

SPELLING REFORM, A Comprehensive Survey of the Advantages, Educational Benefits and Obstacles to Adoption,

Edited by Newell W. Tune

Contents.

Tune, Newell W. [Preface](#)

Barnard, Harvie. [Introduction](#)

Barnard, Harvie. [Prelude](#)

§1. The History of Spelling Reform.

1. Canadian Linguistic Assoc. [A Brief History of Spelling Reform.](#)
2. Barkley, Wm. [A 20th Century Look at the 'New English' of 1066.](#)

[Spelling Reform Anthology pii in the printed version]

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1981 p4 in the printed version]

Preface by Newell W. Tune.

Thruout the history of the English language there hav bin a few wise and far-sighted persons who hav recognized that English spelling has meny deficiencies. Its irregularities and inconsistencies hav bin shown to be a serious handicap to the teaching of reading, writing, and spelling.

The recognition of these problems was first appreciated by a monk called Ormin, who in the 13th century used a new alfabet and simplified spelling when writing a lengthy religious poem called "The Ormulun." Meny others followed with various ideas of an improved alfabet, some attempting to introduce a whole new set of symbols. Others wanted to introduce diacritical marks to express and differentiate the different sounds of the language. Still others tried to devise spelling systems that made no changes in the Roman alfabet, but used digrafs to indicate those sounds for which no single letter was available.

But almost none of these persons, (I'd call them alfabetees), had plans for implementing their proposed systems. This book deals with the meny aspects and problems of reforming our spelling for the broad purpose of improving written communication in the English language. It examines critically the relation of spelling simplification, not only to reading and writing, but also to the basics of comprehension and education in terms of reformed English spelling. Its significant effects upon commerce, printing, the schools, holding jobs, and delinquency are considered.

The question of how simplified spelling could best be introduced is discussed, and several programs for the implementation are proposed for serious consideration.

We are indebted to the Valerie Yule for suggesting the idea of the book and for the category listings.

[Spelling Reform Anthology pii in the printed version]
[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1981 p4 in the printed version]

Introduction

by Harvie Barnard.

The many articles in this volume are intended to reveal the basic relationships between the fundamentals of language: Speech, Spelling, Writing, Reading & Spelling Reform.

In any reasonably well organized society, we coordinate our lives thru a regularized form of communication called language. The essential elements of any language may be said to comprise six essential components:

1. sounds, regularized to become,
2. speech, specialized to become
3. words, represented groups of symbols, by means of written graphemes formalized into,
4. spellings, to represent the sounds of speech, which when expressed graphically become,
5. writing, which in order to become understood or visualized requires,
6. decoding, or reading for comprehension or conceptualization.

To render this system of communication effective, a certain methodology is required, which we call "teaching." But because of serious inconsistencies and irregularities in the "system," the teacher is faced with numerous perplexing problems, most of which relate to confusing sound-spelling relationships, characteristic of the English language.

The basic problem, which concerns a large proportion of words of the English language, is that the spellings do not correspond consistently to the sounds - standardized pronunciations - which have been established thru usage and well defined by virtually all dictionaries. Therefore the correct or preferred pronunciation of words cannot be dependably determined from the spellings, nor can the words already learned in speech be spelt according to the proper pronunciation.

The primary purpose of a spelling reform is that of bringing into closer relationship the inconsistencies of speech sounds and spellings. Which then, would be most readily changed? All speak, but few write. Those who write, or try to do so, must rely heavily upon dictionaries - if they would spell correctly - yet speakers, except those professionally trained, have little concern for spelling, and often not more for pronunciation. To attempt changing the spoken language would be a very slow if not impossible process, but modifying our written language could be a possibility, though not an easy procedure.

But those who would prefer simplified spellings should not forget their readers - those who would hopefully find reading entertaining, educational and necessary. Then there is a very extensive and traditionally taught proportion of the population whose direct concern for spelling far outweighs most others - the teachers.

These important people must be satisfied that:

1. reformed spelling will be easier to teach;
2. easier to learn;
3. easier to read;
4. easier to write; and
5. no less redily understood by the student as well as by the illiterate public.

From the standpoint of practical teaching, it has already been established that, that which is more easily learned is also more easily taught. This would apply to both writing as well as reading. And if we have determined that a regularized mode of encoding, writing, results in a more certain dependable comprehension of such written material, by decoding, then is it not logical to conclude that any such regularized written material will be better understood thru recognition and visualization than other forms of less regularized and/or less rationally presented symbolization? To simplify, writing which is dependably rational and regular should be more easily read and comprehended than that which is rational and the regular. To further simplify, a definite signal, sign, or symbol, should always convey a definite dependable meaning.

It has been argued that if English spelling were reformed or simplified there would be a great loss of etymological values, but there is doubt this would be true in many instances according to Ben Franklin, John Downing and Valerie Yule. For the primary learner, whether a 5 year old or a stranger to our language, it could be successfully argued that the beginner is more interested in the utility of the language than he or she might be in its origin or history - the latter going back in many instances thru uncounted changes both as to spelling and alphabetical development thruout the ages - very interesting no doubt, to a scholar whose concerns are essentially historical. "Etymology is at best a dubious aid, and at worst, misleading." (Ben Franklin).

This volume is not intended to promote or recommend any particular system, but the various aspects of spelling reform are discussed by 60 authors in order to present the broadest viewpoints, the problems, and the possible solutions to the overall considerations of making our English language more useful in domestic as well as in worldwide communication.

[*Spelling Reform Anthology piii in the printed version*]
[*Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1981 p5 in the printed version.*]

Prelude* **by Harvie Barnard**

Simplified Spelling, or Spelling Reform - Who's Interested?

* to the book, *Spelling Reform - a comprehensive survey*.

Why should you or I or anyone else, be interested in spelling reform? It has been sed by the world's best-known authors and most distinguished scholars, as well as by millions of English-speaking illiterates, that English is (outside of Chinese) the most difficult language to read, write, and to spell! As John Steinbeck has sed, "Some people there are who, being grown up, forget the horrible task of learning to read. It is perhaps the greatest single effort that the human undertakes, and he must do it as a child."

Hundreds if not thousands of others: writers, teachers, students and even expert linguists hav expresst the same idea, and very few, if eny, hav denied it. O.K.! So what? As an accomplished reader, writer, and a fairly good speller, I'm really not concerned. I've "got it made it," so why should I be interested in the problems of those "spelling nuts" who want to make English easier to read, write, spell or understand? Why should I care that education be made simpler, so that practically anyone, whether a child, a forener or anyone else might lern to read or become reasonably literate in a few months, or at most a year or two?

After all, I've spent most of my life trying to master the intricacies and peculiarities of English spelling, pronunciation and writing! So why should I or eny other educated person be willing to relinquish our hard-earned advantage? I've given meny years to acquire my degrees, and I feel fully entitled to my academic credits as the teacher and a scholar. So to hell with the illiterate, the kids and the foreners! Let them all suffer as I did - "root hog, or die"!

Isn't this a competitive world?, and since I've got it made, why in hell should I worry about my "brother" who couldn't make it? He had "problems" in school and has had worse problems ever since. After "flunking out" before he finished 8th grade, (he couldn't read), he got into trouble on account of no job. Then he was "busted" for stealing a car, broke outa reform school, started on drugs, and has been in or outa jails or the "pen" six times since he was 16 years old. So what can anybody do about that? Yeah what?

Well, since you asked, the answer is "plenty"! And if you knew what it's costing you, and every taxpayer, you would be screaming to high heaven! You and everyone else who pay billions for property taxes to support the schools would start howling their heds off, cussing out the U.S. Dep't of Education, the state superintendent of schools, the school board, and everyone who is responsible for what is taught - or supposed to be taught - in the schools.

Since this is a dollar oriented society, let's check out the cost of the public schools alone, because whether the schools educate or not, the cost is a minimum of about \$20.00 per day for every pupil. Based on the standard school year of 180 days, this calculates to be \$36 billions (36 thousand millions) per year for the ten million young people in our public schools. Thus for every million who failed, or require an additional year to acquire, a passable proficiency in the basics, we are pouring 3.6 billion dollars down a rathole of educational waste!

Perhaps for some families \$3600 per pupil per year isn't a lot to howl about, but when a taxpayer realizes that about 15% of these ten million pupils are not learning their basics well enough to hold a job after 12 years or more of schooling, that figures to an astronomical loss. Let's calculate: 15% of ten million is 1.5 million; 1.5 million times \$3600 for 12 years = $12 \times 3600 \times 1,500,000$ dollars, which is \$64 billion, 800 million, which makes the cost of educational inefficiency approximately as much as 10% of our total federal budget, and it is spent on 1.5 million pupils who finished their 12 years of schooling as "functional illiterates." So if we're really serious about reducing waste and inefficiency in government, why not begin with education!?

Altho this economic loss may not be a total waste, it does indicate in terms of dollars what might be considered an even greater loss in terms of social pain and unnecessary suffering. These unfortunates, for lack of an adequate education in the basics, are going to be unable to compete in our modern technically oriented society. Being unable to obtain or hold jobs, it is mainly these semi or functionally illiterates who will be in economic difficulties most of their lives, and therefore will tend towards crime to satisfy their needs. Once started in this direction, these people are likely candidates for unsocial activities for the rest of their unhappy existence, and will probably become public wards and continued claims on society, both economically and emotionally as long as they live.

Thus for social as well as economic reasons it should be obvious that any steps we could take to facilitate the educational processes would not only be warranted, but eagerly sought out for the benefits to be realized, not only for those who pay the costs, but also for those whose existence is enhanced by the satisfaction of happier lives.

Virtually all students of the English language have unanimously concluded that the primary roadblock to literacy is our illogical, irregular, confusing, and frustrating English spelling. To some extent this problem has been recognized and partially corrected by emphasizing the phonetic *regularities* which occur at less than 50% of the time. But 50% has never been considered the "passing" grade in English or any other subject, and this beginning use of fonetic spelling, when *emphasized* in the primary grades, does become a source of confusion and frustration whenever non-fonetic words are encountered because pupils search for fonics when there is none. Thus about half of the fonetic "rules" become a handicap rather than a help, which is why most of us are uncertain spellers and find it necessary to lose time "looking up words in the dictionary."

The obvious answer to this problem is to make English spelling as simple and fonetic as possible, and that is what spelling reform is, as we say, "all about." Altho there will always be some exceptions because English is a conglomerate language having 41 sounds and based on an inadequate alphabet of 26 letters, there is ample room for improvement. If we can achieve 95% efficiency, or perhaps even better, that would eliminate most of our confusion and require that only a small proportion of our spellings would be dependent upon pure memory. Thus our mental processes would be relieved of the irritating details of non-essential searching, thereby leaving our organic computers (minds) free to serve the purpose for which they were intended - to reason, to solve problems, to make wise choices, and as we casually say, "*To Think*." So let us think to do what we can to help our thinking.

Editor's note: although we won WWII on the battlefield, we lost in the postwar commercial field - why? Because they (Germany and Japan) were forced to modernize - and we did not or could not see the handwriting on the wall. The situation is still with us.

Section §1. The History of Spelling Reform.

[Spelling Reform Anthology §1.1 in the printed version]

[This item was not in Spelling Progress Bulletin.]

A brief history of Spelling Reform

If the reader of this book needs a more extensive account of the history of spelling reform, the following references should be consulted:

Pitman, Sir James, and St. John, John: *Alphabets & Reading*. Chapter 6, (40 pages).

Mencken, H.L.: *The American Language*. vol. 1, Chapter VIII, (36 pages) and Supplement II, pp 273-331.

Tauber, Abraham: (unpub. thesis), *Spelling Reform in the United States*, Columbia Univ. 1958. pp. 311.

From Some Arguments for & Against Spelling Reform*

*A Report prepared for the Canadian Conference on Education

by a Committee representing the Canadian Linguistic Association and the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, Kingston, Ontario, 1962.

1. When Christian missionaries came to England in the sixth and seven centuries, they brought with them the Latin alphabet. Using this alphabet, they attempted to write down the English language that they heard about them. Broadly speaking, the principle that they followed was the phonetic one, that is, each letter had for them an accepted sound value (in Latin) so that when they heard the same or similar sound in English, they represented it by the letter associated with that sound in Latin. English spelling was at first roughly phonetic with a straightforward correspondence of one symbol for one sound.
2. After the Norman Conquest, French scribal habits influenced English orthography and the earlier Anglo-Saxon writing patterns were modified. It is from this time, for example, that the modern *o* in *son* (from OE *sunu*) and the modern *qu* in *queen* (from OE *cwēn*) derive. But throughout the whole of the middle ages, English documents were more or less phonetically written. W. W. Skeat says of the manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: "Many manuscripts are carefully spelt on true phonetic principles, so that it is often perfectly easy to read them rightly."
3. In the fifteenth century widespread changes in the pronunciation of the language took place, but these were not, on the whole, reflected by corresponding changes in spelling. This was the century when the written and the spoken languages began to drift apart. This separation was positively, though not deliberately, hastened in the sixteenth century through the adoption of the notion by the classically-minded scholars of the day that a word ought to be spelt according to its derivation and not its sound. To make matters worse, the derivations assigned were frequently wrong and as a result a spelling was adopted that was neither phonetic nor etymological. Thus to cite but two examples, the form *sisoures* found in Chaucer and derived from a OF *cisoires* "shears" from the Latin past participle *-ciss-(um)* from *-cidere* "to cut" and *caes-* from *cadere* (compare the word *caesura*) was changed to *scissors* on the supposed derivation from Latin *sciss-(um)* from *scindere* "to cleave", while English *det* from French *dette* became *debt* under the influence of Latin *debitum*.

4. However up to about the year 1600 there was a great deal of elasticity in English spelling. The present fixed spelling is largely a product of the first half of the seventeenth century. During those fifty years writers and printers, and probably the printers more than the writers, were gradually reducing to uniformity the varied orthography of the sixteenth century. With the printer, the tendency toward uniformity had no doubt in some degree a physical reason; with continuous practice, it became more and more natural for the compositor's hand to go to the same compartment of his case in setting up the same words, instead of hesitating between two or three alternatives.
5. In 1755 Dr. Johnson published his dictionary. "It would be an exaggeration to say, as often been said, that Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary* fixed English spelling, for it was already by his time well on the way to fixation. But his dictionary was the first to receive universal acceptance as the arbiter of usage and spelling." The spelling used by Dr. Johnson is largely the spelling that is used in England today.
6. In the U.S.A., however, things have followed a somewhat different course. Largely on nationalistic grounds, to emphasize the separation of his country from its former ruler, England, Noah Webster advocated reforming English spelling. He expanded his principles in 1789 in *Dissertation on the English Language* but he did not put his principles into practice until he published his dictionary in 1806. His innovations were considered too radical to win great support and each succeeding edition of his dictionary has seen a further watering down of his proposals. Thus spellings such as *hed* "head", *relam* "realm", *masheen* "machine" and, *thum* "thumb" are no longer found. His influence however, was great and H. L. Mencken sums it up thus: "he left the ending in *-or* triumphant over the ending in *-our*, he shook up the security of the ending in *-re*, he rid American spelling of a great many doubled consonants, he established the *s* in words of the *defense* group, and he gave currency to many characteristic American spellings, notably *jail*, *wagon*, *plow*, *mold*, and *ax*." Many of these American spellings are now current elsewhere and the likelihood is that the tendency to adopt American spellings will spread. This process is already well under way in the newspapers of Canada, though the accepted standard is that of Britain.

One result of Webster's work was the popularity of the spelling bee which played an influential role in American educational history. The bees exerted considerable influence in building an awesome regard for orthographical rectitude, and thus to prevent spelling reform. The school drill and other expedients were used to maintain a wholesome respect for English spelling as it was. The spelling bees also played a considerable role.

[Spelling Reform Anthology §1.2 pp2,3 in the printed version]

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Summer 1967 pp2,3 in the printed version]

A 20th Century look at the "New English" of 1066, by William Barkley

The structure of the English language was created entirely by the illiterate, unschooled English working man of 800 to 900 years ago.

For 100 years after that battle fought at Hastings on Oct. 14, 1066, nothing is recorded as written in the English language and very little for another 150 years.

English is the only major language in the world which for centuries escaped the clutches of the dons, the pundits, the pedagogues, the grammarians, the literary gents and the writers. English was then a tongue, a speech, used exclusively in the fields and in the primitive forges and timber yards of that day.

It is for this reason, because it was fashioned by the plain, practical handymen of England, that English in its grammar attained a massive simplicity unmatched anywhere else, unimaginable, miraculous and awesome.

Alone among languages, the English-speakers have escaped the toils of grammar which enslave all other Europeans. A splendid writer on languages, Sir Douglas Busk, estimates that a foreigner can learn the whole of English grammar in the same time that he masters the four regular French words, which are merely the first step in the appalling complexity of French grammar.

Considered three of these vast simplicities:

1. The English adjective never changes. A book, a boy or ten women are either 'good' or they are not. What is the French for good? It is one of four words with six pronunciations - *bon*, *bonne*, *bons*, and *bonnes*, of which the s's in *bons* and *bonnes* are sometimes silent and sometimes pronounced. Pre-Hastings English had ten forms of *good*.
2. The past tense of the English verb never changes since we dropped "thou." *I came, you came, he came, they came, we came*. Try it out. The only exception is the verb "to be" with *was* in the singular and *were* in the plural. And this is a more or lesser modern grammarians' rule because the phrases *you was* and *they was* up to 200 years ago were considered classic English.
3. Alone of all European languages, English has abandoned gender. This by itself gives English a claim to be the only logical language in the Western world. It is what distinguishes the British from the rest of the Europeans.

The old Pre-Hastings English of the Confessor's Court was fiendishly complicated. Every noun had its fixed gender, masculine, feminine or neuter, based as in German today, on no principle that the mind can grasp. The sun was feminine; the moon was masculine; just the reverse of the Latin languages. The word "*the*" had 12 different forms to accommodate itself to the gender or case or number (singular or plural) of the noun - *se*, *seo*, *thaet*, being the old English equivalent of the German *der*, *die*, *das* - all plain *the* to us.

VANISHED

Almost overnight 900 years ago French became not only the language of the royal Court but of the law courts, the administration and the Church, along with Latin. The aristocrats and landed gentry, if they did not beat it for freedom to Scotland, learned French mighty quick and had French taught to their children. There is evidence that English was not taught in England's schools for 280 years.

The Old English rapidly vanished. The working man, remote from all these toff activities, invented the New English in the fields, the workshops, the barnyard. He found that he got on very well by speaking only the root syllables of words, dropping all these finicky endings which distinguished for example the gender of nouns and adjectives. And thus he shot the pants off Old English grammar. Hooray for progress!

What miracle then was it which overcame the Norman Conquest and restored English as the language of England? The language which was driven from cultivated use by conquest and massacre was resurrected by disease, by the plague, by the Black Death!

Writing was a monopoly of the church in those days before printing. It is significant that *clerk* and *cleric* are two forms of the same Latin word. The monasteries were, so to speak, the printing and publishing houses of the 14th century. The French-speaking monks were the scribes who copied manuscripts.

The plague was carried by rats and fleas. I conclude that cleanliness was not in those days next to godliness and that the close-packed monasteries were, in short, flea-ridden; and that this terrible Black Death of 1349 which killed half the population of England totally exterminated the French-speaking monks.

SURVIVAL

Nobody can tell exactly what happened in a convulsion as disastrous to life as the most sombre forecasts made today for all-out nuclear war. Certainly within a generation of the Black Death, English was again the language taught in the schools and was used in law courts and in Parliament for the first time since Parliament was instituted.

Such were the slim chances by which our language survived, no one knowing that it was to become the most important in the world. (Recently a Belgian advised his fellow-countrymen to cease their feud between French and Flemish because the language of Europe would soon be English).

But oh! alas and alack! The gods were jealous. When English became official, it was taken over by the clerks, the scholars, and later the printers. No model existed for it. Chaos ruled. Caxton, our first printer, for example, consistently spelled "Englissche" and "Frennsche," which have since been cleaned up a bit. Where the workingmen had made difficult things simple in speech, the scholars, the pundits, made simple things complicated in writing.

Yet in the early centuries you find a striking amount of simplicity which are since been lost. Here are some spellings used by Caxton in his *Morte d'Arthur* roughly 500 years ago:-
Hors, horsbak, heven, redy, frend, wil, shal, wel, peny, gard, els, ar, klok, blak, rok, sak, Temse (Thames), deth. The very title-page shows "The *Lyfe* and *Deth* of King Arthur."

Spenser and many other fine writers wrote: *tung, yung, neibor, fesant, licoris, forein*; Shakespeare has *hart-ake* in Hamlet; Marlow and Milton wrote *num* and *lim*; Donne wrote "no man is an *iland* unto himself", Milton wrote *soveran*.

A Pelican book of Elizabethan prose at a random glance shows: *scyth* (now scythe), *fel*, *shreeke*, *ment*, *minsing*, *brest*, *peercing*, *neece*, *witnes*, *orfan*, *mistres*, *darknes*; and from Robert Greene in 1859 "having *supt il* last night."

Any working man's child entering school this autumn would learn *supt il* much quicker than "supped ill."

Who desimplified these simplicities? Who spread chaos and error in our books and newspapers? I blame the class-conscious scholars of the Age of Ornament, to whom (as in hats and dress) anything simple was crude and barbarous. And I blame their successors in Oxford today who have discarded their ancestors' hats but who perpetuate their folly in print.

I have a feeling that the Oxford don has never forgiven the working man for robbing him of an empire in grammar and is quite happy to see him floundering when he comes to read and write. If the working man understood the fraud that is perpetrated on him we should soon see a change.

I give him one example. *Beleeve* is historic and correct. *Believe* is a 17th century blunder. Every Oxford don knows this fact. Stand by while I show you why.

The original Authorised Bible of 1611 spells *beleeve*, *beleeveth*, *unbeleefe*, *beleever*, *unbeleever*. Today's copy, printed by the Oxford University Press, spells *believe*, *believeth*, *unbelief*, *believer*, *unbeliever*. Now this magnificent press prints another immortal book, the Oxford English dictionary. Look up *believe* in this dictionary and you will read "the spelling is erroneous."

IRONY

So here are the directors, or, as they call themselves, the delegates of the Oxford University Press, who tell us in one of their publications that *believe* is a blunder and in another of their publications, the Bible itself, carefully insert this blunder a thousand times over.

What is worse, a child might easily lose a mark in the 11-plus exam for writing *beleeve* instead of the blunder *believe*. And, final irony, the examiner who awards the bad mark might be an Oxford don or a delegate of the Oxford University Press!

I wrote to one of these delegates, a brilliant scholar, and enquired: "How can you sleep at night when you are in part responsible for teaching errors to children?" For I could fill pages of the Sunday Express with an account of the plain blunders of our compulsory spelling. The reply was "I can quite believe(!) that there is a great case for the change of English spelling, but somehow I do not find myself engaged by the matter."

Money, I predict, will ensure that this matter engages us pretty soon. We spend over £1,500 million a year on education, of which the primary schools take 26%, or say £400 million a year, three times the cost of ten years ago with the rates and taxes mounting everlastingly to pay it. How much do we spend on instructing the young in the blatant falsehood of our spelling? If a quarter of a primary school child's time is absorbed in reading and writing it would mean £100 million a year.

It is proposed to raise the school-leaving age to 16 in 1970. The project would cost hundreds of millions. Everybody knows that we won't have the money to spend and whom we also won't have to teachers to spend it on.

If our scholars and printers would combine to correct our spelling, we would turn out a race of children far better educated at 15 than they will ever be at 16 or 17 while we maintain the present

chaos. It would be a labour of love for our glorious tongue which would then go round the world like wildfire. It has gone far already because of its simple grammar.

Spelling reform need not cost the taxpayer one penny, on one condition - that we employ only the existing Roman alphabet. No alteration would then need to be made to our vast printing equipment or to our millions of typewriters. It would not cost any more to print a book or a newspaper on the lines of *beleeve* instead of *believe*. Anyone who has mastered the present chaos could read the new with little difficulty because each unfamiliar word could be easily sounded out with a reliable phonetic spelling. Anyone who had learned only the new would have trouble with some words in the old unreliable spelling, but context would help and he would learn the anomalies if he needed to read the old books. He would merely become biliterate!

All that is needed is study by an official committee of experts and a decision as to the best spelling. All the materials are at hand in the Oxford Unabridged English Dictionary which took 45 years to compile and which was conceived not in Oxford but in London - and was conceived, as few people realise, with an eye to spelling simplification. That is why it gives every recorded spelling for every word - 70 spellings of the word *cushion*!

19 years work was done by the Philological Society on this great dictionary, and two tons of material for it were collected in London and in the garden of James Murray's house Mill Hill School where he taught, before Oxford was associated at all with the project, and then mainly as the printers.

James Murray, at the outset of his 35 years' editorship, protested in 1880! -

"Amended spelling has become a practical matter in connection with education and the waste of national resources incurred in the attempt to make child after child commit to memory the 20,000 contradictory facts of our present spelling." And 86 years ago Murray and his colleagues published a first list of 500 spelling corrections, of which not one has been adopted here to this day. Altho in America, a half-dozen or so are in general use.

In these highly competitive times it would be a tremendous aid to commerce to have an easily learned spelling. Give our workmanlike speech the workmanlike printed form and we shall be the best educated race which the world ever saw and we'll educate the rest of the world too!

