

# Spelling Reform Anthology edited by Newell W. Tune

## §12. Criteria for a Spelling Reform

Since every reformer has different ideas as to what should be the kind of reform, this section warns potential alfabetees of the mistakes made by previous reformers and suggests guide lines for their benefit.

### Contents

1. Tune, Newell, [Logic & Good Judgment needed in Selecting the Symbols.](#)
2. Tune, Newell, [Criteria for Selecting a System of Reformed Spelling.](#)
3. Tune, Newell, [Regimen Essentiale.](#)
4. Tune, Newell, [A Guide for Spelling Reformers.](#)
5. Read, Kingsley, [Nonsense Prose as a Test for Efficiency.](#)
6. Our Readers Write Us, [Planning a New Fonetic Alfabet.](#)
7. Tune, Newell, [Nonsense Prose as a Test for Efficiency.](#)
8. Tune, Newell, [Quo Vadis Corrector?](#)
9. Gassner, Walter, [The Essential Requirements for- a Spelling Reform.](#)

*[Spelling Reform Anthology §12.1 p172 in the printed version]*

*[Spelling Progress Bulletin Summer 1977 p11 in the printed version]*

### 1. Logic and Good Judgement Needed in Selecting the Symbols to Represent the Sounds of Spoken English, by Newell W. Tune

If all the systems devised for representing the speech sounds of English were laid end to end they would probably reach from here to eternity. Needless to say, most of them would be more efficient than our present unsystematic use of the 26 Roman letters. But anyone can artistically devise a group of 40 or more symbols, draw them on separate pieces of paper and put them into a hat, then have someone draw out the slips one at a time, giving each a name. Then throwing all of them back into the hat and drawing them out again and assigning to each a sound. From examining many proposed systems, it would seem that some such procedure was used to establish some of the systems. Such results as I have seen indicate that little good judgement is used by many alfabetees. No wonder Congressmen shy away from spelling reform schemes. Hence the first requirement for accepting the results of any alfabetee is to pass judgement on his ability to form a coordinated concordance with the Roman letters. New additions to the Roman alfabet must fit in esthetically with the designs of the Roman letters. They must look as if the Romans designed them for the sounds not then used but which were anticipated. Today we know a lot more about the sounds of speech and can recognize half again as many speech sounds as did the Romans. Or perhaps with their limited need for words, they were able to make themselves understood redily with the fewer number of sounds.

But today, before the selection of symbols can begin, it must be determined just how many symbols are needed to represent adequately all the sounds of English speech. Sir James Pitman in correspondence to me said something to this effect: All of the sounds of English speech that are

spoken anywhere need to be represented in order to portray faithfully the speech of all English speakers. However, this might be misconstrued to mean such slight differences in speech as are not significant phonemically or morphemically. For example, "daughter" and "dotter", "thin" and "then", "which" and "witch", and many other pairs must be written differently because they are semantically and morphemically different, hence need discrimination, even tho in the speech of some persons they are not phonemically different.

The speech of foreigners trying to speak broken English or the unusual dialect of the Cockneys should not be allowed to influence our attempts to make an acceptable standard of English speech. The British Broadcasting Company and the American National Broadcasting Company have published Handbooks of Pronunciation for their announcers. The two do not differ very much and it is thought that between them an acceptable standard pronunciation might be worked out.

Sir James Pitman's Initial Teaching Alphabet contains 44 symbols but three pairs of these are redundant; that is, each pair represents only one sound but is used in order to make easier the transition to T.O. These are: *c* and *k*, *z* and backwards *z*, *a* (father) and *o* (odd). It is hardly arguable that the last pair is the same phonetically in American speech, but in British speech they have a sound halfway between "odd" and "aud" so Pitman added another symbol especially for British use. It is similar to "a" but is a little taller. Subtracting three from 44 leaves 41 sounds in English speech that we would think as desirable of being represented. To this, it would also be desirable to add the schwa, *ə*, even tho it is sounded very much like short *u* but is much shorter in sound length and used to be considered as appearing in unaccented syllables only. If used in both unaccented and accented syllables or single words, its usefulness would be destroyed and there would be no reason for adding it to the alfabet. This is where good judgement is needed.

My admonition to all spelling reformers is: "Look before you leap!" Most Saturday afternoon alfabetees dream up their brainstorm and then try to get publicity for their wonderful invention - the perfect fonetic alfabet - without adequate testing or in some cases, without trying it at all on other potential readers. In many cases, they make some unorthodox use of letters discarded as redundant in T.O., which causes confusion with T.O. words. For Example, the use of *c* for the *ch* sound, the use of the Continental sound values for *e*, *i*, *a*, *j*, *y*, would make it unacceptable to English-speaking people because that is the very cause of the present confusion. And we would not be willing to change the spelling of 99% of our T.O. words in order to conform to the dozen or so words that follow the French sound values.

From this it follows that we need a *criteria* for selecting a system of reformed spelling.

[*Spelling Reform Anthology §12.2 pp172-173 in the printed version*]

[*Spelling Progress Bulletin Summer 1977 pp11-12 in the printed version*]

## **2. Criteria for Selecting a System of Reformed Spelling for a Permanent Reform, by N. Tune**

It goes without saying (or being required to prove) that the proposed new spelling system should be as nearly phonemic as practical even tho this conflicts with morphology and etymology. Wm. Craigie said, that "Etymology, at best, is a questionable study," being stressed by so-called scholars who were not always scholarly, and had not the knowledge of language we now have. Noah Webster said, "the etymology of most words is already lost, even to the learned; and to the unlearned, etymology is never known."

The reason why it is important for a language to be phonemic is so that oracy can develop into literacy on a reliable basis. Anything that interferes with this orderly and logical development is a handicap. Even the slightest handicap should be avoided.

Our first consideration should be for the welfare of future generations of children and foreigners desiring and needing to learn English, and adults who are now illiterate in English. All other considerations should receive a lesser priority. This means that the ease of learning, and consequently the ease of teaching, are the most important considerations. Horace Mann said, in *On Spelling Books*, "The spelling book should have especial reference to the ease of the pupil - to his facility in learning to spell and read. The pupil should not first be mistaught and then untaught, in order to be retaught, with the chance that the last two processes will never be performed. The native love of consistency or congruity in a child should not be obliterated or outraged by a succession of contradictions. He should be taught correctly at first, and then whatever new things are taught should be affiliated as far as possible, to what is already known." When any proposed change conflicts with this principle, it should be dropped or receive secondary consideration.

In designing a new alfabet, consideration must be given to its appearance as an adjunct to the Roman alfabet, its ease of remembering and ease of writing. For instance, in making the symbols for *ch*, *sh*, *th*, the new symbols should be a combination of the parts of the two letters, hence easy to remember and no more difficult to write than the component parts. Because the component parts are already familiar to everyone, a new symbol that is a combination of these parts will be easily remembered. But because of technical difficulties, it is more practical that no new letters be added to the alfabet.

Some have said that *readability* of any new system by literate adults is a test that should be applied before it is considered acceptable. But readability - or ease of reading - is largely, if not almost entirely, due to the acquaintanceship the reader has with T.O. words. In other words, how many times he has seen it in his reading experience. Hence, this goes back to finding out how frequently occurring the words are in running text on the printed page in the jargon of the reader (and it will differ as readers differ in their professions and experiences). The more commonly occurring spelling "though" is easier for the average person to read than "tho" altho the latter expresses with less ambiguity the intended meaning and sound. In distinguishing "though" from "thought," the reader must be careful to discern the "t" that differentiates the two words, while "tho" has no such confusable word. Any attempt to inject *Readability* into the spelling controversy would, in my opinion, be a red herring, intended solely to preserve the status quo.

The reader, one of the general public, would after only a few weeks of being exposed to a regularized, semi-phonemic spelling would take it in stride and probably be as efficient in it as he is now in the more difficult (because it is so haphazard in its regularity) traditional orthography.

However, the real beneficiaries of a regularized or reformed spelling would be the new learners, the drop-outs of our present school system, and foreigners who need to learn English in their trade, profession or commerce.

An important part of the criteria should also be the testing of the system on a lengthy sample of written prose that must be sure to: 1. include all 41 (or more) sounds of English speech, 2. words that might be spelled in the new spelling so that they would be confusable with T.O. words. For example, in World English, the word "show" is spelled "shoe", which means something entirely different in T.O., and therefore might be confusable unless the context makes it clear. W.E. does have a few more such words, but those, which have two letters together, such as: *outhouse*, *ongoing*, *engage*, *reelect*, *highest*, *lower*, *power*, *employee*, etc., which might be read as a digraph, should be separated by a dot (or a hyphen?). (*out.house on.goe.ing*, *en.gaej*, *ree.elect*, *hie.est*, *loe.er*, *pou.er*, *emploi.ee*). Other systems I've seen seem to have overlooked this and other deficiencies.

So here are the basic considerations of Priorities for developing any new system of spelling:

1. It should be as nearly phonemic as is practical without adding any new letters to the alphabet.
2. It should be such a simple, logical system that it easy to remember and learn, hence easy to teach.
3. It should have as few points of conflict with T.O. as possible so that persons literate in T.O. will have as few stumbling blocks as possible to overcome.
4. It shall try to be as close to T.O. as is practicable considering the three previous criteria to be more important than nearness to T.O.
5. It shall have been tested thoroly on a lengthy sample of prose so that all possible points of confusion within itself and with T.O. have been exposed and either eliminated or compensated.

We would appreciate hearing about your ideas on these criteria and whether we have overlooked any necessary criteria.

[Spelling Reform Anthology §12.3 pp173,174 in the printed version]  
[Spelling Progress Bulletin Winter 1971 pp13,18 in the printed version]

### **3. To all Spelling Reformers – Regimen Essentiale, by Newell W. Tune**

In order to devise a system of reformed spelling, a reformer is faced with a considerable number of conflicting situations. First of all, will it be a new alphabet, augmentations to our 26 letter Roman alphabet, or will it avoid adding new letters by using digraphs when there are not enough letters to represent the sounds of English?

It is easy enough to put 3 or 4 dozen symbols in a hat, draw them out one by one, giving each a name; then tossing them back into the hat, withdrawing them again one by one and assigning each a sound (with no relation to its name). Some seem to be devised this way.

Unfortunately, a new alphabet such as Deseret, requires new type fonts, new typewriters, etc. Such a handicap means that it hasn't the slightest possible chance of getting established. It took a lot of money to establish Pitman's i.t.a. So let us confine our thoughts to Romanic spelling reform.

A reformed spelling must not only be a great improvement over T.O. (practically all I've seen are more regular and consistent) but it also must satisfy a half dozen or more requirements. Some of these conflict with others, so it is essential that a set of priorities be set up so that the most important principles get first consideration and take precedence over the less necessary changes.

In the questionnaire sent out by the Research Committee on Spelling Reform, a question was asked about these six factors and the vast majority of respondents gave the following priorities: 1. Phonetic perfection, 2. Simplicity, 3. Ease of writing, 4. Nearness to present spelling, 5. Compatibility with typing and printing machines, 6. Economy of space. This last was so low in the reader's estimation as to hardly be worthy of consideration.

With this in mind, I offer the following criteria for your reflection and consideration:

#### **Regimen Essentiale for spelling reforms**

Priorities for the selection of a system of spelling reform, listed in order of their relative importance.

1. Representing *all* the sounds of spoken English without combining any sounds needed for discrimination. A system which fails to distinguish between the vowel sounds in *cot* and *caught*, consonant sounds in *this & then*, or *weather* and *whether*, is inadequate and must be rejected.
2. Simplicity, ease of remembering, and consequently ease of learning and teaching. This also includes rejection of a system which has reversible digraphs which could cause confusion in the minds of children learning to read, such as both *ei* and *ie*.
3. Freedom from confusion with our present T.O. words. This also includes nearness to the regular and consistent parts of T.O. spelling, because these are the parts of T.O. that are now used in the teaching of reading by phonics. Any system that tries to force upon the public the Continental vowel representations must necessarily change the spellings of a large majority of T.O. words. Such a system would cause a tremendous amount of confusion with existing spellings, and therefore would be unacceptable to the general public and educators.

Of course, the above applies only to an all-Romanic system of reform. It would not apply to a non-Romanic system, or perhaps not to some Augmented Roman systems.

Perhaps there are other factors needing consideration. What do you think we have overlooked?

[Spelling Reform Anthology §12.4 pp174,175 in the printed version]

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Spring 1971 pp3,1 in the printed version]

#### **4. A Guide for Spelling Reformers, by Newell W. Tune**

Spelling reformers are sometimes made when a concerned public-spirited citizen finds he has to teach the illogical, confusable anomalies of our English spelling to pupils who question the sanity of such a so-called system. So, with plenty of self-confidence, he sits down and soon has devised a regular spelling system that he feels is undoubtedly an improvement over our regular spelling. Perhaps it is, but this spelling reformer would do well to thoroly test his proposed system before presenting it to the public and backing it whole-heartedly - or else he may be backed into a corner with an untenable system that may cause him embarassment. Some systems that have seen have lots of built-in booby-traps that the proponents have overlooked because it was not adequately tested.

The best way of testing a proposed system is to prepare a dictionary in the new spellings. But, of course, that takes a lot of work, time and money (if it is printed) and this does not appeal to the average reformer. A short-cut does exist which will show any logical minded reformer the pitfalls of his system. Just start writing words in the new spelling with the long vowel sounds, starting at the beginning of the alphabet. Transcribe into the new spelling: babe, bac(k)e, bade, bafe, bage, baje, bale, bame, bane, bape, bare, base, bate, etc. It wont be long before he will encounter some amusing spellings that will easily be confused with some T.O. spellings.

This is the first and most important principle that must be considered. It is imperative that the new spelling shall have as few (or none if possible) spellings that are the same as T.O. spellings of other sounds because confusion will result. If the spelling reformer does not conscientiously criticize his system looking at it logically with an open mind, he is often doomed to disappointment. To avoid confusion with our present T.O. spellings is an important and vitally necessary part of the planning of any new system. For example, one system I have seen uses the French vowel sounds for the letters *e* and *i*, as in *fete* and *machine*. His would change the spellings of many thousands of English words just to fit in with the dozen or so imported French words. He would spell *ee* (long *e*) with *i* in such words as: beer (bit), bead (bid), seat (sit), heed (hid), and bait (bet), date (det), late (let), mate (met), etc. Yet when this probable confusion was pointed out to him, he refused to change, saying, "Oh, well, they'll get used to it." The blindness of some reformers is exceeded only by their stubbornness.

Confusion can be caused by other means. For this reason, discarded letters, such as *q*, *x*, and *c*, should not be reassigned to new uses that are never found in T.O. spellings. It should be obvious (yet it seldom is) that it is difficult for an educated person, who already knows our English spellings from long establisht habits, to try to forget the conventional sound often given to a symbol and then learn to associate a new sound with it. This double-duty is an insurmountable obstacle to the learning of any new system, yet some reformers can't see it. A glance at a page from Ruby Olive Foulk's 218 page book entitled: AMXRIKCAI SPEK would soon show you that it was unreadable without lengthy study, and contains many confusable spellings. Yet she spent over \$ 5000 having the book printed without any testing whatever, when a sample page printed in it and shown to a dozen unbiased teachers would have proved to her the impracticality of the system.

A second and probably equally important consideration is to make the new spellings easy to remember, and hence to be learned and to be caught. Since everyone will have to learn the new system, this importance cannot be stressed too highly. A regular, systematic means of indicating the long vowel sounds is needed, since the short vowel sounds, being the more frequently occurring on the printed page, need to be disturbed as little as possible. (For a complete analysis of this principle, see the SPB, vol. III, no.1, March, 1963, pages 16-24).

These two considerations are more important than another principle: the principle of least disturbance of the regular T.O. spellings (what is regular? - the most frequently occurring spellings?). An apology is probably needed for offering this principle at all yet it has some merit if all other considerations are met first. If we do adhere to this principle, we will make the new system easy to read for the oldsters who long ago learned to recognize T.O. spellings as sight words regardless of their illogical spellings. Perhaps this will placate to some extent their grudging reluctance to any change whatever. Yet this principle should not deter us from making any changes that will follow our first two principles: avoiding confusion and making it easy to learn and to teach.

Since English has only 26 symbols (actually only 23 useful symbols), the spelling reformer needs to add a dozen and a half new letters or to make some provision for representing this many more sounds than we have letters. Alfabetees are torn between adding new letters (which are not on our typewriters) or making the existing letters do double duty, by two different means - doubling up letters to make digraphs, or by adding diacritical marks. The latter will make a less changed appearance on the printed page but at a great sacrifice in writing speed. Diacritic marks slow down the script to a point where it is almost intolerable for taking notes a dictation. Try it before fostering it on your friends or the public. A digraf can be written in much less time than a diacritic. If a diacritic is misplaced or missing, the error could create a wrong meaning or make the message not understandable.

Some have used a mixture of upper and lower case letters to achieve their reform. If the ordinary large upper case letter is used, it makes a very strange, misleading, almost ridiculous appearance to the printed page. If small upper case letters that fit in aesthetically with the regular lower case letters are used, it means that many new keys must be added to the typewriter. Any such change is a definite handicap to the adoption of such a system. The alfabeteer who has this idea should stop and consider the cost of changing, millions of typewriters, print shop fonts, teletype machines and other remote controlled word machines - for news, stock reports, telegraphs, etc.

We admit there are obstacles to spelling reform. Therefore, the idea of this message is to avoid the worst obstacles and to encourage thinking up new ideas that will have a better chance of succeeding.

*[Spelling Reform Anthology § 12.5 p175 in the printed version]*  
*[Spelling Progress Bulletin Winter 1971 p20 in the printed version]*

Dear Mr. Tune:

## **5. Nonsense prose as a test for efficiency**

Your article in the Spring 1970 issue reproducing Bernard Shaw's nonsense prose as a phonetic testpiece, brings back memories of my transcript of it -- in an over-subtle alphabet which embraced 24 vowels and vowel diphthongs. Shaw received it with such acclaim that he must have had some horrid howlers. That was in 1942, and we have all learned much since then. One does better with a set of 15 vowels now.

The importance you attach to nonsense words in test- pieces is questionable. Tests are devised to disclose:

- (a) whether a proposed alphabet suffices to distinguish word-meanings in a nominally phonetic spelling -- without exceeding that function by recording every trivial variant of the essential phonemes:
- (b) whether the writer in fact uses his alphabet as well as he might; and
- (c) how he proposes to choose between alternative spellings in words of variable pronunciation.

Reading deals with words in context. Let us not obscure the purpose and end-product of spelling, which is understood-meaning.

Where, then, is the special virtue in nonsense words or contorted sentences? Should not every word in a testpiece be familiar, or readily pronounced? The test does not set out to disclose one's ignorance of the vocabulary: it calls for good solutions of spelling problems. Shaw's testpiece is valuable in that it is grammatical and speakable without hesitations; and nonsensical only in order to group closely together words illustrating the same or contrasted phonemes. That enables consistency and discrimination of spelling to be checked easily. Much more could be said.

**Kingsley Read, Worcester, Eng.**

*[Spelling Reform Anthology §12.6 p175 in the printed version]*  
*[Spelling Progress Bulletin Winter 1974 p20 in the printed version]*

## **6. Our Readers Write Us**

**Barnett Russell, M.D.**  
**Plainview, N.Y.**

**Planning a new fonetic alfabet**

**Newell T. Tune**

Dear Dr. Russell:

In planning any scheme of spelling reform, it is much more than merely matching each of the 40 or more sounds of English speech to a distinctive symbol(either a single letter or digraf), so as to produce a one-sound-one-symbol system. Anyone with an eight year old mind can put 40 symbols into a hat, and draw out one at a time to represent each sound as it is mentioned - and some of them look just as if that was how the system was made. Some bear little resemblance to our regular spelling. So then, it becomes as much a matter of judgement as it is a knowledge of phonetics and sounds of English speech. Every newly designed system must consider all these qualifications for the use of every symbol (letter or digraf); and I consider their importance in this order:

1. phoneticness,
2. simplicity,



3. ease of learning,
4. freedom from confusion with T.O.,
5. nearness to T.O. (the principle of least disturbance of the regular parts of English spelling).

As you can see, I consider this (5th) as the least important of the several considerations. Why?; because on reflection a logical mind will see that all the others are obviously very important.

Since any one-sound-one-symbol is fonetic if it has no exceptions, rule no. 1 is easily followed (conformed).

In our questionnaire, the large majority of answerers gave no. 2 the next priority in importance. From this it follows logically that Ease of learning is next in importance, and regularity of pattern is the best aid to remembering; hence it is very important in teaching. Next it is logical to assume that confusion is the greatest obstacle to learning and hence freedom from confusion is our next most important goal.

Are there any other conditions that affect ease of learning? If so, they should be inserted here before we consider the importance of nearness to T.O., for we can only accept those parts of T.O. that conform with our previously decided rules or priorities. That is why we cannot blindly accept frequency of use in T.O. as an important means of selecting a symbol to represent an English speech sound. Our T.O. was derived as a conglomeration of words from many other languages. Often their spellings are in conflict with each other, hence some good judgement must be used to decide which of several sounds are to be given to a certain digraf, for instance: ai, or whether because of its many sounds, it should be used at all. Shall it be as in: *main, mountain, plaid, said* or *Britain*? Or should we refuse to use it at all because whatever sound we try to establish for it will cause confusion because of its present 5 different frequently used associations? I think the latter is wisest, not only because of the confusion that would result with T.O. if *ai* were used at all but because it cannot fit in with a regular pattern for vowel symbols.

Remember that each suggested symbol must be tested by these 5 rules before it can provisionally be accepted. Then as others are accepted, each has a bearing on the previously accepted symbols and must pass a test of compatibility with the system as a whole. Sometimes further adjustments must be made in the interest of compatibility.

We must use the single vowel letters for the short vowels as in: *that, pen, is, not, much* because they all occur more frequently than do the corresponding long vowel sounds. So we are forced to use digrafs for the long vowel sounds. Since *ee* is by far the most frequent symbol for long-e (see SPB March. 1963), it must be used for this sound. For the rest of the discussion, see the same reference.

The discussion ends up by showing that the most logical system is this: Mae, see, thie, toe, Tuesdae, noon; and faather, shuud, haul, our, oil, urlier. (plus the aforementioned mnemonic: *that pen is not much*). As you will see by comparison, this is principally World English (altho a few additional combinations are also given for special situations.

You are quite right in saying that "unlearning a word once learned incorrectly is more difficult than learning a spelling in the first place." That is why Sir James Pitman emphasized the ease of transition most of all, in designing his initial teaching alfabet, and its system of spelling. (which by the way, is not strictly fonetic, but is weighted by several rules keeping as near as possible to T.O.)

I am glad that you agree that our goal should be a one time reform with a date set for its introduction in the schools preceded by a period of psychological conditioning (propaganda and familiarizing) for adults. But I don't agree that WES is not likely to be the ultimate solution to the problem of spelling reform. Its simplicity, regularity, ease of learning, and freedom from confusion with T.O. put it vastly in front of other systems I've seen.

Sincerely yours,

[Spelling Reform ed Newell Tune t12.7p176]

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Spring 1970 p9]

## 7. Nonsense Prose as a Test of the Efficiency of a Fonetic Spelling System, by N. W. Tune

Almost all his life, George Bernard Shaw was a crusader for fonetic spelling and a new alfabet to represent it properly. He strongly felt that our imperfect spelling was the cause of our language's deterioration. He castigates William Archer [1] for saying that the English language has not changed for centuries. Shaw says [2] "for example, the 'whoreson knaves' of the 16th century become, in the paragraphs of modest police-court reporters, the - -s of the 19th. Our conventional spelling has not hindered any of these changes: they would have occurred at the same rate if the English language had been spelt all the time on the Weller principle, 'according to the taste and fancy of the speller.' All that the conventional spelling has done is to *conceal the one change that a fonetic spelling might have checked - namely, the changes in pronunciation*, including the waves of debasement that produced the half rural cockney of Sam Weller, and the modern metropolitan cockney of Drinkwater in 'Captain Brassbound's Conversion.' At all events, here alone was the establishment and maintenance of a standard humanly possible; for the influence of the printed word over pronunciation can hardly be exaggerated."

There is a real need for English to be represented by a fonetic spelling system. Dr. Godfrey Dewey said (in a personal letter to me), "It is well accepted that even a linguistic scholar cannot tell with certainty how to pronounce a word he has only seen in T.O. print, or incidentally, how to spell a word which he has only heard." What he said is certainly true, but that is the fault of T.O. spelling, and to a certain extent, of the spoken English language. Being replete with homonyms and words with multiple meanings, it forces the reader and the listener to depend largely on contextual aid. When we eliminate the contextual aid, it forces the reader to depend largely on fonetic analysis. Isn't it a self-evident truism that a properly devised fonetic alfabet and system of fonetic spelling should be able to be read out loud by a reader even if he doesn't know the entire meaning of what he is saying? For the test, it makes no difference whether the reader (and speaker) understand all he says. Merely, it intends that he should be able to get the proper pronunciation to all the words printed thereon, without confusion due to ambiguities or inadequacies in the system. This then, is the value of the Nonsense Prose Test.

Are all fonetic spelling systems equally good? If so, then this whole idea is wasted and it doesn't matter which one is adopted. But some alfabet systems recognize only 35 or so sounds in English. Others show that they feel there is a need for 41 or so sounds in English needing representation. We need some means of comparing all these systems, showing up their deficiencies and attempting to measure their efficiencies.

Many times in the past, spelling reformers or alfabetees with new fonetic alfabetes to present to the public, have transliterated their system into some well known poetry or prose which the reader almost knows by heart. If one really stops to analyze the situation, and if logic is used, one should in all honesty conclude that this is not really a test of the spelling system but a demonstration well calculated in advance to dispell doubts in the mind of the reader that the new system is difficult for the uninformed reader to decode and understand. You can prove this to yourself by using the Cloze Test on the transliterated poem or prose. The Cloze Test consists of replacing every fifth word with an equivalent number of dashes for the letters of the word. Since the reader, who knows by heart the poem or prose he is reading, replaces the missing word from memory - not from any fonetic decoding of the spelling system, such a demonstration is not an adequate test of the efficiency of the spelling system under consideration. You can see this more clearly if you had the opportunity to examine 30 different spelling systems all transliterated into Lincoln's Gettysburg Speech. By the time you had read a dozen you would know it by heart and the latter systems would undoubtedly appear to be easier to read than the first system.

The only way an adequate test of the efficiency of a spelling system may be made is by some means that eliminates memory aid and all or almost all contextual aid. One way of doing this is to list a few hundred words that would require fonetic analysis to be understood. Such a list would be very dull, boring and probably not ever read in its entirety by the reader. So some interesting challenge to the alfabet designer needs to be offered.

George B. Shaw invented a means of testing such a spelling system and offered his nonsense prose as follows: [3]

"Chang at leisure was superior to Lynch in his rouge, munching a lozenge at the burial in Merion Square of Hyperion the Alien who valued his billiards so highly.

"Quick! Quick! hear the queer story how father and son one time sat in the house man to man eating bread and telling the tale of the fir on the side of the road to the sea, following the coast to its fall full two fathoms deep. There they lived together served by the carrier, whose narrower mind through beer was sore and whose poor boy shivered over the fire all day lingering in a tangle of tactless empty instinct ineptly swallowing quarts of stingo!" (In T.O. it contains 494 letters, yet has only 372 sounds - showing a waste of almost 25% in space and time).

While this prose has more than a minimal amount of contextual help, it also omits the 'book' sound. It also has two words not in the dictionary - coined words for the purpose of reducing contextual aid.

Because Shaw's prose gave too much contextual aid, this writer conceived a longer paragraf of nonsense prose which illustrates all 41 sounds of English, which gives a minimum of contextual aid, and also in close proximity, gives a direct comparison of sounds needing discrimination, which some alfabetees fail to discriminate, such as, *what-watt, when-wen, why-Y, whoa-woe, both-bother, thin-then, this-thistle, thy-thigh, odd-aud, otto-auto, cot-caught, don-dawn, not-naught, dotter-daughter*. It also has some words especially coined (so as to be unfamiliar to the reader or alfabeteer) so that he must use fonetic analysis to decode them. Try this on your alfabet - and judge it accordingly!

### **Sokitumi - the Depleted Prose**

The poet Thoreau was thorough in his valediction of the questor right in the shades of night were falling fastly over the meadows, how low now we plough through the brooks, pools and full mountains. Ununctious is the slightly emaciated epitome analogous to nouveau riche in its thoroughated thoughts. Calligraph the photoplasmatic notion that Alice, alike any eight archaic coughs are ploughed asunder. Seek the sprightly leotard in the slough of the Basque and calliphractigate his awsomey unique unicorn unionized against his forehead. Maintain mountains of melancholia mingled amongst the magnificent scents and accents account in the primugal forest since cents are sincerely expensive. Obese and blighmy are the facets of the squirly pterodactyl in his flight to avoid alarcity. Tiz enough to bring candescence to an isomorphic isoplethic kooka-burra in the kourbush, even if you know what that means. The knotty naughty problem awed the odd procrustians in the calm comma and the palm of pommel. Polly Pauley caught a cot in Maud Moll's auto with Otto Fawkes' fox. I yearn for iron to dive in the Ying-yang river in a wet diver's suit. The thin thickness of Thendora thanks the thendar with thithers and theka in Wethick. Profligate thy thigh with this thistle but not naughty did don dawn bother both daughter and dotter. Cash your church unctious suspiciously. If you don't survive this emasculated version of aid-deprived prose, perhaps you will do better next time. (*Note: all words must be transcribed, including personal names*).

[1] Abraham Tauber: *Shaw on Language*. 1963, Philosophical Lib.

[2] Ibid, p. 14.

[3] Ibid, p. 128. Originally, Richard A. Wilson, *The Miraculous Birth of Language*, 1948, Philosophical Library, p. 38.

[Spelling Reform Anthology §12.8 p177 in the printed version]  
[Spelling Progress Bulletin Spring 1978 p20 in the printed version]

## 8. Quo vadis corrector?

Mr. Ed. Starrett,

Newell W. Tune, Dec. 14, 1977

Dear Ed.: I am sorry you misunderstood my intentions - I am sure you are a dedicated spelling reformer AND a concerned teacher of reading to pupils. I merely thought you should try to analyze your thoughts as to why you are proceeding in the direction you are. I'm sure your ideas are influenced by two divergent means of attaining the goals of better education via reformed spelling: 1st, getting it accepted by present literate adults, and 2nd, by getting perfection in the system. These two qualifications are mutually antagonistic. You cannot placate our literate adults who long ago learned to recognize non-phonetic words by sight and associate with them the spoken sounds of each word. So you must decide which way you (or the reform system) should go. Any system that is based on minimal change is not going to be phonetic or as easy to teach as a more radical but more reliable system. Any system that is based on *rules* for spelling and pronunciation will not be as easy to teach as a system that is reasonably or nearly perfected phonetically. Do you really think you can teach reading in T.O. by the rules you suggested or even in T.O. modified by regularizing rules?

But you may be able to put forth your ideas as a means of getting our present literate adults to *tolerate* a gradual use of *some* regularizing rules for spelling, as the examples you gave. This idea may take hold if presented in a manner that shows the intention to upgrade teaching methods as well as making it easier for semiliterate adults to read what they see in the newspapers and magazines. Try putting forth these ideas in articles to editors of newspapers and magazines who are receptive to innovative ideas:

1. I think the first step should be to make the silent terminal *e* reliable.
2. The second step to be S.R.-1.
3. Drop the unnecessary silent letters in some 880 or more words (see my article in Spring 1970).
4. Use doubled consonants consistently to indicate the preceding vowel is short.

The use of these 4 rules would produce a Regularized English that is reasonably close to T.O. (so much so that no one would have the slightest difficulty in reading it) but would remove quite a few of the freak irregularities that cause a lot of trouble for beginners.

I don't like introducing the final *y* rule to 1st and 2nd graders. This rule allows 4 different pronunciations for *y*: 1. long *i* as in terminal *y* in one syllable words, 2. long *e* at the end of polysyllable words, 3. short *i* when *y* is in a syllable and, 4. consonant *y* in words where *y* is at the beginning of a syllable (which is difficult for adults to recognize - let alone immature children).

One thing you have overlooked: children, when learning to read, are not acquainted with the spelling practices of more than a few words. Those few they have seen on the grocers' shelves are usually spelt phonetically. They do *not* know about the irregularities of English or that they need to learn *rules* in order to be able to spell a new word. Children who learned to read in i.t.a. made much faster progress, wrote longer, more interesting themes, tackled longer words, than children who were taught in T.O. by any of several methods (see the Bullock Com. Report). They did not find the transition to T.O. to be difficult, but it did take some time to assimilate all the anomalies of English, which had to be learned one-by-one. Even Pitman was greatly over-concerned about the transition and made several unnecessary concessions (I thought), such as *tch* in *catch*, etc. But the case of transition by pupils has amazed all who taught via i.t.a. And the ease of reading in i.t.a. by literate adults has amazed almost all who have tried it. These points have been conveniently

overlooked by opponents of i.t.a. But openminded persons should not.

Here is some reasoning that you should consider seriously - everyone who is learning to read has a spoken vocabulary that is many times as big (perhaps a hundred times) as his written language. Therefore the spoken language is overwhelmingly important in his learning to read. The natural inclination of a pupil (child or adult) is to associate the sounds of words with the spelling. This is proven by noticing and analyzing spelling errors. (See Mary Johnson's articles in *SPB*.) Almost half of all spelling errors made by boys are because of attempts to spell phonetically. The other half of the errors are caused by a half dozen or so reasons: carelessness, reversals, improper pronunciation, inability to visualize, association of the sounds with the wrong symbols, and a few other inexplainable causes.

Girls are less prone to fonetic errors than boys because they are more fotografically minded. They notice details and the shape of the word (its appearance) seems to tell them when they are wrong.

I did not say the way a word looks is not important. I quoted Louis Foley, who said the appearance of a word *is* important - and I agree, that if it doesn't look right, the spelling needs to be checked. I merely used that to show how much importance literate adults attach to the appearance of T.O. words and how their reading speed might be upset by a radical spelling reform such as W.E. But that does not mean that because of this we should not use W.E. as an initial learning medium to avoid all irregularities and the need for rules to be learned and considered every time the pupil tries to write a sentence.

Another point you have overlooked: It is far easier to *read* in T.O. (difficult as it is) than it is to *write* in T.O. Everyone eventually learns to recognize words by sight (by configuration and the arrangement of consonant letters because they are more reliable than the vowel letters), but when it comes to writing, many times the writer will have to look up the spelling because his visualization of the word is not sufficiently accurate to decide its correct spelling.

Have you ever contemplated, just how does a child learn to read? (see *SPB* winter, 1977). Is it by associating the sounds in words with the spelling (phonics), or by constant repetition of the spelling of each word (the old Blue-back speller), or by look-n-say? Or by a combination of all of these and other methods? (because no one method works well with T.O.'s irregularities). But the tests in England and U.S.A. have demonstrated rather strongly that the *method used* is immaterial *if* the medium used is reliably fonetic - and conversely, 3 different methods (with the attendant confusion caused by not knowing which method of attack to use on new words) are required when the orthography has some words that are fonetic, some that follow rules (part of the time) and some words that do neither but must be learned individually as in look-n-say. Would a system with your 4 or 5 rules overcome these difficulties?

As to an agreement among spelling reformers, or among educators as to the best medium to use, I'm sure it would be impossible to get any sort of an agreement, but one system might be tolerated if sufficient practice materials were available. I attribute the fair amount of success of i.t.a. to the more than 400 different children's books available. Its chief limitation is its special typefonts and the lack of many typewriters with i.t.a. symbols. World English, which uses almost the same spellings as i.t.a., does not have that limitation. And W.E. has been given permission by Sir James Pitman to use paste-overs in W.E. on i.t.a. textbooks in a comparative classroom test. This should show which system is superior, or if neither, the advantages of each, over T.O.

Yours cordially, Newell

[Spelling Reform ed Newell Tune t12.9p178-180]

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1978 p16-18]

## **9. The Essential Requirements for a Reformed Spelling, by Walter Gassner, L.L.D.\***

\*Randwick, Australia.

\*Presented at the First International Conference of the British Simplified Spelling Society, London, Aug. 1975.

The purpose of this paper is to present, in order of importance, various aspects of spelling reform which would provide a maximum of benefits to future users and entail a minimum of inconvenience to those accustomed to the traditional spelling system. It is designed for the English language but the principles stated also hold for other languages.

(1) *Only the 26 letters of the Roman alphabet should be used* - with no augmentations and no diacritical marks which are not in use at present.

The introduction of a new system of spelling will, of necessity, impose a burden on everyone who uses the English language, no matter whether English is his native language or a language that he has acquired. To this burden, no further burden should be added, and a weighty additional burden it would be if it should become necessary to learn new letters or to acquire the habit of putting written accent signs over letters. Indeed, if it were not for these considerations, the most reasonable thing to do would be to adopt the International Phonetic Alphabet, which is widely used for teaching the pronunciation of a large number of languages and is known to scholars throughout the world. This alphabet contains, in addition to the letters of the Roman alphabet, a number of specially designed or adopted signs to provide a sign for each sound (or, to be precise, for each phoneme, a phoneme often encompassing a family of similar sounds whose exact nature in each instance is determined by its phonetic environment).

The deficiencies of the Roman alphabet can, however, also be overcome by continuing the practice of using groups of two letters - so called "compound symbols" or digraphs - for certain sounds, such as *sh* for the initial sound in *ship*, or *th* and *ng* for the initial sound and the final sound in *thing*. The use of compound symbols does not contradict the phonetic principle as long as these symbols are used in a consistent manner and as long as a separation mark (say, an apostrophe) is inserted where letters that usually make up a compound symbol are pronounced separately - e.g. as in *mishap*.

(2) *Writing should be so designed that speech can be deduced from it* - or rather, so that there can never arise any doubt regarding the pronunciation of a word.

The emphasis is on "word" -, for there are limits to the things which an orthography can indicate. An orthography cannot, for example, do justice to sentence stress or allow for alternatives for certain short words usually referred to as "weak forms." Every other aspect of the pronunciation should, however, be clearly indicated, and thus it becomes necessary to have available an appropriate symbol for the Neutral Vowel (i.e., the initial sound in *about*) and two distinct sets of symbols for the majority of vowel sounds, so as to make it clear which syllable is stressed and which syllables are unstressed. The last point is extremely important, for a word wrongly stressed is a word wrongly pronounced - and indeed, often misunderstood.

If this principle is applied, the difficulties of those who have to deduce the spoken form from the

written form will disappear. Those who will benefit most from the implementation of this principle will be foreign learners who study from textbooks. Such persons, once they have mastered the significance of the symbols, would be in a position to read any text - even if they do not understand it - almost faultlessly, the only shortcoming being that their speech might appear slightly pedantic.

Foreign learners would of course, not be the only persons to benefit from this principle. Native English speakers, too, including highly educated ones, are at present, frequently in doubt as regards the pronunciation of a word - say, a scholarly or a technical word, or a proper name or just a word they happen to not have heard before. To clarify these cases, pronouncing dictionaries are available, and the entries in such reference works should supply the basis for the written forms under the reformed system. Obviously, once the new system is implemented, pronouncing dictionaries will no longer be needed.

(3) *Nothing should be introduced that would impair clarity by obliterating the individuality of words.* Hence, provision should be made for the distinction of homophones which are distinguished at present.

Opponents of phonetic spelling claim that clarity would suffer if homophones - words with the same pronunciation, but different meanings - were spelt alike; they might use the existence of homophones to discredit phonetic spelling and to justify the traditional system with all its inconsistencies and archaisms. Whilst their other arguments can be ascribed to prejudice, this particular argument is a sound one. For, if homophones were merged, there would be no way of distinguishing a "mail clerk" from a "male clerk", or the "fore legs" of an animal from all its "four legs." The passage in Shakespeare's Hamlet: "I scent the morning air" would have the same written form as "I sent the mourning heir"; and, as there is, indeed, a "mourning heir" in the play, such an interpretation is by no means strained.

The author of this paper has devised a system of spelling in which provision is made for the distinction of homophones wherever such a distinction is considered desirable. He cannot agree with the argument which alleges that since spoken language can afford to use like forms for words with different meanings, written language can do so likewise. The answer to that argument is: in spoken language there exist numerous ways of making the meaning of an ambiguous word clear, such as differences in intonation, pauses, gestures - all of them devices which written language lacks. Moreover, through habit we instinctively make a choice when hearing a word that allows for alternative interpretations, and this choice would usually be the right one, no matter whether we are aware of having made a choice or of the very existence of homophones. For written language, this habit of making a choice does not exist and such a habit would take a long time to develop. Even where there is no danger of an actual misunderstanding, there is still the possibility of a ludicrous effect - for instance, if "reign" were spelt the same way as "rain." On the other hand, the fact that in spoken language homophones do not create a ludicrous effect unless such an effect is intentionally brought about in a pun, demonstrates that what is tolerable in spoken language is not necessarily so in written language.

(4) *Writing should be made so that it can be deduced from speech* - subject to the limitations imposed by the alphabet and the need to distinguish homonyms.

This principle is complementary to the principle stated in the second place. The beneficiaries of it are those who know the pronunciation and are supposed to deduce the written form from the sound. They are chiefly native English speakers, schoolchildren in particular, but of course, also adults, and by no means only illiterates or semi-literates; foreigners only to the extent that they have "picked up" the language without at the same time learning how to write it.

In the minds of most people who give some thought to spelling reform, this principle should rank first. That it has fourth place, not first, is of course, due to the limitations stated above. If it were not for these limitations and for uncertainty regarding the standard pronunciation where the speaker's pronunciation is a regional variant - there would never be a need to memorize the spelling of a word. Under the author's proposed system, the spelling of *some* words would have to be memorized, but the proportion of such words would be small, and learning to write would no longer be the drudgery that it is today, because in every instance there will be a reasonable explanation for an exceptional written form.

It goes without saying that the exceptional written form would in no instance suggest a pronunciation other than the correct one; indeed, the device for clarifying the stress position - availability of two sets of symbols for vowels - is also the device for providing distinct forms for homophones.

(5) *Continuity with the traditional system should not needlessly be disturbed.*

The choice of symbols should, whenever compatible with the basic principles of phonetic representation, follow current English usage, not only for single letters, but also for letter groups such as *sh*, *ee*, *ai*, *oa*. This is proposed not in deference to tradition, but with the sole motive of making transition from one system to the other as easy and as smooth as possible and to allow for the probability that for a long time to come documents written under the traditional system will call for an interpretation, so that many persons will be required to have a *reading* knowledge of the system at present in use, which will then have become an obsolete one.

The occurrence of a particular written form for one word in the new system which is identical with the written form of *another* word in the old system, is particularly objectionable. Whilst such a situation cannot entirely be avoided (for example, *warm* will have to be spelt *worm*), the symbols have been selected in such a way that cases of this nature have been reduced to the unavoidable minimum.

It is not an unwarranted disturbance of continuity if letters, which otherwise would be redundant, are allotted to sounds for which there is no suitable way of representation under the traditional system.

(6) *The existence of variant pronunciations, to the extent that they are pronunciations used by educated speakers, should be taken into account.*

The new system should be suitable for use throughout the entire English speaking world, despite differences in pronunciation. Where a particular sound used in one speech variant is, in some other speech variant, consistently replaced by some other sound, the key-word given will automatically be variously interpreted, but the allotted symbol will be applied in exactly the same manner by the different types of speakers. Thus, if a symbol (no matter which) is allotted to the "a as in paper," this description would appear to speakers of Southern British and many other types of English as referring to a certain diphthong (phonetically *eɪ*), whilst to Scottish speakers it would appear to refer to a certain long vowel (phonetically *eː*), and to some Australian speakers as referring to a different diphthong, similar to but not identical with the *i* in *time*. These Australians think they are saying long-A, and would not confuse it with the diphthong *i* in *time*.

Where sounds overlap, the system should, in principle, be based on Southern British speech (Received Standard) as recorded in pronouncing dictionaries that use the International Phonetic Alphabet, such as that of Prof. Daniel Jones, but other pronunciations should be taken into account in cases where a great many speakers make a distinction which is not made by speakers of Southern British and which is supported by the written form of the traditional spelling.



This is so with certain vowels for which cases "with r" and "without r" are being kept distinct from each other, the cases "with r" being those where the letter r-silent in Southern British speech, but pronounced in Scottish speech and phonetically significant in American speech - occurs before a consonant or at the end of a word, as in *farm* and *farther*, as contrasted with the word *father*, which has the same sound "without r." In Rec'd Standard, *farther* and *father* are homophones.

In situations which do not come under any of the above descriptions, alternative written forms should be permissible, as with the words now written *either* and *clerk*. The word *clerk* should be written *klark* in England and *klirk* in the United States. Such written variants do not constitute a threat to uniformity any more than the use of different words for the same concept, such as *autumn* and *petrol* in England and *fall* and *gasoline* in the United States.

There are also differences in pronunciation depending on the style used. Pronouncing dictionaries often give more than one pronunciation of a word. In such cases, the written form should reflect the most careful variant - assuming that though only a small proportion of speakers actually use it, most speakers would have an opportunity of hearing it. However, spoken forms that exist only in the minds of those who allow themselves to be influenced by the written form under the traditional spelling should be ruled out. This would apply chiefly to unstressed vowels.

(7) *The system should be economical - achieving a saving of time and space.*

This issue is not a fundamental one. Elimination of silent letters and of needlessly doubled letters will evidently bring about the shortening of a large number of words. The lengthening of certain other words should not detract from the overall effect, since cases in which a word is shortened occur more frequently than cases in which a word is lengthened.

(8) *The suggestion that spelling should reflect etymology is to be rejected.*

The ordinary user of words (reader or writer) is not interested in etymology and cannot be expected to be an expert on it, and the scholar has other means at his disposal. Spelling is often incorrect in indicating the true origin of words, as these who were involved, along with Dr. Samuel Johnson, in finalizing the spelling were often badly informed of the origin of some words.

However, the choice of symbols for the sounds on the principle of continuity and preference given to a "more careful" pronunciation where several variants exist might result in preserving etymology in some instances.

(9) *Some observations relating to other languages might have a certain relevancy.*

Whilst, in theory, it might appear desirable to have the same orthography for all languages, limitations of the Roman alphabet and the need to preserve continuity with traditional usage rule out any suggestion of devising reformed English spelling in such a way that letters are given particular values solely on the strength of compliance with usage in other languages or international phonetic practice. Thus, it goes without saying that the letters *a* and *u* must, in English, be allotted to sounds which are quite different from the sounds which these letters represent in most other languages. It stands to reason that similar considerations also apply to compound symbols, such as *au* and *eu*.

If thought is given to spelling reform in languages other than English, the principles applied should, broadly speaking, be the same as those applicable to English, but different approaches are needed for each language to do justice to different situations. Such diacritical marks as are used at present, e.g., the acute, grave, and circumflex accents in French and the umlaut sign in German, would continue to be used (and, of course, like everything else, in a consistent way), but no new written accent signs should be introduced. Stress presents no problem in French, but there are

other factors that complicate the issue, such as the large number of instances in which up to 5 or 6 words have the same sound, and the words with consonants at the end which are normally silent, but pronounced when the next word begins with a vowel. The stress problem is satisfactorily solved in Spanish and Portuguese, but not completely in Italian; it leaves a lot to be desired in German, and still more so in Russian, where there is the additional complication that in an unstressed position, certain vowels merge and become obscured.

Spelling reforms on a minor scale have been carried out in the last few decades in a number of languages such as Russian, Polish, German, Dutch, Norwegian, Portuguese, Malay and Indonesian (both of which derive from the same stock, & have now the same system of writing). These reforms were usually designed to take into consideration the needs of native speakers, but not those of foreign learners, and were needlessly concerned with etymology. (Thus, in German, *th* has been replaced with *t* in native German words, but has been retained in foreign loan words).

For the Mandarin dialect of Chinese, now the National language of China, a romanized orthography has been devised, which has received official sanction. This orthography has not superseded the traditional ideographic notation. It is merely used as a means to teach the National Language with the correct pronunciation to speakers of other dialects and to overcome illiteracy, or rather as a first step to do so. Now, there is the fact that Chinese abounds in homophones - to a far greater extent than English or French - and by using the ideographic notation, the meaning of a word is always made clear, whilst this would not be the case if the romanized form were used. It is this aspect which explains why it must have appeared unreasonable to abolish the ideographs altogether; and since the situation with regard to homophones allows an analogy with English, these observations should strengthen the argument in favor of maintaining a distinction of homophones in English.

(10) *Some thought should be given to the idea of introducing reformed spelling gradually.*

The concept of a gradual approach is championed by W. Harry Lindgren of Narrahbundah, Australia. He proposes that the first step (termed SR-1, short for *Spelling Reform Step 1*) should encompass one single sound: the short vowel sound in "bet." This sound would invariably be rendered by the letter *e* -thus *frend*, *helth*, *eny*, *meny*, *sed*, etc.

Campaigning for this modest reform is supposed to create awareness of the desirability of a more logical system of spelling, without interfering to any sizeable extent with established usage. A decision on subsequent steps is left in abeyance and is not supposed to be made a subject of discussion until SR-1 is well established.

The author of this paper is not very much in favor of the gradual approach, but is prepared to concede that such an approach might be the only way to get something done. It might be feasible, first to introduce SR-1 in all English-speaking countries, and after this step has been achieved, to proceed further. To be sure, future steps will, on each occasion, have to cover a more extensive field, otherwise implementation of the ultimate reform would take a century.

A succession of steps, numbering more than, say 4, is bound to create confusion, not only because at any point of time documents would come into existence which have to be meaningful for future generations, but also because after each step dictionaries and reference works would have to be revised and reprinted. A succession of a large number of steps would cause a strain on schoolchildren, on the teaching profession and, of course, on the general public, not to speak of the confusion it would create in countries in which English is taught as a foreign language, with the result that even among those teachers and students who are in favor of phonetic spelling, many would give up in despair and revert to the system now in use, pending total implementation of the ultimate reform.

If an opinion regarding a gradual introduction of reformed spelling is required, it would appear that four steps should make up the maximum needed. The steps following SR-1 as described above would be the following:

SR-2: covering all the consonants. The letters chiefly affected are *k* and *s* (replacing *c*), *j* (replacing *g*), *z* (replacing *s*), and the groups *sh*, *hw* and *zh*.

SR-3: covering the remaining short vowels *a*, *i*, *o*, and *u*, and abolishing silent letters that serve no useful purpose. This would produce such written forms as *prity* (for *pretty*), *gluv* (for *glove*), *wosh* (for *wash*).

It stands to reason to assume that disagreement among spelling reformers on any of these points would be unlikely.

SR-4: would be the reform that produces the ultimate shape and would encompass the long vowels and diphthongs, the Neutral Vowel and a device to indicate the position of the stress. This step can evidently be taken only when agreement has been reached among spelling reformers, and it should be the task of interested persons and organizations in all English speaking countries, as well as certain instrumentalities of the United Nations Organization to prepare the ground for such an agreement.