

# Spelling Progress Bulletin

Dedicated to finding the causes of difficulties in learning reading and spelling.

Publish-Quarterly  
Mar, June, Oct, Dec.  
Subscription \$3.00 a year.  
Volume III. No 1.  
March, 1963

Editor and General Manager,  
Newell W. Tune,  
5848 Alcove Ave.  
No. Hollywood, Calif.

Contributions Editors,  
Helen Bowyer,  
1212 S. Bonnie Brae St.,  
Los Angeles 6, Calif.

## Table of Contents

1. Editorial. Grant goes begging.
2. A Test of Adequacy, by Mary Johnson.
7. Our Ten Million Obsolescent Men, by David H. Russell, Ph.D.
10. An English Language School in the U.S.S.R., comments by E. E. Arctier.
12. President Kennedy's Answer to Upton Sinclair,
13. Writing English Around the World, by Helen Bonnema, Ed.D.
16. The Best Means of Representing the "th-sounds", by Godfrey Dewey, Ed.D.
18. The Best Means of Representing the "oo-sounds", by Newell W. Tune.
20. Selecting Alphabet Symbols for English Speech Sounds, by Sam Seegay and Newell W. Tune.
23. Skeemz ov Speling Reform, by E. Jones.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 p1]

## Editorial

A hundred thousand dollars goes abegging! In a letter from George J. Hecht, Publisher of Parents Magazine, dated July 6, 1963, our attention was called to a letter received from the U.S. Commissioner of Education in which the Education Department announced an opportunity for educational institutions to receive financial aid in research projects involving not only better methods of teaching reading but also on the beneficial effects of a reformed or simplified spelling or the use of phonetic spelling systems in teaching reading. It mentioned that applications for such aid that were submitted before September 1st would receive prompt action. In other communications it was announced that six months later on March 1, 1963, any more applications submitted would be acted upon shortly after that date. A recent letter from the Department of Education said that up to that date no college or university had submitted an application for aid for any phonetic spelling project.

What's the matter with our reading teachers and reading specialists? Are they devoid of ideas or afraid of ultra-conservative supervisors? Surely many of them heard of the announcement either from the Dept. of Education, or from George Hecht or from the S.P.B.? Perhaps too many of them think that spelling reform is an unattainable will-o'-the-wisp and are afraid of being classified as "too visionary".

Perhaps also, they do not differentiate between spelling reform for general use and a phonetic system of spelling as a tool for teachers to start their pupils in learning to read, as it is used in England by the Pitman Initial Teaching Medium.

The success of this project can scarcely have missed their ears for the March issue of the Reading Teacher has its story by John Downing. Up to now the majority of the educational press has been

strangely silent about the Pitman-Downing project. And I suppose it takes a lot of time for plans to be made before they are submitted to the Dept. of Education. But surely if anyone had any ideas of trying to start such a project next Sept., he would have had the application in by this March, n'est ce-pas? Quo Vadis?

-o0o-

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp2-6]

### **A Test of Adequacy, by Mary Johnson.**

To what extent does reading instruction affect spelling skill? A unique opportunity for measuring this effect was provided at Arizona State University in May, 1961. A simple spelling test was dictated to a Grade 1 research Class which had received formal instruction in reading, but not in spelling. Two dramatically contrasting sets of misspellings were the result (see table 1) - children nos. 13-26 making over five times as many errors as children nos. 1-12. These two groups had been carefully matched at the beginning of the school year in intelligence and reading readiness; and had been instructed by the same teacher. Because of these factors and because spelling instruction had been withheld from both groups, we can safely attribute differences in spelling skill to differences in methods used to teach these groups to read.

The Experimental group (Nos. 1-12) was taught by the *Phonetic Keys to Reading* Program, and the Control Group (Non 13-26) followed the *Curriculum Foundation Series*, as outlined by Dr. Roy P. Doyle in the October 1962, Spelling Progress Bulletin. The decision to 'test the adequacy' of the Curriculum Foundation Series was made when several neighboring school districts reported marked success with a supplementary phonics program, *Phonetic Keys to Reading*, published by the Economy Company," [1]

These two reading programs differ from each other chiefly in their presentation and timing of phonics. P.K.R. introduces vowels and consonants at the beginning of Grade 1 and provides training in the pronunciation and blending of individual letter sounds (commonly called "direct phonics"). C.F.S. withholds vowels throughout Grade 1, delays consonants until the latter half of Grade 1, and does *not* provide instruction in the pronunciation and blending of individual letter sounds (commonly called incidental phonics).

In spite of their differences: these two reading programs claim to have one important goal in common - to provide children with a working knowledge of phonics. Publishers of P.K.R., the Economy Co., of Oklahoma City state: "This method... provides a functional knowledge of phonetics and ample opportunity for the application of this knowledge." Scott, Foresman Co. of Chicago. publishers of C.F.S., state: '....the child learns to apply his phonetic knowledge in attacking unknown words through the use of initial and final consonant substitution. For example, assume that the child knows the first word in each of these groups: *jump* - bump, lump, dump; *his* - hit, hid, him, hip. From this word, he should be able to derive the sound of any of the other words on the list..." (Grade 1 Teachers' Manual, p.37).

The 26 children in the A.S.U. research class were asked to prove that they had acquired a working knowledge of phonics when Johnson Test No., 3 was dictated. 20 of the words on this test had not been taught in class (Part I); in order to spell them the children had to translate the sounds they heard into written symbols The inclusion of six known words (Part II), familiar to this class through their Curriculum Foundation readers and seatwork, tested for accurate recall of the spelling of known words.

## Test Results

Experimental Group (*Phonetic Keys to Reading*) made half as many mistakes on known words as they made on new words, indicating that, although P.K.R. stresses letter sounds in initial reading instruction, it tends to develop, as a natural by-product, a basic sight vocabulary. The reasonable level of error made by this group on new words (17%) shows that they have also acquired a working knowledge of phonics (see Table 2,a). Almost half of the errors on new words were made by Child No. 12, who was repeating Grade 1. The remaining 11 children in the experimental group spelled the new words with only 11% error.

Control Group (*Curriculum Foundation Series*) also made half as many errors in spelling known words as in spelling new words (a), but here the similarity between the spelling of the two groups ends. The errors made by the control group were more varied, more evenly distributed and over five times as plentiful as those made by their P.K.R. counterparts.

Unknown words: The short vowel sounds in the new words defeated the control group (b), which is not surprising in view of the fact that the teaching of vowels is excluded from the Grade 1 Teachers' Manual for the Curriculum Foundation Series. Although the children were able to identify some of the consonants which had been taught to them by the substitution technique (c), this training had not provided them with a *working* knowledge of phonics,.

Known words: The control group found the spelling of four-letter sight words six times harder to recall than the spelling of known three-letter words (d). This suggests that the recall of one more letter proved too great a strain on their memories because they were imperfectly formed,

## One Year Later

Johnson Test No. 3 was dictated to the A.S.U. Research Class for the second time in May, 1962, at the end of Grade II (e). It was found that the spelling of both groups had improved, though P.K.R. results were once again distorted by the chronically poor speller who had spent two years in Grade I. This child was responsible for over half of the 14.5% error made by the experimental group on new words.

C.F.S. pupils spelled the known words four times as well, and the new words twice as well as they had one year before. In spite of this improvement, however, the children were still unable to apply a working knowledge of phonics-making 40% error on the new words.

## Corroboration

When the Grade II scores of the Research Class on Johnson Test No. 3 are compared with those obtained by larger groups similarly taught, it becomes apparent that not only is the dramatic contrast in spelling abilities normal, but that the Research Class has been particularly well taught.

The experimental group made 3% less error on both sections of the test than did 421 Grade III American and Canadian pupils, surveyed in 1959 [2] whose early reading instruction (like that of P.K.R.) had included the sounding and blending of individual consonants and vowels (f).

The control group made 8% less error on new words, and 18% less error on known words than did 311 Grade III pupils (tested in the 1959 survey) whose early reading instruction had been similar or identical to that of the Curriculum Foundation Series (f), (see Table 3).

## Correlation

A spelling test provides an exact, revealing and time-saving assessment - not only of spelling, but of reading abilities, too. The close relationship between these two vital skills was stressed by Dr. Ruth Strang of the University of Arizona when she wrote: [3]

"Spelling ability is part of the constellation of language arts, related to word recognition; grasp of meaning, vocabulary and comprehension... Students tend to be either good or poor in both reading and spelling. Correlations between spelling and reading are almost as high as between reading and group intelligence scores. Improvement in reading often leads to better spelling."

As long as reading programs exist which teach both reading and spelling with "marked success" at the very foundation of the school curriculum - then programs which fail to reach this goal will be justly indicted as inadequate.

[1] *Research and Service Bulletin No. 12*, Arizona State University, College of Education.

[2] "World-Glide Survey", *Report on Reading No. 1*, Winnipeg Parent-Teacher Study Group, Nov. 1959.

[3] *Problems in the Improvement of Reading*, by Strang, McCulloch & Traxler, McGraw Hill Book Co. p.79.

**Table 2: Analysis of Errors. Johnson Test No. 3**

Arizona State University Campus Laboratory School

Ref. in <u>article</u>	INCIDENCE OF ERROR	
	<u>Experimental Group P.K.R.</u>	<u>Control Group C.F.S.</u>
(a) <i>May, 1961, Grade I</i> Part I, Unknown words Part II, Known words	17% 8%	78% 33%
<u>Unknown words</u> : The % of error was calculated on the number of times a letter was <i>not</i> included in the spelling of unknown test words.		
(b) Short vowels. a, e, i, o, u	7%	54%
(c) Initial consonants in unknown test words, j, w, h, b, c, g, s, f, d, y, b, t Final consonants in unknown test words, t, p, d, n, s	7% 6%	14% 11%
(d) <u>Known words</u> 3-letter words: not, pet, did, sun 4-letter words: jump, help	8% 8%	40% 8%
(e) <i>May, 1962, Grade II</i> Part I, Unknown words Part II, Known words	14.5% 5%	40% 8%
	<u>Sounded Phonics</u>	<u>Incidental Phonics</u>
(f) <i>1959 World-Wide Survey</i> Part I, Unknown words Part II, Known words	17.5% 7.5%	48% 26%

**Table 1. SPELLING ERRORS MADE ON JOHNSON TEST NO.3**  
 GRADE I. ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL  
 May, 1961

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP: PHONETIC KEYS TO READING

	PART I - UNKNOWN WORDS											
Child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Errors	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3	6	10	17
JOT												
WAX				whax					whax		wask	
HUB										hob		balp
ZIP											sip	---
COB								kob				---
GAP												axp
VET												---
SKID						ackid				scid	scid	sad
FRET												---
SPUN											spod	spi
DUMP										dup	domp	lp
YELP											elep	---
QUILT							quilp		qut	kwilt	kwilt	---
WAG												wil
CUB					kub			kub			cob	---
SKIP										scip	sip	---
BOB												---
TAP												ta
FROG									fog			---
QUITS										cwits	kwis	cais
	Incidence of error: 17%											
	PART II - KNOWN WORDS											
Errors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
NOT												na
PET												et
DID												---
SUN												abe
JUMP												jm
HELP												heb
	Incidence of error: 8%											

CONTROL GROUP. CURRICULUM FOUNDATION SERIES.

PART I - UNKNOWN WORDS

Child	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Errors	8		13	13	15	16	18	16	16	18	20	18	20	20
JOT		jat		jat	jat	jt	joat	jat	jat	jaot	jat	jat	jeit	jass
WAX		wacs	wacs	waks	wack	wxs	wase	wags	wacks	waes	waks	wips	wiecs	wzas
HUB	hab		hob	hab	hab	ba	hoeb	hup	ad	haeob	hab	hob	hieb	dab
ZIP		sap		zaep	siep		zep	zap	jip	saeop	sep	zaip	ziep	sz
COB		cab	kob	cab	coab	cb	coobe	cab	cad	caeob	kap	cib	cab	caid
GAP					gab	cp		gop	gop	gaep	kup	paip	gop	tiac
VET			vit		vat	vaet					vat	vat	viet	fvc
SKID	scid		sqid	sked	ceid	scd	sed	skap	scid	saed	seu	sid	siaed	savsk
FRET	frat		frit		faet	fot	fate	freb	frat	fet	fat	fait	fiet	frk
SPUN			span	spin		sn	sene	span	spen	sear	span	spen	sipen	sazos
DUMP			dape	dap	dup	dpm	dup	bap	damp	daep	np	dip	dimp	darp
YELP	lalp	halpe	ylp	yalp	yalp	lp	wep	ulap	alp	qile	elap	yaip	elip	earck
QUILT	qulet	cult	kwit	qoelt	cwit	ct	q	cwat	qalt		walt	quoilt	cailt	tarck
WAG							wage	walg		waeg	wog		wieg	sat
CUB	cab	cabe	kab	cab	caob	cld	coob		cad	caed	gab	cab	coop	pat
SKIP	scap	sckp	scipe	skep		scip	scype	scup	ship	sep	seb	saip	sicep	waan
BOB						bod	bod			badd	babb	baib	bieb	---
TAP										tep	pat		tip	---
FROG	fralg				faog	fag	fog	fag	frag	feg	tag	foig	firg	---
QUITS		cute	cwits	qets	cits	cs	kweas	kwas	qass	ces	wes	gats	caws	---

Incidence of error: 78%

PART II - KNOWN WORDS

Errors	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	4	3	5
NOT												wait		ton
PET														---
DID				dad								dib	bib	---
SUN														
JUMP				jaup				junny	jummp	jeop		junup	jemp	junp
HELP	halp	halp	hlap	holp	halp	hlap	hope	halp	hlap	hlp	halp	haep	hlepp	---

Incidence of error: 33%

--- indicates that child made no attempt to spell word.

Blank spaces on chart represent words spelled correctly.

**Table 3. UNKNOWN/KNOWN WORD TEST RESULTS, 1959**

Our Ref.	School District	Home and neighbourhood environment	Reading Text	
<b>GRADE ONE</b>				
1-1-6	Crestwood, Mo.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
2-1-5	Edmonton, Alta.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
3-1-1	Toronto, Ont.	Under-priv.	Laidlaw Readers	#FS
4-1-2	"	"	"	#FS
5-1-3	"	"	"	#
6-1-8	Albuquerque, N.M.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	
<b>GRADE TWO</b>				
7-2-4	Toronto, Ont.	Under-priv.	Laidlaw Readers	# FS
8-2-5	"	"	"	# FS
9-2-6	"	"	"	# FS
10-2-2	Fort Garry, Man.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
11-2-3	"	"	"	#
12-2-1	Edmonton, Alta.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	
13-2-11	Nottingham, Eng.			
14-2-12	Albuquerque, N.M.	Privileged	C.F.S. (and others)	
<b>GRADE THREE</b>				
15-3-31	Garwood, N.J.	Average	Carden Method (phonic)	
16-3-23	"	"	"	
17-3-4	Stonewall, Man.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
18-3-1	Fort Garry, Man.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
19-3-26	St. James, Man.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
20-3-27	"	"	"	#
21-3-28	"	"	"	#
22-3-20	"	"	"	#
23-3-30	"	"	"	#
24-3-38	Albuquerque, Paroch	Privileged	(Phonics for 1st 6 mos. then)	
25-3-37	"	"	(Curriculum Foundation Series)	
26-3-10	New Market, Ala.	Under-priv.		#
27-3-21	Omaha, Neb.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	
28-3-5	Toronto, Ont.	Under-priv.	Laidlaw Readers	#
29-3-6	"	"	"	#
30-3-32	Nottingham, Eng.			
31-3-24	Winnipeg, Man.	Under-priv.	Curriculum Foundation Series	
32-3-25	"	"	"	
33-3-35	Nottingham, Eng.			
34-3-2	Edmonton, Alta.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation. Series	
35-3-3	"	"	"	

# Reading instruction for this class began in Grade I with sight words, followed by the early introduction of articulated phonic training.

Our Ref.	Class grouping	Class enrolment	Age of pupils	% of error made on test			
				Unknown words		Known words	
				Class %	Average	Class %	Average
1	Ø	15	6/7 (Av.IQ 117)	11%	11%	7%	7%
2	Ø	25	6/7	18%	18%	16%	16%
3	(A)	30	6/7	28%)		16%)	
4	(B)	26	6/7	43%)	45%	43%)	40%
5	(C)	31	6/7	75%)		62%)	
6		12	6/7	94%	94%	67%	67%
7	(A)	30	7/8	11%)		3%)	
8	(B)	27	7/8	22%)	20%	11%)	10%
9	(C)	26	7/8	28%)		18%)	
10		26	7/8	18%)		7%)	
11		21	7/8	29%)	23%	10%)	8%
12	Ø	29	7/8	37%	37%	13%	13%
13	Top Infants	35	6/7	60%	60%	45%	45%
14		5	7/8	83%	83%	44%	44%
15	Heterogeneous	26	8/9	7%)		2%)	
16	"	24	8/10	9%)	8%	8%)	5%
17		25	8/9	14%	14%	8%	8%
18		28	8/9	15%	15%	3%	3%
19	(A)	35	8/9	.4%)		.6%)	
20	(B)	33	8/9	9%)		1%)	
21	(C)	32	8/9	16%)	15%	2%)	3%
22	(D)	15	8/9	20%)		5%)	
23	(E)	28	8/9	34%)		6%)	
24		46	8/9	23%)		12%)	
25		49	8/9	24%)	23%	8%)	10%
26	Ø	24	8/11	28%	28%	16%	16%
27		28	8/9	29%	29%	9%	9%
28	(A)	26	8/10	22%)		9%)	
29	(B)	30	8/9	37%)	29%	11%)	10%
30		32	7/8	30%	30%	23%	23%
31	(A)	32	8/11	25%)	33%	4%)	
32	(B)	15	9/11	42%)		6%)	5%
33	Unstreamed	34	7/8	33%	33%	18%	18%
34		28	8/9	31%)		10%)	
35		31	8/9	43%)	37%	12%)	11%

Ø Other classes at this grade level were not tested.

FS Filmstrip technique was used to instruct this class. (described in THE RIGHT TO LEARN by Glenn McCracken, Regnery Co., Chicago)

Our Ref.	School District	Home and neighbourhood environment	Reading Text	
GRADE THREE contd.				
36-3-9	Denver Suburb, Col.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	
37-3-8	"	"	"	
38-3-20	Rural Nebraska	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	
39-3-34	Nottingham,Eng.			
40-3-22	Sonoma,Cal.	Privileged	C.F.S. (and others)	
41-3-14	Albuquerque, N.M.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	
42-3-36	"	Privileged	C.F.S. (and others)	
43-3-13	Rural Nebraska	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	
44-3-11	"	"	"	
45-3-12	"	"	"	
46-3-7	Leeds,England	Under-priv.		
47-3-33	Nottingham,Eng.			
GRADE FOUR				
48-4-17	Garwood, N.J.	Average	Carden Method (phonic)	
49-4-7	Leeds,Eng.	Under-priv.		
50-4-1	Fort Garry,Man.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
51-4-2	"	"	"	#
52-4-4	Stonewall, Man.	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	#
53-4-3	Edmonton,Alta.	Privileged	Curriculum Foundation Series	
54-4-15	Rural Nebraska	Average	Curriculum Foundation Series	
55-4-16	"	"	"	
56-4-8	"	"	"	
57-4-5	Toronto,Ont.	Under-priv.	Laidlaw Readers	#
58-4-6	"	Under-priv.	"	#
59-4-18	Nottingham,Eng.			
60-4-19	"			
GRADE FIVE				
61-5-3	Nottingham,Eng.			
62-5-2	"			
63-5-1	Leeds, Eng.	Under-priv.		
GRADE SIX				
64-6-2	Nottingham,Eng.			
65-6-1	Leeds,Eng.	Under-priv.		

Our Ref.	Class grouping	Class enrolment	Age of pupils	% of error made on test			
				Unknown words		Known words	
				Class %	Average	Class %	Average
36	(A)	28	8/9 (Av.IQ 112)	28%)		11%)	
37	(B)	29	8/9 (Av.IQ 102)	63%)	40%	32%)	21%
38		22	8/9	45%	45%	21%	21%
39	Unstreamed	19	7/8	47%	47%	29%	29%
40		26	8/9	52%	52%	36%	36%
41		20	8/9	55%	55%	20%	20%
42		13	8/9	55%	55%	24%	24%
43		15	8/9	57%	57%	14%	14%
44		10	8/9	59%	59%	19%	19%
45		14	8/9	62%	62%	28%	28%
46	'C' Stream Ø	25	7/8	66%	66%	43%	43%
47		35	7/9	70%	70%	54%	54%
GRADE FOUR							
48	Heterogeneous (A) Stream Ø	24	9/10	4%	4%	1%	1%
49		36	8/10	8%	8%	4%	4%
50		24	9/10	6%)		1%)	
51		17	9/12	20%)	13%	4%)	2%
52		31	9/10	19%	19%	3%	3%
53		29	9/10	19%	19%	4%	4%
54		9	9/10	21%	21%	12%	12%
55		13	9/10	23%	23%	9%	9%
56		9	9/10	24%	24%	6%	6%
57		30	9/11	25%)		2%)	
58	31	9/11	31%)	28%	9%)	6%	
59	32	8/10	40%	40%	19%	19%	
60	Unstreamed	24	8/9	42%	42%	29%	29%
GRADE FIVE							
61	(C) Stream Ø	29	10/11	21%	21%	4%	4%
62		33	9/10	31%	31%	11%	11%
63		35	9/10	60%	60%	44%	44%
GRADE SIX							
64	Unstreamed	35	10/11	29%	29%	14%	14%
65	(C) Stream Ø	8	10/11	37%	37%	20%	20%

AVERAGE INCIDENCE OF ERRORS MADE ON TEST BY TOTAL OF 1,934 CHILDREN (GRADES I to VI)

Unknown words  
35%

Known words  
17%

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp7-9]

## **Our Ten Million Obsolescent Men, by David H. Russell, Ph. D.**

The International Reading Association must be concerned with reading, not only in classrooms, but in relation to our national welfare. We need to know about illiteracy and unemployment and the men plagued by them.

In January of this year the Kennedy Administration asked Congress to approve a bill for about 50 million dollars for a campaign aimed at wiping out adult illiteracy in this country. This problem is close to the one of finding 25,000 new jobs every week for the next ten years to keep pace with workers displaced by automation and new machines. It is related to the finding of jobs for the 26 million adolescents who will reach job-hunting age in the next decade.

May I illustrate the problem by two examples? W.J. is a Pennsylvania steelworker whose job was erased by automation during the 1960 recession. G.T. is a day laborer in a relatively prosperous area in northern California - except that he hasn't labored for pay for over three years now. Both were part of the estimated five million men unemployed in the United States in the spring of 1961 and of the larger group who find it increasingly difficult to get regular work. Both are obsolescent men - and they and others like them will soon be obsolete unless they are helped.

W.J. has the better chance. He had a couple of years in high school before he left it to help out the family. He has manual skills and can be classed as "retrainable." He may make it if the Federal Government's depressed areas legislation of May, 1961, can be implemented soon. G.T.'s chances are not so good. He lived in the rural South and did not finish the fourth grade. Accordingly, he must be classed as an illiterate. At thirty, despite responsibility for a wife and three children, he has never held a job for long. His lack of literacy as well as technical skills makes every prospective employer look to the next man in line.

W.J. and G.T. are representatives of a huge group of men, some of whom are unemployed, some labeled as "unemployable", but all often anonymous, frequently unnoticed by neighbors and neglected by government agencies. Sometimes they are the men of the slums and flop-houses of the big cities, but sometimes they live in small centers where they get occasional seasonal employment in mining, fishing, construction or farming.

In the younger group, one third of the total high school population who are dropouts from school in 1962 will have trouble getting their first chance at employment: Their unemployment rate will be double that of the high school graduate. David L. Hackett, an assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, estimated in the summer of 1961 that there were about one million youths who had dropped out of school and were unemployed, most of them belonging to minority groups in big cities such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Already they were too obsolescent in a scientific, industrial world.

Our moves toward increasing industrialization and automation are erasing low-skill jobs and setting higher qualifications for the jobs that remain. A business such as a trucking company may demand high school graduation, and many factories are asking for a high school diploma before they invest in an individual's job training and apprenticeship. As Edgar Dale puts it, "Dig ditches? The pick and shovel are as outmoded as the cuspidor or mustache cup."

Many illiterates and semi-illiterates have learned to conceal their illiteracy. They mark their time cards so they can pick them out quickly as they check in for work. They glance at the menu in a restaurant but ask, "What's the special for today?" They look at the pictures in a newspaper and they

get their news from the radio. When they are given a form to fill out at an employment office they say, "I forgot my glasses," or "Can I bring it back tomorrow?" Something like the military programs of World War II for improving reading and writing abilities is still needed for the "forgotten tenth" at the bottom of the literacy heap.

What are the causes of illiteracy in this day and age? The percentages of various causes in a group of illiterate Canadians studied during World War II were found to be family economics, 28; distance from school, 25; didn't get along at school, 18; father incapacitated, 13; foreign education, 9; moving too often, 2; others, 6.

Each of these causes probably operated in the United States at the time of the war. Increasing mechanization has created new problems. The figures may be higher today in such categories as "moving too often." Non-English speaking background looms large in parts of New York City, southern Texas and southern California. The amount spent on schools is another factor. Low educational budgets are associated with low school achievements. But perhaps the chief cause of illiteracy is having illiterate or semi-illiterate parents - which may sometimes involve mental ability but almost certainly includes a childhood environment in what is now called an "underprivileged" or a "culturally deprived" home and neighborhood. Here the child has few contacts with the printed word. He never hears stories read aloud and sees few newspapers or magazines - and no one in his family circle cares if he reads or not.

Perhaps the most important thing we can do in the days ahead is to see that the children of illiterate parents do not repeat the pattern - that such adolescents attend a school regularly and that schools and teachers are equipped to cope with their difficulties, Teachers of adults and taxpayers who have felt hopeless about the problems can get a fresh start from the success of the Higher Horizons projects in New York City. Similar efforts are under way in the Great Cities Project in other places such as Detroit and San Francisco, supported in part by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. These projects emphasize the upgrading of young people's achievements in reading and language at all school levels, along with help in getting suitable employment when they leave school.

Another task for school people is to recognize that illiterates or semi-literates can be of average or better intelligence. Perhaps they were "late bloomers" or somehow got labeled as dumb in their school careers. Perhaps they are like the plasterer making excellent daily wages who came to a reading clinic for help. He had been much troubled by headaches but his doctor discovered that these appeared when his young daughter brought her primer home from school and asked him to read to her. The doctor sent him for help in reading. Although he had gone through junior high school, he confessed he had never really learned to read. He was the boy who cleaned the blackboards and got sent on errands by the teacher. A few months of expert help and he was able not only to keep up with his daughter but to help her with her reading.

School people must also study their dropouts more intensively. Nowadays about a third of our young people go on to college, a third graduate from high school and look for work, and a third never finish high school. Why do adolescents leave school around the ninth or tenth grade and thereby ruin most of their chances for a successful and useful life? Some causes have been listed as dissatisfaction with school, economic need, lure of a job, and marriage and pregnancy. Most adolescents who drop out have been *retarded in school at least one year*. Perhaps most boys have failed to find a realistic vocational program and they have had no plans for college. They did not want to dilute courses of mathematics or English and they haven't had a chance at a rich variety of experiences through which they would learn best-field trips, motion pictures, relevant shop experiences, or more recently, television and other learning aids, Programmed learning may be as good in the technical branch of a high school as in a modern factory. Despite all we know about

reading development, most high schools in this country still *don't have a full-fledged attack on the reading problems* of the academic lower half of their student bodies.

Put the solution to the problem goes far beyond any thing a school system can do by itself. More libraries are needed, especially in rural areas and depressed zones. The backwardness of some isolated areas and the growing cultural and economic disintegration in the heart of our largest cities affect not only education. Housing and sanitation and employment must be improved. The total lives of people are involved. The federal government has begun to help with the retrainable men like W.J. although only on a token basis so far. Large industrial concerns spend millions on the training of employees and some are adopting a humane point of view in changing employment patterns and locations of plants. The tougher problem of G T and his fellow illiterates calls for a combined attack by government, school system, industry, local welfare agencies and neighbors. **Our concern for our national survival demands help for forlorn and wasted lives.** It requires useful productivity of goods or services by men now obsolescent Our concern for the individual must include the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

-o0o-

Dr. Russell is the President of the National Council of Teachers of English, and author of many books, including *Characteristics of Good and Poor Spellers*, *Children Learn to Read*, *Finding New Neighbors*, *Listening Aids Through the Grades*, and many magazine articles.

Reprinted from *Challenge and Experiment in Reading*, the 1962 Conference Proceedings of the International Reading Association.

### **Comment by Helen Bowyer,**

Here is an article which strikes the *Bulletin* staff as of wider horizon and deeper insight than that against which our national reading problem is usually set. Seldom at any concourse of educators has the plight of the jobless adult and the adolescent on his way to become that, been more compassionately discussed, Yet it seems to us this horizon needs still further widening, this insight further deepening. Some of Dr. Russell's points need further contemplation.

He speaks for example, of "the problem of finding 25,000 new jobs a week for the next ten years to keep pace with workers displaced by automation and new machinery." Where are we to look for them - in our present wage paying concerns? - in railroads, bus and truck systems automobile manufacture, machine making, building canning., tanning, textile works, merchandising and the other enterprises, great and small, that are now writing the weekly and monthly paychecks of some 68,000,000 employees? Where would be the point of their spending huge sums in devices for doing the work now done by human mind and muscle if it didn't mean cutting down on these? Yet Dr. Russell finishes his speech with a plea "for a combined attack by government, school systems, industry, local welfare agencies, and neighbors," which would reinstate his G T and his other obsolescent adults in the useful productivity of goods and services." And at the same time find jobs for the 26,000,000 adolescents who will in the course of the next ten years be reaching job hunting age.

But in the same month (May, 1962) in which he deliverers this plea Dr. Robert Hutchins appears in *School and Society* in an article shot through with the realism of these two sentences; "Adult education offers the only sensible answer to the question of what we are going to do with ourselves in a workless world. Since that world is rapidly coming into existence, we may expect our people to take a new attitude towards the continuing education of adults."

A position, be it said, which should not be new to any member of the International Reading Association. G B Shaw was advancing it some half century ago.

But this workless world is still only on its way. At the moment, machines are displacing humans by not greatly more than a million a year. What we do in the next ten years with the accelerating numbers of adults so displaced and of teenagers with scant prospects of ever getting a job, may well decide whether the full arrival of this world will be a blessing or a curse.

The biggest immediate contribution the schools can make to its smooth and happy coming is to stop creating *dropouts*. I use this ungloved word advisedly because whatever other factors contribute to school quitting the crucial cause is overwhelmingly the inability of the 16 or 17-year old to decipher his textbooks well enough to do the work of his grade. And this inability his teachers have foisted on him from his first eager opening of his earliest primer. And are still foisting on that third of their pupils who, as things are now, will also fail to finish school.

Oh yes, I know about this new *Ungraded Primary*, about these *Higher Horizons* and *Big City Projects*. Would that the time, the money, the enthusiasm invested in them were more discerningly invested. Invested in that one sure cure for reading disability which is staring their personel in their unseeing eyes. Visits to T.V. studios - seeing the opera *Rigoletto* - cuddling lambs and gathering eggs

on visits to the country are highly desirable experiences for all underprivileged city children, good readers and poor, but a much more basic therapy for the latter calls to every teacher, every supervisor, every principal from the parentheses of the elementary dictionary on his (or her) desk.

The *Bulletin* says Amen to Dr. Russell's concern over the illiterate or semi-literate parentage of so many of our drop-outs. And the low family income, the crowded and run-down housing, the slum neighborhood, to which, in most cases, this parentage condemned their early, their most formative years. But none of these "underprivileges" or all of them together, offer an alibi for our failure to make efficient readers of the majority of their young victims. Russia's stupendous upswing into her present high literacy, child and adult, took off from an ignorance, poverty, insanitation, illness, deathrate, beyond anything - either in prevalence or degree - with which our schools have to contend. And, presumeably, from a national I.Q. no higher a gamut than ours.

As to this last, Dr. Russell is undoubtedly right in recognizing that reading retardedees can be of average intelligence or better. But careful research seems to indicate that the drop-outs among them are not. The Feb. 1963 number of *Education* reprints a table from Dillon's *Early School Leavers* which gives these clinching figures. Of the 2500 seventh graders on whom the study was based, 400 tested below I.Q. 85 and 400 at I.Q. 115 and up. Of the low group, 95.5% dropped out before finishing high school, while of the high group 11.5%. For the three categories in between - containing nearly three fourths of the erstwhile seventh graders - the figures were a progressively decreasing 46, 36.6 and 24%.

But to the extent that reading difficulty was the basic cause, *there need have been no drop-out at all*, except in the lowest group - and very little there. For not only can practically all physically normal I.Q. 85's learn to read up to their listening-thinking potential, but so can most children ten points lower, That is, if the school gives them a chance to learn. If it fosters what intelligence they have - what burgeoning sense of consistency, of analogy, of cause and effect they bring to their earliest print on the like of *kum, dum, lim, him - sed, hed - jem, flem - yoor, shoor - riet, liet - aul, haul, baul*, and doesn't addle it on *come, dumb - limb, hymn - said, head - gem, phlegm - your, sure - write, light - all, haul, bawl*. Such a chance, in brief, as Russia's phonemic spelling gives all her

forty million elementary and secondary young, and China's text-book Mandarin her hundred and five million of them.

As of now, automation is no headache to either of these under-industrialized giants, Russia has no five million adults looking for nonexistent jobs and no million adolescents out of school and looking for work. There is every indication, moreover, that she is preparing for Dr. Hutchins' workless world in quite the way he advocates. As far back as 1958, when our then U.S. Commissioner of Education was reporting on his first-hand study of the Soviet school system, he wrote: "Everywhere we went in the U.S.S.R. we were struck by the zeal and enthusiasm which people have for education. It is a kind of grand passion with them."

Why isn't it here? Here where the need for it looms so much more urgent; here where we are in line for an earlier coming of that workless world. Because the first requisite of such zeal, such a grand passion is the easy speedy, happy mastery of the mechanics of reading. And not by any method tried since Plymouth Rock, not thru any research, any conference, any workshop, have we been able to give our people that. Consequently, while in the U.S.S.R., even before the end of the first semester the child is already experiencing this enthusiasm, this zeal in the unaddled response of his mind, his emotions, his aesthetic sense to appropriate excerpts from his country's great novelists, poets, playwrights, scholars here for two, three, even four semesters more, all too many will be struggling - or giving up the struggle - to recognize in *have, give - many, meant - climb, rhyme - - word, bird, heard - use, goose, juice*, the words they speak, hear and understand as *hav, giv - meni, mentkliem, riem - wurd, burd, hurd - yoos, goos, joos*.

On what alter are we sacrificing these precious, never to be recovered years of our children's highest receptivity to the beautiful, the wonderful, the gay, the brave? Neither Plato nor Pericles would turn in his grave if we revamped *graph* and *chemist* into *graf* and *kemist*. Not a Dutch printer, up above or down below, would give a hoot if we freed our English of the "dutchisms" he wished on it in his London printery centuries ago, Shakespeaere would have given the green light to; "Ie noe a bank hweron the wield tiem groez." And recently our own world famous novelist, Upton Sinclair, asked J.F.K. for White House leadership into that wun-sound-wun-sien speling hwich wood majik our langgwij intoo the eeziest too reed and riet ov aul urth's maejer tungz.

Yet Dr. Russell's speech takes it for granted that we shall continue our struggle for literacy, child and adult, through the quagmire of our present 251 multi-value spelling units for our 40 basic sounds. And so do the 74 other speeches reprinted in these Proceedings.

But they were all delivered before Sir James Pitman and John Downing reached our shores with their message of what their regularized orthography was doing in England for 2500 five and six year-old beginners and an ever-increasing number of older children seriously retarded in their reading. In their month-long lecture tour of some 20 of our major universities and educational organizations, they must have been heard by hundreds of members of the I.R.A. And though in the four issues since of its official organ, *The Reading Teacher*, there has been but one brief note on their visit, who knows what may have been going on in the minds of their I.R.A. auditors? Of this much the *Bulletin* has been informed: In the annual Convention this coming May of its 16,000 membership, Sir James and Mr. Downing will take a prominent part on the program.

So, who knows? For those ten million children, who as things are now, may be the drop-outs of the next ten years, and those millions of others who will just manage to continue through high school, this may be the most fortunate convention of reading teachers ever held on these shores,

Correction: In the previous issue, we erroneously gave credit to Prof. John Shepard, a degree he has not yet acquired. He has his B.A. and MA, and is working toward the Ph.D. degree. Our best wishes go to him for its attainment.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp10-11]

## **An English Language School in the U.S.S.R. Comments by E. E. Arctier.**

Dear Mr. Tune,

I was quite intrigued by your December reprint of this article from the November U.S.S.R., so much so, indeed, that for the sake of the photographs you could not afford to reproduce, I bought a copy of this "Magazine of Soviet Life" today from a downtown news stand. Have you space in your next issue for a few reflections the little story evoked in me?

It would seem that between the ordinary schools and these special language ones, there are some 16,000,000 young Sovieteers choosing our mother tongue as their required foreign language in preference to German or French, What are we doing to encourage a choice so gratifying to our national ego and so conducive to our national welfare at home and abroad?

Well, for one thing, our science and technology did its best towards the production of those linguaphones and other sonic devices by which the young Russki learns to hear and speak our lingo much as his agemates do in the schools of England and our American Midwest. To hear and speak it thus, moreover, through the whole schooled expanse of their vast motherland, so that at an All-Union Conference, blue-eyed Katinka from Baltic Leningrad and black-haired Mikhail from this side of the Manchurian border, can gaily venture their foreign acquisition together unimpeded by any but the slightest regional accent or intonation.

For another thing, we've blessed them with a grammar and syntax which is a very miracle of simplicity compared with that of their Russian. Or even with that of the German or French they might have elected. Take the sentence, "The handsome young officer took his pretty partner by the hand." In our language it undergoes only three inflections in changing to the plural, "The handsome young officers took *their* pretty partners by the hand," whereas in French it would undergo 8. Personally, I am happy that the structure of our mother-tongue should thus ease the way to its acquisition by these 16;000,000 young Sovieteers with which our own children must share the wonder and the danger of this new age to which both were born. But why, oh why, must we offset this boon by a spelling which must be even more burdensome to them than to our own luckless young.

For unlike ours, they are not starting reading *tabula rasa*. Even in these special schools where they begin English in the second grade, they have had a year in which the mind's inherent expectation that the sounds of the words they hear and speak shall be reliably depicted in the sequence of letters which purport to depict them, has been almost wholly actualized. The 2000 words of their First Grade Primer and Reader and the books they have drawn from their children's libraries have come so close to the phonemic ideal of one character and one only for each basic speech sound that they have taken it for granted that this is the nature of books. Imagine, then, their confusion when they discover that the words they hear as: *sed, bred, - siti, prit, - not, hwot, yot*, present themselves in print as: *said, bread, -city, pretty - knot, what, yacht*, and must be written in this unpredictable way. And learn, moreover, from older school fellows that this irrationality is not just a temporary phenomena which will soon straighten itself out, but one which will plague them the whole ten years of their English course.

How does Alexandra Lupishkina, the attractive young teacher of beginning English, handle this problem with her seven and eight year olds. If there were even a hundred phonemic words she could string into enough meaningful sentences to fill the first few weeks! Sufficiently meaningful, that is, not to insult the intelligence of second graders who as *first* graders had read poems, fables, fairy tales, anecdotes from Leo Tolstoy, Pushkin, Nekrassov and their great successors. But even so elementary an observation as "All dogs love to gnaw bones," bristles with traps. First off, there is the *a* of *all* which has the same sound as the *a* of *gnaw* but achieves that result by tying up with wholly different consonants. Then comes the *o* of *dogs* transcribing itself by exactly the same symbol as do the quite different *o*'s of *love* and *bones*. Next the little Russki is faced with a *g* that is sounded in *dogs* but silent in *gnaws*, and in both these words by an *s* which isn't *s* at all but is deceitfully playing the part of *z*. What, moreover, is he to make of that *e* which gives the long sound to the *o* of *bones* but turns the *o* of *love* into a short *u*?

In this whole sentence, then, the eager little Piotr and Vera will find only one letter adhering to the wun-sound-wun-sien rule which made *lurning too reed and riet hiz mother tung soe eezi, speedi and hapi an ekspeeri-ens*. And that one letter - *d* - will soon be betraying him in such past tenses as *dropped, asked, puffed*, where it takes the sound of *t*.

In Alexandra Lupishkina's place; I think I'd come clean with "Well, my dears, you'll just have to park your reason at the classroom door, and tell your eyes and memory to take over, as far as the reading and writing of English is concerned." Unless, of course, I could get official permission to follow the lead of that Siberian schoolmaster on whom, the reader may remember; I commented in an earlier Bulletin -last October's, I believe, He had seized on the Augmented Roman Alphabet as an invaluable device for staving off the outrage of our conventional print till his six to eight year olds had had the fortifying experience of a year or two of reeding and rieting - on the level of their Soviet primer and readers in the streamlined orthography this medium provides. And meanwhile had matured to the point where they could deal with the like of *our, your, sure, hour - hair, care, err, their, prayer*, as just a perversity which a race; outstanding in many admirable respects, had not yet summoned what it takes to abnegate.

Something like this tolerance, one supposes, is what all Soviet students of our language must come to before they get very far in their course. They can come to it all the more philosophically because in the rest of their academic studies, they know nothing of the "reading problem" which darkens history, geography, literature, science, for such millions of our own young. But what of us? Do we like this situation-those of us who are aware of it? Is it really compatible with our national dignity that our spelling requires this indulgence on the part of 16,000,000 Soviet school children?

Moreover, like Helen Bowyer, in I forget which of her articles, I am wondering what all this evokes in the minds of the Russian school authorities. Like her, I am not supposing it to be flattering to our national perspicacity. Ever since Sputnik I, we have glutted our press, educational and lay, with acres (or as she asks, is it square miles?) of warnings on *The Challenge of Soviet Education*. And not once an acre has there been a glimmer of an intimation that the phonemicism of the Soviet school books may have a little something to do with its perturbing superiority. I imagine there isn't much of this output that isn't at least skimmed over by the appropriate echelon of Soviet officialdom, and I too can picture the lift of the shoulder, the quirk of the lip with which this or that Minister, Director, Curriculum Maker, lays down this or that of our journals, Educational Supplements, Conference Proceedings, Work Shop Reports, with a derisive "Challenge of Soviet Education! And their kids with a basic learning tool of 251 jumbled spelling units and ours a streamlined 36."

Nor can the Soviet hierarchs be the only ones jibing the bland delusion of their American counterparts that the little surface devices they write so endlessly about (the shifts and shunts of method from *Whole Word* to *Phonics* or something in between - the little clues to word recognition like the long tail on the end of *monkey*, and the two round little eyes peeping out of *moon*), will some time take the curse off the reading and writing of English. Least of all, one would suppose, can the Chinese take this fritterdom seriously. More poignantly, perhaps, than any other great people do they know what is the one thing that can do this. For not only are they attempting to teach our mother tongue to more children than we ourselves are, but they have a unique reason to realize the blessed saving of time, effort and tax dollars which that one thing would bring about. For look you, they have alphabetized their ancient Mandarin into a phonemic notation which could serve excellently as the sole reading medium in the regions around Peking. But the multi-lingual and multi-dialectic make-up of the rest of the vast population prevent it playing that role elsewhere, so it is still used mainly as an aid to the learning of the Mandarin characters. Still, there it is, a linguistic feat so immensely greater than would be required to liquidate our "reading problem", small wonder if Chinese teachers of English tap their foreheads when speaking of ours.

As for Spanish America, blessed throughout its nineteen lands with the most nearly one-sound-one-sign ortografía of all earth's major tongues, the barbaridad of ours cannot but exacerbate her resentments, old and new, against el coloseo of her hemisphere. And now we hear pleas from Commonwealth Africa for the spelling reform which could so easily zoom English into the *Lingua Franca* of a continent now bogged down in some 800 tribal and sub-tribal tongues. I take quite seriously the warnings of those two letters you published in the December *Bulletin*. The one from Nigeria, you remember, closed with these fateful words. "If we do not make the adoption of English as a second language easier than it is at present, it is conceivable that our children will have to learn the alien speech of a race which was wise enough to realize that a cumbersome spelling is a luxury no nation can afford in this nuclear age." Fateful words which your Rhodesian subscriber made yet more explicit. "Because of the cold war with communism," he writes, "the education of black Africans is vital to the West as a means of introducing them to Western culture and knowledge, Western ideas and ideals. It is here that we encounter one of our greatest obstacles - the obsolete and chaotic spelling of English. Spelling reform thus becomes a necessity of such urgent importance; it should be dealt with at government level."

And what government should take the lead: if not ours? True, we have no states or territories in negro Africa, but our stake in the westernization of its population is just as great, while our economic and military might makes our responsibility even greater.

How to go about it? Time, again, isn't it, for the *Bulletin* to point out that a start has already been made? That five years ago, a California Congressman introduced in the House a Bill to establish a National Spelling Commission of qualified specialists. A Bill urged on him, *not by any schoolman*, but by a small town California newspaper publisher. In the five years since, he has made every State Department of Education in the land aware of it. Also hundreds of college teachers of English, professors of teacher education; and editors of school journals have been informed by the *Bulletin*. With the net result, as I've heard you rage, that not one letter in a hundred that has reached you from a classroom teacher has evinced an inkling of awareness of the existence of the Bill. Have you ever thought of putting the State Teachers' Journals on the spot? Of sending each and every one of them a copy of the new Bill with the request that they publish it in - let's say - their next issue but one? And send you a copy from which you could publish a national report as to the extent to which their teacher subscribers have been informed. It's just possible, don't you think, no editor would care to go on record as so conspicuously denying his classroom subscribers the information they have so fundamental a right to receive.

Yours sincerely, E. E. Arctier.

With tongue in cheek and fingers crossed, we would like to suggest some mottos,-,

For Congressmen:

No hurry on this. . . we can foul it up later.

For spelling teachers:

Confusion is our most important product.

(Credit is due the Better Mottos Association, Los Angeles, and EV.Roberts & Assoc.)

-o0o-

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 p12]

## **THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON**

July 31, 1962

Dear Mr. Sinclair:

The President has asked me to reply to your letter of July 3rd concerning the problem of reforming the spelling of English. This problem is one to which the U.S. Office of Education has had its attention drawn by a number of persons. As a result, last year several prominent linguists were asked to react. They pointed out approximately the same advantages as you do and also listed several disadvantages.

One solution appears possible. The Cooperative Research Branch of the Office of Education can entertain research proposals from colleges, universities, or State departments of education. If a proposal should be received that would involve research into the problem (history, experience of other countries, extent of the need, possibility of agreement upon one system, method of implementing, and possible impact and long-range results), such a group of scholars as you mention might confer, study, and reach defensible conclusions. If the study involved linguists, educators, printers and publishers, lexicographers, businessmen, and other interested and informed persons from the United States, from other English-speaking countries, and from countries in which English is an important second language, the findings could be widely disseminated and possibly translated into international action. The first requisite would be a proposal of high quality from a reputable scholar or group of scholars, submitted through proper channels.

Sincerely,

Ralph A Dungan,  
Special Assistant to the President

Mr. Upton Sinclair,  
Monrovia, California.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp13-15]

## Writing English Around the World, by Dr. Helen V. Bonnema.

### A talk over Radio KOA, Dec. 26, 1962.

Last week I was talking with a man who had just returned from a trip around the world. He was upset. And if you knew him as I do, you'd be surprised to hear what it was that worried him. First, let me explain how he happened to take the world tour. He was sent to the Orient by his employer to repair machine tools and equipment which had been sold last year in Japan, Hong Kong, China, and other places. When his repair work was finished, he found that at not too much greater cost, he could take a plane continuing west through the Mediterranean countries and Africa instead of returning across the Pacific. I asked him how he got along without knowing any language other than English.

"Oh, just fine! People everywhere speak enough of our language to allow me to get along well. But you know that's what's bad. They're ruining English!"

His face became red, and his voice excited.

"There were signs in front of stores with words on them like; *clean your clothes*, spelled, say, "Kleen Yor Kloze", and for biscuit, "Biskit", for machine, "Masheen". They write words the way they sound. It's bad enough in our own country where kids spell does DUZ, instead of d-o-e-s. If foreigners can't spell English right, they ought to leave it alone."

I said to him,

"Why should they? What is the purpose of writing? Isn't it to tell something? More power to the foreigner who gets his message across in a quicker, easier way! He is doing exactly what the first writers of English did long ago."

When English began to be written and ceased to be only a spoken language, the spelling represented the sounds fairly consistently. In words like night, n-i-g-h-t, the gh was pronounced. They said "nīgh̄t", or something like that. Name, n-a-m-e, was pronounced, "nahmeh". Knee, k-n-e-e, "Knee". In those days, the few people who did any writing, put down the *sounds* they heard, so they had little trouble with spelling.

After a time, however, as the pronunciation kept on changing, and they continued to write words with the letters they formerly used, the spelling no longer represented the sounds spoken. People went on writing certain letters even though the sounds once represented, had changed or disappeared. They continued to write lamb with a *b* at the end even though then they didn't sound it "lambeh."

There were other reasons why the spelling no longer represented the pronunciation in a straightforward way. There was a period when English was written by many who came from Normandy and by their descendents. They were accustomed to writing French, and when they wrote English, they often represented sounds in the same way as in French. So they spelled with o many English words that had the uh-sound. *Love, honey, some*. These words were spelled with the short-u in Old English. But when the Normans were in power, they spelled to suit themselves.

Another reason for the change in spelling: When books were first *printed* in England, instead of being lettered by hand, the compositors who had learned their trade in Holland used the Dutch spelling for some sounds. They used the Dutch (ghugh, spelled g-hL for our "guh" sound to distinguish it from "juh", as in gentle. And so the H crept into our spelling where it had not been in Old English. It doesn't belong there, If someone spells *ghost* without the h, he's not changing our

*language*. The real language is speech, anyway - spoken groups of words - and not the written signs representing it to the eye.

How far off is our spelling? How far from the true English as spoken? You know only too well. Perhaps you tried the test in a recent Readers' Digest, *One Hundred Words Easiest to Misspell*. What did you decide for *license*? How many c's, how many s's and where? *Disappoint*. How many s's, how many p's? *Weird*. ie? ei? *Niece*. i before e? *Sauerkraut*. s-ou? au? *Drier*. washer and d-r-y or i-er? If you missed only half of the words you were doing all right. Even college graduates make what is considered a phenomenal score if they spell 85% correctly. Think of that! After 16 years of schooling - 6 years in elementary grades, 6 years in junior and senior high school, 4 years in college - laboring over words, writing them rewriting them, going over and over and over them, they still can't do it. A professor from Fordham University wrote in a recent periodical that one of their magna cum laude graduate students made 17 spelling mistakes that day in a research paper.

Do you remember what you went through when you were in grade school? You learned to write b-e-d spells *bed*. That was easy. But you heard another word almost like it: *dead*. The spelling therefore should be d-e-d. But the teacher informed you that this is not the case. The word *dead* contains a silent letter a; d-e-a-d. Then you saw the word *bead*, and were told that here the two letters *ea* have that same value as ee in *feed*, so the word wasn't bēd but bēd.

Another time you were told that the word *toe* is spelled with o-e. But when you met the word *toad*, you find it is not spelled t-o-e-d, and when you come to *poet*, you were warned against the pronunciation *pote*.

You learned that the vowel in *wind* is written with the letter i but were not allowed to give that same pronunciation to the letter i when you meet it in *find*. In this word, you were told, the letter i had the same value as in I - meaning me. Because you used this letter i in *find* and *I*, you naturally wanted to use it in *my*, *high*, *eye*. But if you did, you were assured that it was wrong, and that you needed m-y, h-igh, and e-y-e.

Do you remember that after you knew the word *true*, t-r-u-e, and heard *truth*, you spelled it t-r-u-e-t-h, only to be told that this is wrong, and that there is no *e*? Or, having learned the spelling of *true*, you heard a word in which the t is at the end instead of the beginning, and proceeded to write r-ue-t. Wrong again! After learning that the spelling is r-o-o-t, you heard a word containing the same sounds, but with f in front: so wrote f-r-o-o-t, spells *fruit*, and had to learn that you must write f-r-u-i-t. Or, having learned the spelling of *root*, you heard a word very much like it, but ending in *d* instead of *t*, and wrote "he was r-o-o-d." Once more you had gone wrong, through no fault of your own.

Why should we expect the sign painter from another country to go through all of this in order to get his message across? Clean your clothes, or K-l-e-e-n y-o-r k-l-o-z-e? Here in this country, why should we expect our little children to struggle laboriously when writing their thoughts. This is what a former Commissioner of Education had to say about it:

The American child must spend a large portion of his school days in learning, one by one, the peculiar combinations of the written words of his language. There are at least five years as good as thrown away in learning the mass of heterogeneous conventionalities dignified by the name of 'orthography.'

George J- Hecht, Publisher of *Parents Magazine*, wrote in the January, 1961 issue:

"Russian children learn Russian very much more rapidly than American children learn English because Russian has more consistent spelling. This gives the Soviet Union great advantage in our education race with them. May I say that after I visited the Soviet Union in the spring of '56, I wrote an article for *Parents' Magazine* entitled "The Coming International Brains Race" which expressed the thought that we are in an arms, trade, scientific, & brains race with the Soviet Union, and that the most basic of all is the brains race. If for no other reason, should we not simplify our English spelling to eliminate our handicap in our educational competition with the Communist powers?"

In an article "Can Ivan Read Better Than Johnny", *Saturday Evening Post*, May 27, 1961, and in his book *What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't*, Arthur S. Trace says that while our children are reading babyish primers, the Russians are handling material of a sort that ours do not reach until years later."

The reason for this, according to Dr. Clarence Hotson of Romulus, New York, is that we are not using the best way of representing any particular sound with a letter of the alphabet and making that the rule.

He says,

"We could achieve a rational and consistent orthography in place of the ghastly mess we've inherited. For something is certainly rotten, not in the state of Denmark, but in the traditional spelling of English words."

"In the following words there are nine ways of spelling the sound a:

vein ei    plain ai    obey ey    way ay  
great ea    eight eigh    same a    gauge au

"Many efforts have been made in the past to reform English spelling, but they have never sufficed to overcome the massive inertia that resists all change. Now, however, the evident fact that the young of Russia are being much more efficiently educated than our own should be just what we need to compel this reform... For if we want to catch up with the Russian education, we *must* reform our spelling."

But what should be done about this situation?, you ask, Do you suggest that we start spelling clean k-l-e-e-n? No, if everyone spelled the way he wished, things would be in a worse state!

Spelling reformers have usually tried to do either too much, or too little. They either insist on getting a perfectly phonetic system or they try to reform only the worst of our present spelling. Among those who want a perfect system was George Bernard Shaw. He advocated 42 characters for the alphabet instead of our present 26. His will stipulated that \$23,000 be paid the winning inventor of a new alphabet. Shaw argued that tools and machines have been vastly improved in the last few generations, yet we have been using the same alphabet for 3500 years! It was a wonderful advance on the picture systems of writing that preceded it, but since then, languages have come and gone, the science of phonetics has progressed,, and the art of printing has come in and changed the world. English has about 40 distinct sounds, and therefore has to pull and stretch its 26 letter alphabet in all directions. Some of the letters have to do duty for two or more sounds, and we also fall back on digraphs such as *aw*, *oo*, *sh*, *th*, and *ng*. At the same time, we completely waste C, Q, and X, since they are used for sounds already represented by other letters for example, C for sounds of S or K. On top of all this, we spell with such abandon that it might be supposed we had too many letters instead of too few. This strange state of affairs has come about chiefly because the English vocabulary derives from various languages, each with its own system of spelling, so that several conflicting systems using the same letters exist side by side in the written language. Think of the

one sentence containing five words which are spelled with the *same endings*, but the endings are pronounced differently. "A rough cough and a hiccough plough me through." There are five different ways you can read the sentence. A ruff cuff and a hiccuff pluff me thruff or, A roo coo and a hiccoo plooo me throo, and so on.

Shaw insisted that this chaotic nature of English spelling is no longer a matter of passive acceptance. He held that an entirely new alphabet is the only hope of reform, and that tampering with the traditional spelling would be up against the emotional hostility with which we all defend our old habits, as well as causing confusion between the two systems. Shaw said that an entirely new alphabet could be existing side by side with the old one. Gradually, it would take over more and more until, after a century or two, when everyone living has grown up with both notations the old one, which is our present ABC, would become merely an historical academic subject. That is how our number system was changed. The clumsy old Roman numerals were gradually superseded by the Arabic ones. The idea of using a symbol for zero had existed as early as the 6th century, but most of the people went on using the Roman numerals for another 900 years. They had learnt them in childhood, and found it too troublesome to change! When the change was finally made, it opened the door to the machine age. Just try doing long division with Roman numerals. But, according to Shaw, the change gradually came about because the two systems were sufficiently different to exist side by side, giving the better a chance to oust the worse.

You perhaps read in the *Denver Post* a few weeks ago (Nov. 22) about how one of Shaw's plays has been published in a book having our traditional spelling on the left-hand page and in the prize winning alphabet on the right-hand. The latter uses simple, shorthand-like signs which Shaw wished to have taught in schools as an auxiliary rapid script. By the way, for 50¢ you can purchase a copy of this from Penguin Books, Inc. History is certainly on the side of a modern alphabet, and when the dream comes true at last, who knows what human progress may accompany it?

However, for the present, spelling reformers feel that the only system which has a chance will employ the 26 Roman letters we now have, but use them in a better, more efficient way. This is the suggestion of the Simpler Spelling Association. The members use the 26 letters consistently to represent particular sounds. This reform may not produce a perfectly phonetic system, but it will greatly improve our spelling, will enable foreigners to learn English much more easily, and will save our children years of schooling. One such system had various names in different places. In Sweden, a professor of English named Zachrisson, devised this form and called it Anglic. In Britain, it was adopted by the Simplified Spelling Society and known as New Spelling, and in our country is now called World English Spelling. A few minor modifications have been made as a result of research.

It is very easy to learn. It is similar to the pronunciation key used in many dictionaries. A short vowel is always indicated by that vowel appearing alone without other supporting vowels. a e i o u sounded as in the words Fat Ed is not up. A long vowel sound is indicated by the vowel immediately followed by e:

ae together as in the girl's name Mae  
ee together as in the word see  
ie together as in the word pie  
oe together as in the word hoe  
ue together as in the word cue (billiard cue)

Consonants have their usual, regular sounds. Knowing just this much, you are now ready to spell correctly in World English such words as;

done dun	one wun	have hav
head hed	sack sak	save saev
his hiz	rock rok	use ues
live liv	wrong rong	use uez

This is only one of the suggested systems. There may not be agreement as to what the reformed spelling should be, but there is agreement that improvement must come.

Some indications of increased interest in such improvement are these: Within the past few years the British Parliament came within three votes of setting up a Royal Commission to reform English spelling. In our country, Hon. Harlan Hagen, a Congressman from California has introduced into Congress H.R.2476, [1] "A bill to establish a national spelling commission to reform the spelling of English words, to publish the United States Official Dictionary, and for other purposes." The bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. On May 18 of this year, Congressman Hagen wrote that the bill has been given to the select Subcommittee on Education headed by Congressman Frank Thompson Jr., of New Jersey. Homer W. Wood, a newspaper publisher and lawyer of Porterville, California has been very active in the cause for spelling reform. On May 6, 1961 he secured a resolution favoring a national spelling commission from the California Newspaper Publishers Association, which has a membership of more than 400 California newspapers. On May 23, under the leadership of Senator J. Howard Williams, the California State Senate passed a similar resolution. The Hagen bill (new number H.R. 336) in the national capitol, affords an opportunity finally to rid the English-speaking world of an enormous handicap. It is at least a motion before the House on which to speak and argue the question.

Upton Sinclair, famous magazine writer; author of books, and publisher, favors reformed spelling. He has asked President Kennedy to help this cause in a very fine and strongly worded letter. I have a copy of this letter before me. It was written by Mr. Sinclair without his knowing that a bill was in Congress for the creation of a National Spelling Commission. He expresses the same idea, however, and has since written Homer W. Wood that he is in favor of the present procedure expressed in the bill.

The necessary government action must have proper preparation and be accompanied by the peculiarly American way of handling a political problem, namely, by the interest of the people at large. As many as possible should become concerned with the problem of spelling reform. Let each one develop his own system; and then compare notes. Let the best ideas be found in that way, and submitted to the National Spelling Commission.

Suppose a National Spelling Commission decides on an improved orthography. How will it be adopted? Can't you hear someone say, "I've spent my whole life learning the present system, no one's going to make me learn a new one!" Quite right. No one will force any adult to adopt a new system. A suggested plan is this: Children in school can first be taught to read in the new, easy, dictionary way. They will quickly master it, and within a year or two, read and write it fluently and correctly. Parents will be able to *read* what these children have written even though they may not wish to write that way themselves. Each age group can *read* what the other has written, but can *write* with its own spelling system. Gradually the new can replace the old just as was done in many countries where systems of writing have changed within our century.

If a better form of English spelling takes hold; people all over the world will be benefited. We will have more respect for ourselves, and foreigners will have more respect for us. Correct English writing around the world will be a boon to all.

## **The Best Means of Representing the Th-sounds, by Godfrey Dewey, Ed.D.**

In a phonemic notation using no new letters, 18 of the necessary 24 consonant sounds may be represented by single letters used with their well-established normal values, and 4 additional digraphs - *ch*, *ng*, *sh*, and *zh* - present no problem, for the normal values of the first three are clearly established and the voiced *zh* is an obvious cognate of the unvoiced *sh*, and represents in any event the least frequent sound of English (0. 05%). The normal unvoiced and voiced sounds of "th", represented in World English Spelling (WES) by *th* and *dh* respectively, have however been a stumbling block for over a century. Shorthand manuals have commonly distinguished these two sounds by names such as *ith* and *thee* or by using capitals or italics for one or the other, but such devices are not acceptable in a notation for general use.

The two sounds of "th" are curiously enough the two most regularly spelled sounds of English, and to a shorthand writer or phonetist the *th* and *dh* notation is entirely acceptable, for it is logically consistent with unvoiced and voiced *t* and *d*, or *sh* and *zh*. To the untutored layman, however, the digraph *dh* is probably the strangest, most completely unfamiliar symbol of the entire phonemic notation (in WES, at least) and the great difficulty is that this uncouth *dh* represents over 90% of all "th" occurrences, including 11 of the 100 commonest words of English, while the familiar *th* represents just under 10%.

For the sake of the easiest possible transition from phonemic writing to conventional spelling, which is the crucially important factor in the use of a phonemic notation for the first teaching of reading and writing, it becomes therefore almost essential to assign the *th* notation to the voiced 90%, and to find the most acceptable solution, within the criteria of the particular notation, for the unvoiced 10% of "th" occurrences.

The accompanying table contains every word involving unvoiced "th" that occurs in ordinary usage more frequently than once in 10,000 words, and exemplifies 8 possible notations for each (the sounds other than "th" are spelled as in WES); 4 of these within the limitations of the Roman alphabet (2 within the limitations of the lower-case Roman Alphabet) and four involving an added diacritic available on all typewriters. The three bottom lines indicate my own personal choice:

- 1) if diacritics are to be permitted;
- 2) if capitals are to be permitted;
- 3) within the limitations of the lower-case Roman alphabet, as is extremely desirable.

(see table II)

Many people reading the examples where the "th" precedes the vowel will prefer the notation *tth* which brings the familiar th-component of the trigraph next the vowel. For the same reason, however, *thh* is preferable following the vowel. There are a few more occurrences preceding than following the vowel, but the fact that *h* is familiar as the usual non-phonetic determinant in most consonant digraphs is, I believe, a sufficient reason for preferring it as the distinguishing characteristic of the trigraph.

The net effect of this change in the representation of the th-sounds, which is under consideration by both the American S.S.A and the British S.S.S., is twofold: to eliminate the present logical but uncouth *dh* and to increase by a significant percentage the number of very common words such as: that, with, this, them, then, than, etc., as well as the wordsign for the commonest word of English, *the* (7.3%) which will appear in World English Spelling unchanged in their familiar conventional spellings.

**Table I.**

Frequency of representation of voiced *th* (3.43%), and unvoiced *th* (0.37%).

Assuming *th* for the voiced, consider for unvoiced *th* : tH, TH, tth, thh, th', th, th. th: The 29 multiple examples following make up 66% of all unvoiced occurrences of *th*.

things	through	three	think	thought	thing	something	anything
tHingz	tHruu	tHree	tHink	tHaut	tHing	sumtHing	enitHing
THingz	THruu	THree	THink	THaut	THing	sumTHing	eniTHing
tthingz	tthruu	tthree	tthink	tthaut	tthing	sumtthing	enitthing
thhingz	thhruu	thhree	ththink	thhaut	thhing	sumthhing	enithhing
th'ingz	th'ruu	th'ree	th'ink	th'aut	th'ing	sumth'ing	enith'ing
th, ingz	th,ruu	th,ree	th, ink	th, aut	th, ing	sumth, ing	enith, ing
th. ingz	th. ruu	th. ree	th. ink	th. aut	th. ing	sumth. ing	enith. ing
th:ingz	th:ruu	th:ree	th:ink	th:aut	th:ing	sumth:ing	enith:ing

thousand	thirty	third	thank	thinking	authority	everything
tHouzand	tHurti	tHurd	tHank	tHinking	autHoriti	everitHing
THouzand	THurti	tthurd	tthank	tthinking	authoriti	everitthing
tthousand	tthurti	THurd	THank	THinking	auTHoriti	everiTHing
thhouzand	thhurti	thhurd	thhank	thhinking	authoriti	everithhing
th'ouzand	th'urti	th'urd	th'ank	th'inking	auth'oriti	everith'ing
th, ouzand	th, urt	th, urd	th, ank	th, inking	auth, oriti	everith, ing
th.ouzand	th. urt.	th. urd	th. ank	th. inking	auth. oriti	everith. ing
th:ouzand	tthurti	th:urd	th:ank	th:inking	auth: oriti	everith:ing

throughout	thousands	nothing	both	months	month	worth
tHruuout	tHouzandz	nutHing	boetH	muntHs	muntH	wurtH
tthruuout	tthouzandz	nuthhing	boethh	munTHs	munTH	wurTH
THruuout	THouzandz	nuTHing	boeTH	munttHs	munthh	wurthh
thhruuout	thhouzandz	nuthhing	boethh	monthhs	munthh	wurthh
th'ruuout	th'ouzandz	nuth' ing	boeth'	munth's	month'	worth'
th, ruuout	th, ouzandz	nuth, ing	boeth,	month, s	munth,	worth,
th. ruuout	th.ouzandz	nuth. ing	boeth.	munth. s	munth.	worth.
th:ruuout	th:ouzandz	nuth:ing	boeth:	month:s	month:	worth:

truth	method	strength	south	earth	forth	north
truutH	metHod	strengtH	southH	urth	forTH	northH
truuTH	meTHod	strengtH	souTH	urTH	forTH	norTH
truutth	metthod	strengtth	southh	urthh	forthh	northh
truuthh	methhod	strengthh	southh	urthh	forthh	northh
truuth'	meth' od	strength'	south'	urth'	forth'	north'
truuth,	meth,od	strength,	south,	urth,	forth,	north,
truuth.	meth.od	strength.	south.	urth.	forth.	north.
truuth:	meth:od	strength:	south:	urth:	forth:	north:

**Table II**

Examples of discrimination:

voiced:	thie	eether	with	teeth (v.)	this	northerli
unvoiced:	th:ie	eeth:er	with:	teeth:(n.)	th:isl	north:
	tHie	eetHer	withH	teetH	tHisl	northH
	thhie	eethher	withh	teethh	thhisl	northh
bother	bruther	heethen	loeth (v.)	uther	them	then
boeth:	brauth:	heeth:	loeth:(adj)	auth:er	th:eem	th:enar
boetH	brauhH	heetH	loetH	autHer	tHeem	tHenar
boethh	brauthh	heethh	loethh	authher	thheem	thhenar
thee	theez	thien	thoe	this	thus	witherz
th:eka	th:eesis	th:in	th:aut	th:ik	th:rust	withH
tHeka	tHeesis	tHin	tHaut	tHik	tHrust	withh
thheka	thheesis	thhin	thhaut	thhik	thhrust	

and th:ithurz has boeth: soundz!

Editor's note: The examples in the above are not exhaustive but are sufficient. Other symbols that are usually found on a typewriter and could be used are: the asterisk \*, the slant line /, and one of the parentheses (. But all punctuation marks have the decided disadvantage of possibly being misunderstood when the th is in the end position. Hence, no punctuation marks should be considered for any other use than what they are now intended.

One disadvantage of the thh trigraph is in the words withhold and withheld, which would be confusing or misleading according to your pronunciation. These are more frequently pronounced with unvoiced th, as it is difficult to pronounce two successive voiced sounds. To represent these with unvoiced th would appear thusly: withhhold.

If instead of a trigraph, a digraphic symbol could be selected, even arbitrarily, it would (in the editor's opinion) be preferable to a trigraph. I would like to suggest "fh" as this symbol. This combination is not now found in English, so could not be mistaken for any present use. Phonetically, it suggests a sound rather close to the intended th, certainly closer than some of our presently used digraphs. You could not say that the sound of c plus the sound of h makes the sound we attribute to ch. Nor is the sound of t followed by the sound of h equal to either sound of th. If we could accept fh as an arbitrary symbol for the unvoiced th-sound, it would not only save space, time of writing, but look (in print) reasonably close to its voiced counterpart and present usage, yet readily distinguishable. Notice: munfh, wurfh, soufh, norfh, fhurd, fhank, nufhing, authoriti, fhree, fhaut, fhousand, fhruu, fhingz, fhirti, boefh mefhod, truufh.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp18-19]

## **The Best Means of Representing the Oo-sounds, by Newell W, Tune.**

There are many words in the English language spelled with the digraph oo, but these words include two different sounds, as in boot and book. Hence, it is necessary in any system of reformed spelling that different symbols be used to distinguish each of these sounds. The digraph ou could not be used as it is used for the diphthong in "out", "uo" should not be used because of the possibility of mental reversal and possible confusion, besides the fact that it is seldom used at all. Then uu remains the other logical symbol. The British Simplified Spelling Society uses "oo" as in "good" (the short oo-sound), and "uu" for the long oo-sound in "rude, food". Originally, the American Simpler Spelling Association used these symbols in reverse order, but in 1952 adopted the British idea for the sake of uniformity.

Let us explore the reasons advanced for each of these plans, in order to be sure of the best means of representing these two sounds.

Frequency of occurrence is a good means of deciding the use of certain symbols, because it allows you to anticipate the number of words that will be changed and those unchanged by the choice of the two digraphs. In the Rhyming Dictionary part of Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, on pages 1258 to 1263, the words are listed by pronunciation of endings. By actual count, there are a total of 398 words with the pronunciations of long and short oo. These are divided into 264 words with the "food" sound and 134 words with the "full" or "book" sound.

Considering first the long-oo, "food" sound: there are 114 words now spelled with oo, 67 words now spelled with u or u-e, and 83 words with other combinations of letters. If oo were chosen as the symbol for the long oo-sound (food), then 114 words would be unchanged, and the 67 now using u or u-e would look quite different in oo. But these 67 would be changed no matter what system is adopted, and the 83 words with unusual combinations of letters would also be changed no matter what digraph is adopted.

Now let us look at the short oo-sound as in "full, book." There are 31 words spelled with oo 95 spelled with u or u-e, (87 of which are composed with the suffix -ful), and 8 with other combinations of letters. To be sure, these 31 now spelled with oo would look strange spelt with uu, but the 95 now with u or u-e would look less strange spelled with uu than with oo. These 95 as well as the 8 with other combinations of letters would also have to be changed regardless of the kind of new system. That makes 95 plus 8 equals 103 of these words that will have to be changed anyway, plus the 83 irregular words on the first list, plus the 67 words with u or u-e, making a total of  $103+83+67=253$  words that must be changed no matter what regular system of reform is adopted. Isn't it better to allow the 114 words with the long oo-sound to remain unchanged rather than to change them and allow the 31 with short oo-sound to remain unchanged?

The coordinating committee of the S.S.S. & S.S.A. have maintained that uu should be used for the long oo-sound in "food" because, in the common mispronunciation of words like "new" and "due", which are sometimes pronounced not as diphthongs but as in "food", the spelling "nuu" and "duu" would look closer to the correct spellings "nue" and "due" than would the other system of reformed spellings with "noo" and "doo". But they apparently overlooked another important example. In the British system, the word "full" would be represented by the spelling "fool". (Remember, there are 87 compound words with the suffix -ful). This is a most unfortunate coincidence and also a likely point of attack by opponents of spelling reform. In Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, World English spells it in this sentence: "dhat from theze onored ded we taek inkreest devoeshon to dhat kauz for which dhae gaev dhe last fool mezher ov devoeshon;" Or how would you like to see from the Bible:

Acts 7:55, "But he beeing fool ov the hoeli goest, luukt up stedfasli intuu heven and sau the glori ov god." And can you imagine the Sanctus and Te Deum Laudamus: "hoeli, hoeli, hoeli, lord god ov hoests, heven and urth arr fool ov thie glori." Or some of the other places in the Bible: Acts 6:3, "fool ov the hoeli goest;" Deuteronomy 34:9 "fool ov the spirit ov wizdum;" John 1:14, "fool ov graes and truuth;" 1 Peter 1:8, "with joi unspeekabl and fool ov glori;" Psalms 119:64, "fool ov thie mersee;" 2 Timothy 4:5, "fool pruuf ov pruuf ov thie ministri;" 2 John 8, "that we riseev a fool riward;" And how do you think the Catholics would like to see their services written: "hael, mari, fool ov graes, blesed iz the fruit ov thie wuum, jeezus."?

I can just imagine some Congressman saying: "That's a damn fool way to spell "full". It is not difficult to imagine what would happen if the opponents of spelling reform were to single out this word's spelling as their target for the butt of their sarcasm and ridicule. The Spelling Reform movement might again be retarded for half a century as it was in 1906 by the opponents of Teddy Roosevelt. This we must avoid at all costs.

The 264 words referred to in the first list are: coo, do, loo, shoe, sou, through, to, too, two, who, woo, you, ado, bamboo, canoe, halloo, Hindu, outdo, ragout, shampoo, taboo, tatoo, undo, rendezvous; brood, crude, food, mood, prude, rude, snood, conclude, exclude, intrude, obrude, preclude, protrude, seclude, cooed, wooed, rued, strewed; hoof, proof, roof, woof, aloof, behoof, disproof; snook, spook, caoutchouc, peruke; cool, drool, fool, pool, rule, school, spool, stool, tulle, befool, overrule; bloom, boom, broom, doom, gloom, groom, loom, room, tomb, whom, womb, entomb; boon, coon, croon, June, loon, moon, noon, prune, rune, soon, spoon, swoon, baboon, balloon, bassoon, buffoon, cartoon, cocoon, dragoon, festoon, galloon, harpoon, lagoon, lampoon, maroon, monsoon, platoon, racoon, typhoon, honeymoon; coop, croup, droop, drupe, group, hoop, jupe, loop, poop, scoop, sloop, soup, stoop, swoop, troop, whoop; goose, juice, loose, moose, noose, sluice, spruce, truce, abstruce, burnoose, recluse, boot, bruit, brute, chute, coot, flute, fruit, hoot, loot, moot, root, route, shoot, toot, recruit, uproot, parachute; booth, smooth, smoothe, soothe; booth, ruth, sleuth, booth, tooth, tooth, truth, youth, forsooth, insooth, uncouth; groove, move, prove, approve, behove, disprove, improve, reprove, disapprove; booze, bruise, choose, cruise, lose, ooze, ruse, snooze, whose, peruse, coos, rues, shoes, twos; blew, blue, blues, brew, chew, clue, crew, cue, dew, drew, due, dues, few, flew, glue, grew, hew, hue, Jew, knew, mew, new, news, pew, rue, screw, shrew, skew, slew, stew, strew, sue, thew, true, view, yew, accrue, adieu, askew, bedew, endue, ensue, eschew, imbue, pursue, renew, review, subdue, withdrew, interview, residue, retinue; douche, ruche, barouch, cartouche, debouch; wound, crooned, pruned; broom, brume, flume, glum, grume, plume, rheum.

The 134 words in the second list are: could, good, hood, should, stood, wood, would, brotherhood, livelihood, maidenhood, motherhood, neighborhood, sisterhood, understood, womanhood; book, brook, cook, crook, hook, look, rook, shook, forsook, mistook, overlook; boor, moor, poor, tour, your, amour, assure, contour, insure, paramour, foot, put, soot; bull, full, pull, wool, awful, bashful, beautiful, blissful, boastful, brimful, bucketful, canful, carfull, careful, cheerful, chuckful, colorful, cupful, deceitful, delightful, disgustful, disdainful, distasteful, doubtful, dutiful, easeful, faithful, fateful, fearful, fretful, fitful, forgetful, fulfill, fullback, fulldress, fullblood, fuller, fullhouse, fullhand, fulminate, fulsome, graceful, grateful, hateful., hopeful, helpful., housefull, hurtful, joyful., lustful, masterful, meaningful., mindful, mouthful., painful., peaceful, playful, plentiful, pipeful, pocketful, powerful, regretful, resentful, resourceful, restful, rightful, roomful, sackful, shameful, sinful, skilful, soulful, spiteful, spoonful, successful, tactful, tasteful, tearful, thankful, trustful, truthful, tuneful, useful, voiceful, wakeful, wasteful, watchful, willful, wonderful, zestful; bush, cushion, push.

There are probably others with the suffix -ful, which have been overlooked.

Here are some gems from Faith M. Daltry, Santurce, Porto Rico.

I object to a fool in beautiful,  
And the same in the saying of dutiful.  
Now since the word awful  
Rhymes nicely with waffle,  
Why shouldn't those two spell like cuticle?

How odd is the spelling of iron  
For a better recording I yearn.  
I might mention that Byron  
Rhymes well with environ.  
But I give up - say, "Let's adjourn."

-o0o-

Heerz too a fien awaekend lot  
Ov parents, teechorz and what not,  
Hooz yung wil reed with eez and plezhur  
And soe in due and boiant mezhur

Wil lurn thaer lesunz aul, in order,  
Az kwikli az biyond our bordur  
Whaer childrun in thaer Spanish books  
Proenouns eech wurd just az it looks.

(Sorry we don't have the diacritic marks Mrs Daltry used to show her system of phonetic sounds.)

-o0o-

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp20-23]

### **Selecting Alphabet Symbols for English Speech Sounds, by Sam Seegay & Newell Tune.**

The *Spelling Progress Bulletin* is attempting to find out if there is any basis for agreement among the many alphabet designers (or alfabetees, as we call them), for the 41 (more or less) sounds of the English language. In considering this problem, we find it consists of three parts.

First, we are confronted with the problem of deciding the correct number of necessary sounds in the English language. This is not as easy to resolve as it might seem. We are aware that the professional phonetist is in need of a great many more distinctions between sounds than the layman; that is why the theory of phonemes was developed. On the other hand, the layman is aware that there are differences in the rendition of speech sounds due to the particular geographic region and to the national derivations of its residents. These differences do not usually introduce any new sounds- they only substitute one of the conventionally used sounds for another. Partly because of this, alfabetees vary in their enumerations considerably, going all the way from 33 in one system to 47 in another. Some of the primitive languages of the South Seas get along with only 19 sounds. Samuel Seegay at one time created a system with only 18 characters plus diacritics, for the transcriptions of 13 languages.

For the sake of the discussion in this article, the authors will compromise their own conception as to the number of necessary sound denotations for the proper rendition of General American Speech. In order to encompass those systems which differentiate the sounds more precisely, 42 sounds will be listed, altho some alfabetees seem to think that even some of these are duplications.

Secondly, having decided upon 42 as the number needed, it will be necessary to classify them and name them so that we will all understand what we are talking about. What system of numbering and identifying shall we use? We could follow the order of sounds as listed in one of the dictionaries, or by agreement, we could follow the system employed in one of the outstanding text-books on phonetics, that of Grace Barnes in: *General American Speech Sounds*. Since this seems to be the most logical that any phonetician has devised as well as convenient in manner, it will be used.

But not all of the sounds and their denotations are in disagreement. For instance, few alfabetees are in disagreement in the denotation for the consonant sounds that are attributed to the following letters: b, d, f, (hard)g, h, l, m, n, p, r, s, t, v, and z. Thus we can dispose of these 14 sounds at once and concentrate our attention on the remaining 28 sounds. All of these will be listed in the order of Grace Barnes in her previously mentioned book, altho we will combine one pair of symbols, in which the distinctions are too small to bother even the most discrete of the alfabetees. Her arrangement, with appropriate examples is listed in Table 1. To this is added the sound of schwa, as sounded in the beginning and end of abatta. This latter is not listed by Grace Barnes as a separate sound, but as a variant of the *u* in *up*, or more precisely as being between the *u* in *up* and *a* in *ask*.

Thirdly, we want to discover the extent of a basis for an agreement among the various alphabet designers to see if there is a possible agreed compromise alphabet that will be representative of the general thinking. One of these authors (Sam Seegay) has frequently stated that any system of writing should and must be an exact mirror of speech (by which he means that only one written symbol may represent one spoken sound); that no system of orthography is valid unless it is in exact conformance with his principles of physiological articulation. He asks, "Can you think of a better basis?" "Yes," we answer, "usage can in many cases be considered more important, when it is also based upon logical reasoning. No one needs to know where his tongue is placed in order to make each sound of English speech." Yet, Seegay reminds us, that every speech teacher shows her pupils how to make each speech sound.

**Table 1**

1. e-eve	16.ou-out	30. n-nun
2. i-it	17. o-owe	31. l-lull
3. e-end	18. u-cube	32. s-sis
4,5. a-at,ask	19. p-pop	33. z-zoos
6: a-ah	20. b-bob	34. r-roar
7. o-odd	21. m-mum	35. sh-shush
8. a-awe	22. hw-when	36. zh-azure
9. oo-foot	23. w-went	37. ch-church
10. oo-boot	24. f-fluff	38. j-judge
11. er-earth	25. v-verve	39. y-yet
12. u-up	26. th-thin	40. k-kick
13. a-ate	27. th-then	41. g-gag
14. i-eye	28. t-tot	42. ng-king
15. oi-oil	29. d-did	43. h-he
		44. a-abatta

There is an auxillary difficulty to be faced in attempting to evaluate all the various phonetic systems extant, for they come in four main types of denotations. The most extreme are those which introduce an alphabet composed entirely (or almost so) of new non-roman letters. Naturally, there could not possibly be any agreement of the many possible characters that could be fabricated from all the possible wiggles that a pen could move, so in this article we must eliminate from consideration such systems as the Deseret Alphabet, the Kunowski Alphabet, the Seegay Phonic Alphabet, Arthur Robson's and the runner-ups in the Shaw Alphabet contest, as well as the winning alphabet recently published. For the same reasons we must also eliminate from consideration alphabets which add a substantial number of new letters to the 26 Roman letters. Actually, no new letters should be allowed in order to make it possible to get an agreement, but an example of an alphabet with one new letter will be compared. This then, eliminates such alphabets as Dr. Edward Blaine's Sound Alphabet, Sinclair S. Eustace, Ruby O. Foulk's *amxrikai* spek, John R. Malone's Single Sound Alphabet, John M. Mott, Charles Morrell's Phonoscript, Wm, W. Murphy, Senator

Robert L. Owen's Global, Victor Paulsen's Polish English, Pitman's Augmented Roman, P:1. C. Rodi, and many others which add from 8 to 18 new letters.

There is a third method of indicating sounds, that is by the addition of diacritic marks. If we seriously consider the cost of converting all our typewriters, typesetting and teletype machinery, and other transcription machinery, we are forced to withhold consideration in this article of any system that relies upon such diacritical marks, as: George A. Bischoff, Faith M. Daltry, Alexander J. Ellis' World English, the Standard Alphabet of Dr Richard Lepsius, James Juvenal Hayes, Ernest B. Roberts, L. Soames, and others.

For the same reason - that of staying within the letters on the ordinary keyboard - we will have to exclude a much larger number of systems which add letters from Greek, or other foreign alphabets, or use distorted characters, such as the systems of A. W. Anderson. Joseph Bowden, Lewis Boyle. John Chappell, Ivor Darreg, Leo G. Davis, Robert Davis, Percy Freer, J. F. Hayden, Dr Gertrude Hildreth, Emma Johnson, Sir Harry Johnson, W. F. Kemble, La Verne Kirshner, Keith Morford, Charles Morrell, Win W. Murphy, Peter D Ridge Beetle, Simpler Spelling Assoc, Sir Isaac Pitman, Benn Pitman, E. L. Sitton, Barbara Smoker, Henry Sweet, Martin Vikla, Herbert Willig, and nearly a hundred others.

Also to be dropped from consideration are a few systems that mix upper and lower case letters or use numbers for word signs, such as: Frank Epperson, Leo G. Davis, Emma Johnson, George Wride.

We must also withhold from consideration others such as William Barkley, Albert Eagle, Nellie Neal, Dr. Axel Wijk, who have proposed systems of reformed spelling which have the alternate choice of several symbols for each of many speech sounds. Since these, strictly speaking, are not phonetic systems, they will not be considered here.

This leaves us with only one type of system being considered - those systems employing only the regular standard letters in a single font of lower case Roman Letters. These consist of: N. D. Argawalla, A. W. Anderson, Roland Barrett, Grayce C. Barthel, Bloch-Trager, R. P. Bull's Cheilic, Candy's Temporary, Denham Court, John C. Chappell, V. C. Crassnoff, Reg. Deans' Britic, Godfrey Dewey's World English, Alex. J. Ellis' Glossic, Europic & Suggested, Kyril Evans, W. R. Evans' Union, F. Experimentum, W. Fay, Mont Follick, Ralph Gustafson's Nuw Wae, Clarence Hotson, E. Jones' Popular, Robert Lambert, Frank C. Laubach, Walter Ripman's New Spelling, Bruce Rouse's Fonik, William Russell, Rundell's Utility, Sam Seegay, Swadesh, Henry Sweet's Broad Romic, George L. Trager, Newell W. Tune's Foeneemik. Fred C. Wingfield, Wrenick's Simple Orderly Spelling See Table 2.

In trying to compile a chart from examples of prose - even large samples of a page of 500 words - there always enters the question of whether the writer's pronunciation is the same as the reader's. In cases where it is obvious the writer's pronunciation is Received Standard (Southern British) one can easily note the difference, but wonder if the r's that are dropped should be indicated. Other dialectic pronunciations also offer difficulties of interpretation and may be the cause of some apparent inconsistencies. While typographical errors should have been eliminated in such precise and exacting examples, this possibility should not be overlooked.

The idea that prompted this research and discussion - that of trying to see if an alphabet could be devised from a consensus of opinions of the many alphabet designers, did not in any way imply that this consensus alphabet would necessarily be the best alphabet, nor even that it would be a workable alphabet, altho it was hoped it would. One cannot take the best and the worst, blend them together, or pick out the most frequently suggested character and necessarily expect to have the best solution

to the problem. To do so would be to say that individual thought is without merit and it is only that path that many sheep followed that we should follow. By this we do not mean to imply that customary usage and the familiarity that accompanies it should not be taken into consideration, and when it is dominant as well as sensible and logical, place credence in its value and accept it as an established part of our phonetic system. The better a sound and symbol association is already established, the better it would be for use as a phonetic symbol. Hence, it occurs to us that those symbols that are used and accepted by a considerable majority of alphabet designers, will probably deserve acceptance. Just where one should draw the line and say that a certain percentage of agreement among these alfabetees is necessary, would undoubtedly be an argumentative question. Hence, it will have to be settled arbitrarily.

Now let us see if a consensus alphabet can be devised from the data in table 2. Assuming that 40% is a sufficient majority for the consensus of opinion when there are more than three candidates, then the following symbols may be accepted for our alphabet:

ee (eve) - 43%	u (up) - 60%	sh (shush) - 84%
i (it) - 100%	oi (oil) - 67%	zh (azure) 84%
e (end) - 100%	ou (out) - 40%	ch (church)- 62%
a (at,ask) - 80	wh (when) - 54%	j (judge) - 87%
as (father) - 45%	w (went) - 95%	y (yet) - 78%
o (odd) - 84%	th (thin) 73%	k (kick) - 97%
ur (urge) - 40%	dh (then) - 57%	ng (ring) - 81%

This leaves the following sounds with no apparent agreement: awe, foot, food, Mae, eye, owe, fuel, and the schwa? Let us see if a compromise can be worked out. Logical reasoning could be used when frequency indicates divergent thinking patterns.

For awe, the most frequent symbol, au, is sufficiently ahead of all but o, which it exceeds only by one, that it could be accepted. O is already used for another sound (not, odd) so could not be considered anyhow.

The most frequent symbol for the foot-sound is u with 38%. But this conflicts with the u in up, so cannot be considered. The next most frequent symbol is a tie, with uu and oo having six each.

For the food-sound, the most frequent symbol is uu with 35%. This could be accepted as a satisfactory symbol, depending upon the use of oo for the foot-sound. But oo is a close second with 29%, hence the difference is only two alfabetees. A discussion of these two sounds and symbols is on another page of this issue.

For long-A, as in Mae, the most frequent symbol is ai, but this is also even more frequently used for eye, hence confusion would exist no matter what sound the symbol ai was allowed to represent, Could we select the next most frequent symbols? That would give *ei* for Mae and *ie* for eye - hardly a desirable selection as confusion could again exist due to mental reversals. Next is ae with only one less. Apparently, no satisfactory solution is possible on a consensus basis. But let us go further.

For owe, the oe-symbol is the most frequent by one. While this is a slight margin, this choice will not conflict with any other, so we might be willing to accept it.

For the diphthong in fuel, the two most frequent, *iu* and *ue* are tied with six each. Hence, no consensus is possible here.

To recapitulate on the long vowels, we have *ee* for the long-e, *oe* for the long-o, *ie* as a second choice for long-i, and *ue* is tied for a choice for long-u. It would merely be an extension of the regular pattern of long vowel symbols to select for long-a, the symbol *ae*. Would it be logical or consistent to select the most frequent, *ai*, when so many had selected this symbol for the sound of long-i? And also when it deviates from the regular pattern of the other long vowels? Any decision on these points is bound to be criticised (principally by the losers).

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that five alphabets included *x* for the *ks*-sound, and two used *qu* for the *kw*-sound. Apparently, these were concerned with making the transition as easy as possible. Some others seem to try intentionally to see how far from traditional they can make an alphabet, so that it is almost unreadable at first sight. The prize for this is Cheilic, with 17 unorthodox uses of symbols, followed by William Russell with 13 and Argawalla with 12. It might be amusing for alfabetees to transcribe a passage in these three alphabets and compare it with their own. Also, nine alphabets used some form of accent marks to indicate stress location. Most of these were old alphabets of the last century.

There were too few alphabet designers who had any particular symbol for the schwa to be able to get a consensus of opinion. Only 12 (33%) used any one symbol consistently. Of these, the following symbols were used: *i'*, *q*, *u*, *u'* (2), *x*, *v*, *æ* (2), *ə* (3). Five alfabetees omitted a symbol for the schwa when lightly sounded, and a few others used an apostrophe. Most of them ignored it and used conventional vowel letters, usually excepting the *u*, as it was generally recognized as a stressed letter.

In presenting the Consensus Alphabet, the Editor has taken the viewpoint that a consensus is of little value unless it produces something worthwhile. To merely list the most frequently selected symbol for each sound, without rhyme or reason, would accomplish no purpose, nor would require any thinking. Hence, the chief idea was to try to fabricate a workable alphabet that would reflect most of the thinking of the alfabetees. We hope we have accomplished this objective.

Here is the Consensus Alphabet:

1. eve,	ee.	16. out,	ou.	30. nun,	n.
2. it,	i.	17. owe,	oe.	31. lull,	l.
3. end,	e.	18. fued,	ue.	32. sis,	s.
4. at, ask,	a.	19. pop,	p.	33. zoos,	z.
6. ah,	aa.	20. bob,	b.	34. roar,	r.
7. odd,	o.	21. mum,	m.	35. shush,	sh.
8. awe,	au.	22. when,	wh.	36. azure,	zh.
9. foot,	oo.	23. went,	w.	37. church,	ch.
10. boot,	uu.	24. fluff,	f.	38. judge,	j.
11. urge,	ur.	25. verve,	v.	39. yet,	y.
12. up,	u.	26. thin,	th,	40. kick,	k,
13. Mae,	ae.	27. then,	dh.	41. gag,	g.
14. eye,	ie.	28. tot,	t.	42. king,	ng.
15. oil,	oi.	29. did,	d.	43. he,	h.

We wish to acknowledge the help of Leo G. Davis in gathering data from alfabetees for this survey. We also wish to thank Dr. George L. Trager for the use of his unpublished alphabet for indicating speech sounds, which as tabulated here does not do justice to the thoroughness of his system. In a personal letter to the Editor, he says in part: "I don't recall that Bloch and I ever actually suggested publicly an orthography within the 26-letter alphabet, but such things were, I'm sure,

discussed by us. And I have myself on more than one occasion drawn up a list of suggestions for such an alphabet

"I am appending a list of suggestions along lines that I have played with in recent years. The first one of these was learned in one afternoon by my ten-year old son sufficiently well for him to use it in a material of his own composition. You may include these materials in your article if you state that they are from a personal communication to you by letter, and have not been published, and add that I don't seriously expect English spelling to be changed in any near future.

Sincerely yours, George L. Trager

**Table 2.**

GB# = Grace Barnes' #; Key = Key Word;

NDA=N.D.Argawalla, AWA=A.W.Anderson, RB=Roland Barrett, GCB= Grayce C. Barthel, B-T= Bloch-Trager, RPB= R.P.Bull, Cheilic, C,T= Candy, Temporary, DC= Denham Court, JCC=J.C.Chappell, VNC=V.N.Crassnoff

GB#	Key	NDA	AWA	RB	GCB	B-T	RPB	C,T	DC	JCC	VNC
1	eve	ii	ee	ee	ee	ij	ih	.i	ee	iy	y
2	it	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i
3	end	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e
4,5	at,ask	a	a	a	a	æ	a	a	a	ae	aq,x
6	father	q	e	aa	ah	ah	o	.a	aa	ah	a
7	odd	q	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	ah	a
8	awe	vv	o	au	aw	oh	o	o	au	qw	o
9	foot	u	u	oo	uh	u	v	u	uu	uh	u
10	food	uu	uu	uu	oo	uw	ev	.u,u	oo	u	u
11	urge	vr	er	?	er	ur,ər	ur	er,ur	ur	ur	oqr
12	up	v	v	u	u	ə	u	ŭ	u	oh	a,o
13	Mae	ee	ae	ai	ai	ej	ei	.e	ai	ey	ei
14	eye	qi	ai	ii	ey,y	aj	ai	i·	ie	ai	ai
15	oil	vi	oi	oi	oi	oj	oi	oi	oi	oi	oi
16	out	qw	au	ow	ow	aw	av	ou	ou	qu	au
17	owe	ow,o,oo	ō	oo	oh	ow	ov	o·	oa	o	o
18	feud	iw	iu	ew	yoo,eu	juw	iv	y-u,u·	yoo	yu	uq
22	when	wh	hw	wh	wh	hw	hv	wh	hw	wh	wh
23	went	w	w	w	w	w	v	w	w	w	w
26	thin	fh	j	th	th	th	z	th	tth	th	th
27	then	x	y	th	th	dh	y	dh	th	x	th
35	shush	sh	x	sh	sh	sh	xh	sh	sh	c	sh
36	azure	c,zh	c	zh	zh	zh	j	zh	zh	zh	zh
37	church	c	tx	ch	ch	tsh	x	ch	ch	tc	c
38	judge	j	dc	j	j	dzh	dj	j	j	j	j
39	yet	i	j	y	y	j	i	y	y	y	i
40	kick	k	k	k	k	k	k	k	k	k	k
42	ring	ng	q	ng	ng	ng	q	ng	ng	nk,ng	ng
44	schwa	v	omit	?	?	ə	?	?	ə	?	x

RDB=Reg. Deans, Britic, GDWE=G. Dewey, World Eng., AJEG=A.J.Ellis, Glossic, AJEE=A.J.Ellis, Europic, AJES=A.J.Ellis, Suggested, KE=Kyril Evans, WREU=W.R.Evans, Union, FEA=F.Experiment, Analog, WF=W. Fay, MF=Mont Follick.

GB#	Key	RDB	GDWE	AJEG	AJEE	AJES	KE	WREU	FEA	WF	MF
1	eve	ii	ee	ee	ii	ee	y	ii	ii	ii	ie
2	it	i	i	i	i	y,i	i	y,i	y,i	i	i
3	end	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e
4,5	at,ask	a	a	a	æ,a	a	a	a	a	a	a
6	father	ar	aa	aa	a	a	aa	aa	aa	aa	aa
7	odd	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	aa	o
8	awe	or	au	au	oo	au	o	ao	ao	o	oa
9	foot	u	oo	uo	u	uu	w	u	u	u	uu
10	food	w	uu	oo	uu	oo	w	uu	uu	uu	oo
11	urge	er,ur	ur	er,r	œr	er	ur	oer	ur	?	er
12	up	u	u	u	œ	u	u	œ	œ	x	u
13	Mae	y	ae	ai	ee	ay,ai	ei	ey,er	æ	ee	ei
14	eye	ai	ie	ei	ai	..iy,ii	ai	ay,ai	ei	ai	ai
15	oil	oi	oi	oi	oi	oy,oi	oi	oi	ay,or	oi	oi
16	out	aw	ou	ou	au	ou	aaw	aw,au	ou	au	ou
17	owe	q	oe	oa	oh	oh	oh	ow,oo	o,oh	ou	ou
18	feud	iw	ue	eu	iu	yoo	iww	iu	iu	yuu	iu
22	when	w	wh	wh	wh	hw	hw	hw	hw	wh	u
23	went	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	u
26	thin	x	thh	th	th	th	th	th	th	th	th
27	then	x	th	dh	dh	dh	dh	dh	dh	dh	dh
35	shush	c	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh
36	azure	c	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh
37	church	tc	ch	ch	ch	ch	ch	ch	ch	ch	tsh
38	judge	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	j
39	yet	i	y	y	i	y	i	y	y	y	y
40	kick	k	k	k	k	c	k	k	c	k	k
42	ring	n'	ng	ng	q	nk,ng	ng	ng	nk,ng	ng	ng
44	schwa	u	a,e,i,o	u'	u'	?	a,e,i,o	œ	o,a	?	?

RGNw=R.Gustafson, Nuu wae, CH=C. Hotson, EJP=E. Jones, Popular, REL=R.E.Lambert, FCL=F.C.Laubach, WR=Walter Ripman, BRf=B. Rouse Fonik, WmR=Wm. Russell, RU=Rundell, Utility, SCS=S.C.Seegay.

GB#	Key	RGNw	CH	EJP	REL	FCL	WR	BRF	WmR	RU	SCS
1	eve	ee	ee	ee	ii	ee	ee	e-	iy	e;ee	iy
2	it	i	i	y,i	i	i	i	i	i	y,i	i
3	end	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e
4,5	at,ask	a	a	a	æ,a	a	a	a	a	a	a
6	father	aa	ah	aa	o	aa	o	o	o	a	o
7	odd	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
8	awe	au	aw	o	c	aw	au	o	ow	o,au	uh
9	foot	oo	ui	w	u	uu	oo	uu	c	ù	ih
10	food	uu	oo	oo	uu	oo	uu	oo	cw	u'	iw
11	urge	er,ur	er,r	er	r	ur	er,ur	r	ur	er	ur
12	up	u	u	u	q	u	u	u	u	u	u
13	Mae	ae	ai	ay,ai	aa	ā,ae	ae	a-	ey	a',ai	ey
14	eye	ie	y	ie	ii	ī,ie	ie	i-	qy,q	y',i'	oy
15	oil	oi	oy	oy,oi	ci	oi	oi	o-y	owi	oy,oi	uy
16	out	ou	ou	ow	ou	ou	ou	ow	qw	ou	aw
17	owe	o,œ	oa	o,œ	oo	o,oe	oe	o-	uw	o'	uw
18	feud	yu	iu	yoo,eu	yoo	ue	ue	u-	ycw	y,u',u	yi
22	when	wh	hw	wh	wq	hw	wh	w	hw	wh	hw
23	went	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w
26	thin	th	tth	th	th	th	th	c	xh	th	th
27	then	dh	th	dh	dh	<del>th</del>	dh	c	x	th	dh
35	shush	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	q	sy	sh	sh
36	azure	zh	zh	zh	zh	zu	zh	q	zy	zh	zh
37	church	ch	c	ch	x	ch	ch	ch	tsy	ch	c
38	judge	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	dzy	j	j
39	yet	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
40	kick	k	k	c	k	k	k	k	k	k	k
42	ring	ng	ng	nk,ng	ng	ng	ng	ng	j	nk,ng	x
44	schwa	?	omit	i,o,a,e,	q	?	i,o,a,e	?	c,omit	a,e	u,i

S=Swadesh, HSBR=H.Sweet, Broad Romic, GLT=G.L.Trager, N WTF=N.W.Tune, Foeneemik, FCW=F.C.Wingfield, WS=Wrenick, S.O.S., REZA=R.E.Zachrisson,Anglic, C=Consensus, %F=% Frequency

GB#	Key	S	HSBR	GLT	N WTF	FCW	WS	REZA	C	%F
1	eve	ii	iy	iy	ee	j	ee	ee	16 ee	43
2	it	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	37 i	100
3	end	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	37 e	100
4,5	at,ask	a	æ	ae	a	ae	a	a	31 a	80
6	father	aa	aa	ah	aa	q	aa	aa	17 aa	45
7	odd	o	o	o	o	q	o	o	32 o	86
8	awe	o	ao	oh	aw	c	au	au	10 au	26
9	foot	u	u	u	uu	w	uu	oo	14 u	38
10	food	uu	uw	uw	oo	u	oo	uu	13 uu	35
11	urge	?	œ	i'r	ur,ør	u:,r	ur	er,ur	17 ur	40
12	up	u	œ	a	u	v,a	u	u	23 u	60
13	Mae	ei	ei	ey	ae	ei	ai	ae	9 ai	21
14	eye	ai	ai	ay	ii	ai	y	ie	13 ai	31
15	oil	oi	oi	oy	oi	ci	oi	oi	28 oi	67
16	out	au	au	aw	ou	qu	ou	ou	16 ou	42
17	owe	ou	ou	o',ow	oe	o	oe	oe	8 oe	18
18	feud	yuu	yuw	.yiw,rw	ue	yu	eu	ue	6 ue	14
22	when	wh	wh	hw	wh	hw	wh	wh	20 wh	54
23	went	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	35 w	95
26	thin	th	th	th	fh	th	th	th	27 th	73
27	then	dh	dh	dh	th	dh	dh	dh	21 dh	57
35	shush	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	sh	31 sh	84
36	azure	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	zh	31 zh	84
37	church	ch	c	ch	ch	tsh	ch	ch	23 ch	62
38	judge	j	j	j	j	dsh	j	j	32 j	87
39	yet	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	29 y	78
40	kick	k	k	k	k	k	k	k	34 k	92
42	ring	ng	q	n,ng	ng	ng,x	ng	ng	30 ng	81
44	schwa	?	œ	i'	ə	a,',omit	?	i,o,a,e,	?	

[SPB June p16]

### Some corrections in the alphabet table of March, 1963

In the comparison of three dozen alphabets, we inadvertently gave as examples for Robert E. Lambert and John C. Chappell, some obsolete alphabets. The changes, to bring them up to date, are listed below:

Sound	#1	4,5	6,7	8	9	10	12	15	16	17	18	22	27	37	44
R.E.L.	ee			q	uu	u	x	oi	ou		yu	hw		c	x
J.C.C.		a	α	α w			o		α u	ou			dh		o

Chappell explains that sounds 4, 5 (and others) are intended to be represented by the script a (α), in the absence of which on a typewriter, temporary use may be made of the letter q.

Since no complaints were expressed by the other alphabeteers, we may consider that the others are correct.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin March 1963 pp23,24]

**Skeemz ov Speling Reform, by E. Jones**  
**(Reprinted from *The Spelling Experimenter*, Feb., 1881)**

I consider dhat dhe discusson ov dhe fundamental prinsiplz and dhe detailz ov dhe vairius propoezalz for Speling Reform in dhe *Experimenter* wil be ov grait advantej in dhe present staj ov dhe moovment. In order to giv point and definitnes to dheez discussonz, it wil be nesary for eech author to stait distinctly for whot purpos hiz skeem iz intended, dhe baisy upon which it iz fraimd, and dhe meenz by which it iz propoezd to secuer dhe adopshon ov dhe skeem.

Dhe purpos for which dhe present skeem iz intended iz for teeching reeding and speling in scoolz and for jeneral ues, independently ov eny ultimet skeem.

Dhe baisy upon which it iz fraimd iz dhe *prezent English* ues ov dhe Roman Alfabet, without referens to eny udher langgwej, or to eny former peeriod ov dhe English Langgwej.

Dhe meenz propoezd to secuer its adopshon iz by invieting dhe keenest discusson on every prinsipl and on every detail from speling reformerz, so az, by adopting such modifcaishonz az may be jeneraly agreed upon, aplicaishon may be maid for dhe sancshon ov dhe Eduecaishon Department for dhe ues ov a comon system ov reformd speling not to be naimd after eny individual.

Dhe fundamental prinsipl iz:

Dhe simbol for eech recogniezd sound in dhe langgwej shal be dhat leter or diegraf by which it iz reprented ofenest in dhe curent speling, *dh* and *zh* beeing dhe only new simbolz recwierd, and dheez ar in harmony widh dhe coresponding simbolz, *th*, *sh*, for dhe relaited soundz.

For obvius reezonz, a *second* simbol iz retaind for sum ov dhe soundz in defiend pozishonz. i.e. *k* for *c* befoer *e*, *i*, and *y*, and at dhe end ov monosilablz, *y* for *i* befoer vowelz and at dhe end ov wurdz.

At dhe end ov wurdz, in formativz from dhe saim, and befoer vowelz in dhe midi ov a wurd -  
*ay* for *ai* - pay, payer, payee, payment, payabl;  
*oy* for *oi* - joy, boyish, loyal, toying, joyful;  
*aw* for *au* - saw, sawing, sawyer, lawful;  
*ow* for *ou* - cow, coward, powder, bowing.

*Jeneral Ruel.*

A vowel not foloed by a consonant haz its *long* or *naim* sound.

*Speshal Aplicaishon:*

1. At dhe end ov wurdz: *be*, *she*, *go*, *no*, *sho*, *my*, *by*,
2. A vowel befoer anudher vowel in dhe mid] ov a wurd iz long; dhus - *trial*, *deist*, *dual*.

A sistem ov speling on dheez lienz, it is submited, secuerz dhe maccimum ov advantej widh dhe minimum ov chainj. It iz eezy to print, eezy to riet, eezy to reed in print and in manuscript, eezy to teeche, and eezy for transizhon to reeding in curent speling. Whot moer iz wanted?

Dhe rieter disclaimz eny credit for himself az to orijinality in dhe sujeschonz heer maid. Hiz object iz to endeavor to bring into harmony dhe best and moest practical ideaz ov dhe leeding speling

reformerz. It iz deemd to be a far moer agreeabl task to seek for points ov agreement between speling reformerz dhan to emfasiez points ov diferens.

It iz pleezing to see so much agreement between Mesrs. Ellis, Pitman, Fleay, Evans, and udherz, az to dhe practical nesesity ov a reformd sistem ov Engglish speling widhout new leterz.

Mr. Pitman and Mr. Evans hav laitley proovd to demonstraishon, dhat to giv to dhe vowel leterz, a,e,i,o,u, dher long or Continental soundz in a sistem ov reformd speling for Engglish, wwd be impractical and absurd, a point long insisted upon by Mr. Ellis.

Dhe dificulty ov establishing eny corespondens in dhe shaips ov leterz for related soundz iz found to be insueperabl. Moest skeemz having swoloed dhe camel ov Engglish valuez, and widhout referens to eny corespondens in dhe shaips ov pairz ov leterz for pairz ov soundz, in such *consonants* az *j* and *ch*, wil not strain at dhe nat in dhe *vowel* soundz.

Mr. Fleay haz reesently cauld tiemly atenshon to a point insisted on by Prof. Max Muller sum tiem ago, to dhe efect dhat langwey woz not maid for etimolojists and filolojists. Linggwists and stuedents ov comparativ filolojy can certainly taik cair ov dhemselvz in deviezing simbolz for ues in dher investigaishonz. It iz not nesesity dhat dhe *saim simbolz* shwd be uezd in a popular skeem az in a sistem for linggwistic purposez, which wil only be needed by wun in 10,000 ov dhe former.

Mr, Fleay haz aulso very properly protested against dhe too sweeping condemnaishon by sum advocaits ov speling reform ov dhe anomaliz ov dhe present speling. It haz bin repeeted a thousand tiemz within dhe past thirty yeerz, dhat oenly wan wurd in a thousand iz spelt foneticaly in dhe curent orthografy. Dhe ecstravagans ov such a staitment may be juld from dhe fact dhat in dhe test spesimenz presented to dhe Skeemz Comitee, such thuro-going reformerz az Mr. Pitman and Mr. Evans retain dhe curent speling at dhe rait ov from 150 to 300 wurdz per 1,000.

On dhe jeneral polisy ov speling reformerz, I wwd moest hartily endors dhe wurdz ov Mr. Evans, dhat "Speling Reformerz wil hav wurk enuf to maik needful, uesful, and practical chainjez, widhout invieting opozishon by atempting unnesesary, uesles, and caprishus wunz." Aulso, "Meerly dhat aul difthongz (and vowel'z?) shwd be plaist on dhe *saim* theoretical fwting, iz realy trivyal in comparison widh dhe considerashon in behaaf ov retaining dhe oeld simbolz."

Az to dhe standard ov pronunsiashon, I am dispoezd to adopt dhe vew ov Prof. Max Muller, when he sayz, "If eny atempt wer maid to employ dhe minuet fotografy ov spoeken soundz, dhe hair-splitting masheenery, in which sum eysel, dher wwd be fifty diferent wayz ov speling English, and dhe confuezhon wwd be graiter dhan it iz now." Mr. Ellis aulso telz us dhat dher ar merry diferent wayz ov pronounsing Engglish corectly. I wwd myself eeven suport dhe vew dhat in certain doutful caizez dhe pronunsiashon shwd bend to dhe speling, notably in such wurdz az *book*, *foot*, &c.

Widh dheez vewz, I shal be glad to discus prinsiplz and detailz widh Mr. Evans or eny wun in dhe *Experimenter*, not in a carping or capshus spirit, but widh a sinseer dezier to ariev at sum comon agreement. It wil be nesessary, however, in order dhat discussyon shwd be ov sum practical benefit, dhat eech shwd stait ecsplisitley hiz aimz and methodz, az I hav endevord to doo. It wwd be a meer waist ov tiem to discus points ov pronunsiashon at dhis staj, or misprints.

I feel widh Mr. Evans dhat it iz hy tiem speling reformerz shwd cum to dhe point and agree upon *sumthing*, els we shal becum dhe lafing-stok ov dhe enemy. For me, to wait fifty yeerz til we can get whot iz cauld "a thuro sistem," iz by far too long a rainj. I see *no object* in seeking to fiend whot woz dhe pronunsiashon ov dhe ainshen Roemanz or dhe Anglo-Saxonz. I wozn't dher to heer, nor can I fiend enybody to giv me pozitiv, definit informaishon dhat may be practicaly aplied to dhe

problem ov English speling reform. Whot soundz dhe vairius langgwejez ov Europe or dhe wurd giv to dhe Roeman leterz, iz a problem beyond my reech. With Mr. Evans, I consider we hav a big job befoer us to efect eny improovment whotever in English speling, and let everyudher tub stand on its pen botom.

Dhe preeching ov speling reform in eny shaip, and to eny degree, wil be to pendants a stumbling-blok, and to etimolojists foolishnes. Eeven if aul speling reformerz pwld togedher, dher task wwd be dificult enuf, widh divieded counselz, dhe pasiv rezistans wil be moer dhan a mach for us.

Yorz, E. Jones, Liverpool, 1881.