public. As a school manual for use it shud have a large sale as the orthography produced is legible. It is a worthy part of fast-growing bibliography of speech-analysis, and appears well adapted for pupils acquiring the elements of vocal physiology.

ENGLISH SPELLING CONDEMD.

The present mode of spelling English has been tried before the tribunal of reason, and has been condemned.

It has been condemned by the unanimous voice of philologists, who declare that it distorts facts, obstructs study, and hinders healthy growth of the language.

It has been condemned by teachers, who declare that it burdens the growing memory, deceives the growing reason, and dwarfs the growing understanding of children, and makes of 'their teachers' efforts an enormous waste.

It has been condemned by economists, who declare that it causes every year in the total a loss of millions of days and millions of dollars, in learning, teaching, riting, and printing superfluous letters.

It has been condemned by statesmen who see in it the main cause which raps more than one-tenth of our whole population in total, and nearly one-half in almost total illitacy.