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ABSTRACT

This study presents a descriptive account of the development of a system of phonetic printing known as phonotypy, and the application of this system by a firm headed by Elias Longley in Cincinnati, Ohio. In point of time, the study embraces the interval from 1812, when the idea of phonetic printing was first mentioned by Isaac Pitman, to 1861, when the Longley firm of phonetic publishers was dissolved. This period falls into two distinct parts: first, the development of the original phonotypic alphabet through its various experimental stages from 1812 to 1847; second, the application and development of the phonotypic alphabet in the United States under the leadership of Elias Longley from 1848 to 1861.

The divisions of the dissertation are topical, and consist of the following: (1) The background leading up to the development of the mid-nineteenth century thinking on phonetics, with particular attention to Isaac Pitman; (2) the development of the first practical phonetic printing alphabet by Pitman and A. J. Ellis during the years 1812 to 1847; (3) the revision of the Pitman-Ellis alphabet by the American Phonetic Council in the years 1852 and 1853; (4) the phonetic publishing business of the Longley firm, first with the original alphabet of 1847 and later with the revised American alphabet of 1853; (5) the application made of phonotypy to the educational process of teaching reading, spelling, and diction; and (6) the reflections of the phonetic reform in the general press of the period.

The nature of the study has necessitated leaning rather heavily on two major sources of information. The principal source for the
early development of the alphabet was Pitman's Journal (title varies) for the years 1842-1848. The source for the activities of the Longleys, and for the development and spread of phonotypy in the United States, was Longley's periodical, which appeared with a variety of titles but is generally indexed as Type of the Times, Volumes I through XII (1848-1859), and Longley's Journal of Progress Volumes I and II, (Jan. 1860-Aug. 1861).

Several additional research projects may suggest themselves through the perusal of this study, and the periodicals mentioned above are fruitful source material for several more studies of varied nature. Some of them have been suggested in this account.
PREFACE

The genesis of this study was in a footnote. In his doctoral dissertation\(^1\) Cj Stevens noted that a certain phonetic dictionary had been published by a firm known as the Longley Brothers, in Cincinnati, Ohio. The footnote referred to Krapp.\(^2\) This led me to investigate the source of this reference. It was found that two books were mentioned as significant in the dictionary field in the middle of the nineteenth century, the second of which was entitled The American Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language.\(^3\) Krapp described this volume as having been designed by Nathaniel Storrs, a former school principal of New York, compiled by Dan S. Smalley, with a general introduction by A. J. Ellis. These comments were then made concerning the book, a facsimile of the first page of which is given in Plate I:

The book is intended "to represent, by means of a phonetic alphabet, that pronunciation of the English Language which is supported by the greatest number of competent authorities," and to define the meanings of words as they are used by standard writers. Words are arranged in alphabetical order, and are then phonetically transcribed, the definitions also being in phonetic type. The phonetic alphabet is a good one, and it was devised by Benn Pitman, Elias Longley, and A. J. Ellis, and others. The book was published by the aid of a bequest left for this purpose by Nathaniel Storrs, a Boston school principal. It was published in Cincinnati because the Longleys were established there as phonetic publishers, especially of the Pitman shorthand books. The phonetic alphabet used in the dictionary differs slightly from the


\(^3\)Published in 1855.
### The Phonetic Alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Vowels</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| e | Ɛ / ɛ | Long (open) 
| e | ɛ / e | Short (open) 
| a | ɒ / ɔ | Long (round) 
| a | ɒ / o | Short (round) 
| o | ʌ / ʌ | Open-mid 
| o | ʌ / u | Round-mid 
| i | ɪ / ɪ | Long (round) 
| i | ɪ / i | Short (round) 
| u | ʌ / u | Open-lower 
| u | ʌ / u | Round-lower 

### Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diphthong</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ai | aɪ / aɪ | Long (open) 
| au | aʊ / aʊ | Short (open) 
| ee | ɛɛ / ɛɛ | Long (open) 
| ee | ɛɛ / eɛ | Short (open) 
| oo | ʊʊ / uʊ | Long (round) 
| oo | ʊʊ / uʊ | Short (round) 

### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b | b / b | Bilabial 
| c | k / k | Palatal 
| d | d / d | Dental 
| f | f / f | Labial 
| g | g / g | Velar 
| h | h / h | Glottal 
| k | k / k | Palatal 
| l | ɬ / ɬ | Labial 
| m | m / m | Labial 
| n | n / n | Nasal 
| p | p / p | Bilabial 
| r | ɹ / r | Tongue-root 
| s | s / s | Dental 
| t | t / t | Alveolar 
| v | v / v | Labial 
| w | ʍ / w | Labial 
| x | ʍ / ʍ | Labial 
| y | ɬ / ɬ | Labial 
| z | ʒ / ʒ | Dental 

### Phonetic Dictionary

**Abbreviations**

- S, Z, S, Z
- S, Z, S, Z
one devised by Isaac Pitman, but the changes, such as they were, are the only features of the book that can be called American. It is not a record of American speech, but merely a phonetic record of a generalized kind of English speech published in America. . . .

The statement that the dictionary was published by the Longleys of Cincinnati was provocative. Who were the Longleys? To what extent did they engage in the phonetic printing business? What was the nature of the phonetic system they employed, and how widely accepted was it at the time? Evidently there must have been some activity in the field of phonetics to have justified the publication of a dictionary of this sort.

A preliminary investigation revealed no mention of the Longley firm in any standard reference work. There was no evidence that previous research in the field of historical phonetics had done more than give casual mention to the Longleys, if they were mentioned at all. Further investigation revealed that the Longleys had published a periodical over a period of about twelve years, copies of which were still available. A cursory glance through two volumes of this periodical showed considerable activity in the field of phonetic printing and publishing during the middle of the nineteenth century, and led to a decision to institute a more thorough research into the activities of this group of phonetic publishers, the Longleys. The problem presently divided itself into two parts: (1) What was the system of phonetics which was used during that period? (2) What was the extent of its use and influence, and how was its spread promoted by the Longleys. The first three chapters of this study deal with the first phase of the problem. The remaining chapters consider the second.
Since this study treats of a part of several larger and broader fields, it is necessary to define the limits within which this investigation was confined. Perhaps this can be done best by identifying the larger areas of which this study is a part, and then eliminating the portions which were not considered.

In the area of historical phonetics, we find numerous attempts made to form workable representations of the sounds of human speech, both within the boundaries of a single language and as an international system. This research is confined to only one of these attempts, viz., phonotypy—a system of phonetic printing developed in England by Isaac Pitman and A. J. Ellis, and later modified by the American Phonetic Council for use in the United States and Canada. The use of this system of phonetic printing was prevalent both in England and in the United States, and with the passage of time was adopted by several publishing firms to a greater or lesser degree. This research was concerned with the English activities only as they furnished necessary background material. This orientation forms a large part of the first chapter.

In the area of educational reform, numerous experiments were being carried on during the period of time covered by this study. From the impetus which the activities of Horace Mann gave to the cause of education in the early part of that century, educational reform of all sorts spread throughout the whole nation. The present investigation does not consider the history of educational reform as a whole, but confines itself to the single group of experiments in the use of phonotypy as an aid to the teaching of reading, spelling, and articulation. Of the various publishing and printing houses which made use
of the phonotypic alphabet during the period from 1848 to 1860, one firm was outstanding, and may be considered the most stable influence the phonetic printing and spelling movement had during that time. This was the firm headed by Elias Longley, in which at various times different ones of his brothers shared as partners.

This study has been confined to the study of the phonotypic alphabet itself, to the effect this phonetic system had on educational reform, and to the phonetic printing activities of the Longley's, who have been found to have made effective practical use of phonotypy in printing, and in promoting the cause of education by publishing phonetic school books.

Since the basic organization of this dissertation is chronological, and since the Longley firm does not come into the consideration, except incidentally, until the second part of the study, beginning with Chapter IV, it is appropriate that the Longleys be identified briefly at this time. The most significant person in the firm was the oldest of five brothers, Elias Longley. The firm was named at various times "Longley and Brother," "Longley Brothers," and "Longley and Company." During the period from 1848 to 1860 this firm engaged in an extensive phonetic publishing business, the latter years of which were devoted largely to the publication of phonetic school texts for primary schools. They also published a periodical, sometimes weekly, sometimes semi-monthly, and sometimes monthly, which bore various titles, though it was always the same publication. Volume I (Aug., 1848-July, 1849) was entitled The Phonetic Magazine, Volume II (Aug., 1849-July, 1850), The Phonetic Advocate, Volumes III through VI (Aug., 1850-Dec., 1853), Weekly Phonetic Advocate, and Volumes VII through XII
(Jan., 1854 - Dec., 1859), *Type of the Times*. Following the dis-
solution of the firm in 1859, Elias Longley undertook publishing
another magazine which had the title *The Journal of Progress*, which
went through only one volume and part of a second before it was
absorbed into the *Ohio Journal of Education*. For the sake of brevity,
all textual mention of this periodical will be made as follows:
Volume I will be mentioned by title, Volumes II through VI will be
called the *Advocate*, Volumes VII through XII will be called *Type*.
The occasional references to the short-lived second periodical will
be made by name, *The Journal of Progress*. A large part of these
periodicals (and all of some volumes) was printed in phonotype, and
is devoted to the cause of the spelling reform—a term which Elias
Longley defined as "The use of phonotypy to enable a pupil to learn
to read and spell in the common print easier and with less loss of
time."\(^4\) The phonetic printing activities of the Longleys are not
considered until Chapter IV, and their influence as educational
reformers by the use of phonotypy is reserved until Chapter V. The
earlier chapters, as we have already mentioned, are confined to a con-
sideration of the phonotypic alphabet which was the medium through
which they promoted the reform.

Before beginning the body of the study, it is advisable to call
attention to a certain practice that has been followed in the writing,

\(^4\) Though the term "spelling reform" is often associated with a
later movement, it was commonly used during the period of this study
to distinguish phonotypy from phonography. The latter was designated
as the "writing reform."
a practice which has already been introduced in mentioning the titles of the Longley publication. Since not only the titles of the various volumes were written in phonetic type but most of the text as well, quotations either of the titles of or textual excerpts will be transliterated into ordinary orthography. However, certain difficulties present themselves in the process of transliteration. The first of these is that in some instances it will be desirable to retain the phonotypic representation in a single word of group of words while transliterating the remainder into ordinary type. The modern practice in phonetic representation is to use brackets to set off phonetic symbols of the I.P.A., and virgules--slash marks--to set off phonemic symbols. Since it would be confusing to use either of these methods for setting off phonotypic symbols retained in a quotation which is otherwise transliterated into ordinary orthography, the policy here is to enclose these phonotypic symbols in parentheses. In other cases where a single phonotypic symbol--or letter--is mentioned outside of a transliterated quotation, it is being treated like any other isolated letter by italicizing (underscoring) it. This procedure will, occasionally, create another problem. This arises from the practice in phonotypic printing of identifying words spelled in ordinary orthography by separating them with parentheses. In these and other instances in which parentheses are used to separate identified words in a passage being quoted, the standard modern practice of underscoring the words is followed.

The boundaries within which this study is confined have forced another limitation upon it. This is the limitation of material. The principal source of information about the activities of the Longley
firm is the periodical published by that firm. For this reason, a
great many references will be credited to the Longley periodical
identified by various titles earlier. Ordinarily, this fact would
cause a too frequent occurrence of footnotes of the type of ibid,
and op. cit. In order to avoid this repetition, parenthetical
textual notations of the volume and page of the periodical are used
without either citing the periodical by name or giving a footnote
reference, unless there is a reason for including additional infor-
mation. For example, a textual notation such as (V:147) will be
understood to indicate Volume V, page 147 of the Longley periodical,
which in this instance is the Weekly Phonetic Advocate. Where
practicable, this method is used in citing certain other references.

One other periodical is a frequent source of information, though
not to the extent of that of the Longleys. This is Pitman's Phonotypic
Journal, which also had a variety of titles during the time of its
existence. When information is to be credited to this periodical, it
will be referred to as Pitman's Journal, in accord with most indexing
practices. Textual references to information from this source will
always contain the name Journal immediately preceding the reference
to volume and page, in order to avoid confusion with references to the
publications of the Longleys, which are not ordinarily identified by
title.

One further item needs mention here. This is the fact that since
Elias Longley was the most influential member of the firm, and since
he acknowledged responsibility for all editorial matters unless they
were specifically credited to someone else, references to editorial
opinion or editorial policy will be made by using the singular name
Longley, rather than the plural, the Longleys. It will be assumed in such cases that Elias Longley is speaking for the firm in his capacity as editor-in-chief.
CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Such is the state of our written language, that the darkest hieroglyphics, or most difficult cyphers, which the art of man has yet found out, were not better calculated to conceal the sentiments of those who used them, from all who had not the key, than the state of our spelling is, to conceal the pronunciation from all except a few well educated natives.

Sheridan

From the time of the invention of the first system of writing based upon symbols to represent individual sounds, man has been concerned with obtaining a more nearly phonetic representation of his language. When an alphabet to represent the sounds of a particular language is invented, the possibility of reasonable agreement between symbolization and sound for that language is fairly good. But when the alphabet system of some language is borrowed for representing a language for which it is not intended, difficulties arise. Many of these difficulties are exemplified in the irregular system of orthography of modern English. This chapter is not intended to give a history of English spelling, nor an analysis of the various orthographic symbolizations of the English sound system, since both of these topics have been adequately treated in previous studies, one by Coxe,\(^1\) the other by Laguaite.\(^2\)


When the Phoenician alphabet was borrowed by the Greeks, and later by the Romans, it became necessary to modify it to accommodate sounds not occurring in the Semitic tongue. The Greeks abandoned three of the Phoenician letters and created five new ones for sounds not in the Phoenician. The Romans, on the other hand, only rejected two of the Phoenician letters, and only added three new ones. Later, as Roman culture spread throughout western Europe, the Latin alphabet spread over most of the continent. Picking up two new letters from the Runic alphabet of northern Europe, crossed ķ and thorn (ȝ, þ), it carried a system into England which was adopted by the early Anglo-Saxon scribes to record their language.  

Unfortunately, though this alphabet had probably been adequately adapted to the sounds of Latin, it did not, necessarily, suffice for indicating the sounds of English. Consequently, there was considerable variation in the manner of representing the Anglo-Saxon language, with scribes in different parts of the country adopting widely divergent spelling habits because of dialectal differences or pronunciation. This diversity of spelling enables modern scholars to locate geographically the origin of many early English texts. One of the earliest references to the practice is alleged to have been made by a certain "Brother Galfred, the grammarian of Lynn Norfolk, who wrote the first English Dictionary, Promorium Parvulorum, [sic] in 1140," inasmuch as he felt the necessity to apologize "for having spelt all his words according to the Norfolk dialect, as it had been the only he

---

had learnt from childhood, and knew thoroughly. The practice was also quoted by Noah Webster:

> From the period of the first Saxon writers our language has been suffering changes in orthography. The first writers having no guide but the ear, followed each his own judgement or fancy, and hence a good portion of Saxon words are written with different letters by different authors; most of them are written two or three different ways, and some of them fifteen or twenty.

It is generally accepted, largely on the authority of A. J. Ellis, whose monumental work has formed the basis for most textual dicta, that these variations in spelling during the different historical periods of Old English represented differences in actual pronunciation. It is conceivable, though, that these changes in spelling represented refinements in the adaptation of the Roman alphabet to the needs of the language. Though this writer inclines toward the second hypothesis, the problem has not, as yet, been resolved.

---


5 R. G. Gilbert gave this quotation in his article "Literary Barbarisms," Advocate, IV:122.

It is not presumptuous, then, to suppose that the movement known as the "spelling reform" is as old as written language, and that the reform of English orthography has its roots in the early efforts to reduce the Anglo-Saxon tongue to written form.

Though one of the earliest formal efforts in English in this direction, so far as we now know, was made by John Hart in 1569, a letter from George Webster to "the editor of the Correspondent" was quoted in the Advocate (II:29) which summarized Hart's work "as requested," and makes the following reference to an earlier Latin work:

Our author refers to the work of Sir Thomas Smith, entitled De recta et emendata linguas Anglicae inscriptione [On a correct and improved writing of the English language], which had the same object in view as his own "Orthography." This work is referred to in several other places, and the forms of some of the letters proposed by Sir Thomas Smith are given and compared with those of Hart himself.

The letter is first an evaluation of the overall aspects of Hart's work, which summation is given in the Advocate (II:28 f.), and secondly a running commentary and summary of the substance of each chapter of the work, which is not quoted for the reason that "it will not likely be of interest to the readers of this paper. . . ." Since the periodical known as the Phonographic Correspondent was published by Sir Isaac Pitman in the second, or corresponding, style of shorthand, an examination of the rest of the letter should prove of interest if anyone familiar with the Pitman system of phonography would undertake to locate the proper issues and decipher it.

From the time of Hart to the pseudo-phonetic representations of modern advertisers, numerous attempts have been made to reform English orthography. Though these efforts form, roughly, a continuum,
their influence has varied, forming a series of irregular waves of increased and diminished popularity. It is not the province of this study to consider the total reform movement in English orthography, but rather to examine in some detail a single segment of the movement which reached its zenith in the middle of the 19th century, and which in the United States centered itself, geographically, in Cincinnati, Ohio, with the publishing firm of Longley and Brother.

Before we can consider this movement, however, it is necessary that we examine some of its immediate antecedents. To this end we must seek its roots in England. The framework for the process of phonetic printing lies in the process of phonetic shorthand, and though it is not the intention of this chapter to study the history of shorthand writing in detail, a brief resumé is necessary to give the background for subsequent discussion.

It is known that the ancient Greek and Roman scribes had a process of brief notation, though little of their art has been preserved. Much of the information which exists concerning their practice was collected by Isaac Pitman and presented in a series of articles entitled "History of Shorthand" and was published in his Journal. From these references we gather that at best it was a highly developed system of abbreviations and conventionalized symbols representing the common roots, with an elaborate system of indicators for the various inflections as well as for the common affixes. In

---

this article Pitman states

From the decline of the Roman Empire, in the 5th century, till
the revival of learning, by means of the discovery of printing,
we find scarcely any trace of shorthand, . . .

But he goes on to point out that

. . . a system of abbreviated longhand was compiled by Mr.
Radcliff, of Plymouth. He employed the common alphabet,
and expressed only as many letters of each word as would
be sufficient to recall it to memory. . . . This book was
published in London, 1688, after the death of the author,
how long after, we are unable to say, but, probably, more
than a century.

In 1750, William Tiffin developed a system of shorthand using
a phonetic base. The idea of basing a shorthand system on sound
rather than on spelling caught on, and a number of others followed
Tiffin's lead and invented phonetic systems of notation. None of
the systems proposed became popular, for various reasons, until Isaac
Pitman presented a system that was both practical and legible.

Pitman became interested as a youth in the process of writing
by sound, beginning his experiments in the early 1830's while still
in his 'teens. In 1837, at the age of 23, he produced his first
publication, introducing the Pitman system of shorthand under the
title Stenographic Sound-Hand. This is generally considered to be
the first practical system of shorthand until the introduction of the
Gregg style of cursive notation in 1888.

---

8 Ibid., p. 58.


10 In a letter printed in the April 1849 issue of the Fonetic
Magazin Pitman refers to his age then as 35. The figure 23 for his
age in 1837 is derived from this reference.

11 Encyclopedia Britannica, Loc. cit.
During the years following the publication of Pitman's method, the principle of writing by sound increased in popularity more rapidly than it had following the invention of any of the other attempted systems. By 1842 Pitman was able to publish a small lithographed periodical, written entirely in his system of shorthand, which bore the title Phonographic Journal. The word phonography thus became identified with his particular system of writing by sound, and continued to be identified with it for many years. During the first year of publication of this periodical, the idea developed of attempting to invent a system of printing by sound as well as of writing by sound. This was announced for the first time in the May, 1842 issue of the Journal in these words,

Phonography must soon supersede all other systems of Short Hand, then become the common medium of written communications, and, lastly, change the printed character of the millions that speak the English language.\(^\text{12}\)

During the latter part of 1842 and the early part of 1843 the problem of phonetic printing occupied Pitman's attention, and several experimental alphabets were printed in the Phonographic Journal. In 1843, the name of the periodical was changed to The Phonotypic Journal, and though there was no phonetic type yet available, a great deal of space was devoted in each issue to a discussion of phonetic printing, using common orthography as well as lithographed shorthand.

As a result of this activity, sufficient interest was aroused to promote a "Phonetic Festival" in Birmingham, England, on July 18,

1843. One of the purposes of the meeting was to discuss the project of phonetic printing, as well as to encourage the promotion of phonography. Toward the latter part of the discussion, an elderly man, Mr. T. W. Hill, father of Sir Rowland Hill, who originated the idea of using stamps to indicate payment of postage, rose and made the following proposal:

The business which I would particularly address you on this evening is, a plan which Mr. Pitman has under hand, and which I have no doubt he will carry through successfully. It is Phonotypography. His intention is to have a perfect alphabet, which is to contain every elementary sound in the language, and no superfluous letters. . . . We all know what are the sinews, not only of war, but of every benevolent enterprise—MONEY! . . . Now inquiries have been made with respect to the possibility of bringing forth a phonetic alphabet, and it is found to Mr. Pitman's satisfaction, that the sum of £50 will be sufficient fairly to try the experiment. . . .

Mr. Hill then suggested that the various subscribers to Pitman's two journals subscribe such money as they were able in order to raise that amount as early as possible. The suggestion was favorably received, and sufficient money was raised in a short time to procure a small font of type in a single size. The third volume of his Journal, beginning in January 1844, was partly printed with this alphabet, and during that year a number of additional letters and forms were cut and tried experimentally. The detailed discussion of these various experiments will be undertaken in the second chapter. It is sufficient here to state that from the first appearance of phonetic printing in 1844 to the appearance of the final revised alphabet in January, 1847, the phonotype alphabet was in a constant state of

revision and experiment, so that scarcely two successive issues appeared with the same forms for the symbols.

Meanwhile, Ellis, who had been independently occupying himself
"with phonetic investigations and attempts at forming a universal alphabet, for several years before he had heard of Mr. Pitman's labors on the same ground,"\(^1\) engaged Pitman in an extensive correspondence concerning the project of phonetic printing. From September, 1843, until the completion of the first stable alphabet in 1847, Ellis cast not only the weight of his influence and scholarship into the reform but also considerable of his resources. Longley said of him editorially, following an announcement of the publication of his

**Essentials of Phonetics** in 1848 (I:211),

> He has been the leading genius in the construction of the phonotypic alphabet; and very fortunate for the reform has it been that a man of his talents was induced to enlist in the work in its infancy. His superior education together with his financial resources, have given a character and permanency to the movement that otherwise would not have been attained for years... .

> Ellis' interest in the phonetic printing reform was that it should become the basis of an educational reform. His views in this respect were given editorially in this manner:

> The Spelling Reform is not a mere literary freak, the whimsy of a student, the fancy of a phonetician, as we must in charity suppose those to think who merely advance literary arguments in opposition to it, or who are so inconsiderate as to laugh outright. We proclaim in all places that The Spelling Reform is instituted to make the education of the poor possible, by rendering the art of reading pleasant, and easy to acquire. We proclaim the fact that one third of our population cannot read; and we make war against ignorance, by removing the fatal obstacle which has hitherto stemmed the stream of national education... .

\(^1\) *Journal*, VII:7
The matter is now reduced to a small compass. What we are doing, viewed as work actually in hand, is merely attempting to remove a certain amount of physical obstruction to the improvement of the poorer classes; the reason why we are doing it is to be sought in the consequences of this removal, the possibility of having an educated people.\textsuperscript{15}

In working out the details of the phonotypic alphabet, Pitman and Ellis were careful not to appear arbitrary or dictatorial. In order to assure favorable acceptance of their work they began publishing, shortly after they began work on the phonotype alphabet, a periodical known as \textit{The Precursor}, which was "printed occasionally during 1844-5-6, for the purpose of getting opinions as to the best arrangement of the alphabet" (II:264). In addition to this, they established an organization for the purpose of advising with them in these and other phonetic matters. This organization was known as the Phonetic Council, and was begun at a meeting of phonographers in Manchester in February, 1844.

Both Pitman and Ellis, by their own admission, were familiar with the efforts of Comstock, Abner Kneelands, Franklin and others who had made attempts at creating a phonetic alphabet, but in each case these efforts were felt to lack certain elements thought necessary in order for phonetic printing to become an aid to education rather than the plaything of scholars. In a speech given at Manchester on July 12, 1849, Ellis mentions some of the decisions he and Pitman faced in making the alphabet (II:44). He points out that other alphabets, particularly Comstocks, used continental (or, as he calls them, "European") values for many of the letters of the Roman alphabet,

\textsuperscript{15}Quoted from Mr. Ellis' publication \textit{Phonetic News} (Bath, Eng.: N.P., 1849), in the \textit{Advocate}, (II:184).
particularly for the vowels, and they felt this would handicap any
system designed primarily for English. Pitman mentions in his

*Journal* (III:94) their earlier efforts in designing a type alphabet
in these words,

The intention, at first, was to have a new series of letters
for the alphabet, entirely rejecting the Roman forms, . . .
but after careful deliberation, . . . it was considered that
if it would be practicable to carry the reformation to such
an extent, it would be, at least, inexpedient to attempt it
at the onset, and a modified Roman alphabet, constructed on
phonetic principles, has been adopted. . . .

The philosophy underlying this decision is given in detail by

Ellis in the Manchester speech mentioned above, as follows:

The letters that we retain of the Roman alphabet shall,
therefore, have those sounds, not which they have when we
repeat the alphabet successively, but which they most fre­
quently have when they occur in English words. In this way
we hope that any one who is now able to read, should be able,
in a very short time, to read on our phonetic plan. We have
accomplished that to such an extent that there are very few
of those who can read fluently on the romantic system who re­
quire more than ten minutes to acquire the power of reading
phonetically. There are many who take up a piece of phonetic
printing, in these characters which you see before you, and
read it off from the look of the words, at first, on account
of the analogies. This is what we aimed at. We had an
obscure notion that the converse might be the case. But it
was reserved for this town. . . . to have been mixed up with the
whole reform, from its very first commencement, for it was in
Manchester that the first piece of phonography was litho­
graphed;—it was in Manchester that the first adult class
proved the cheering fact that those who had learned to read
phonetically required but very little and slight instruction
to be able to read romantically better than others who had
been taught for years. This is one of the most important
lights at the present day, in which we can view the reform.

The thing is to get a standing ground to go before
Educational Societies and say, "We have something which you
must pay attention to." We might have brought forth our
alphabet, and they would say, "It is a pretty bauble, but
it is of no use to us;" but now we say, "No, it is not a
bauble, but a part of school apparatus, and if you try to
do without it you will forfeit your character as educa­
tionalists." I think too much stress can not be laid on
this point; it removes the monster objection which occurs
to every body. "What! render all our libraries useless!
render our literature a blank!" as I have heard it expressed.
No such thing. We shall make more readers. Practically our books are useless, they are a blank to every one who cannot read. It takes but thirty years to change the whole aspect of the country. In that time we have a new set of persons to whom these books would be a blank, until they had gone through the great trouble and disgusting task, "the most difficult of human attainments," in the words of Mr. Edgeworth, in acquiring the power of romanic reading. But we put these in a position to acquire, with a considerable degree of ease, the power of romanic reading, and thus make more readers of romanic works. Instead of rendering romanic books useless, then, we render them more accessible, and therefore more useful. This is a very important point, and one which has to be presented before people very strongly, or they will overlook it— that we do render the books already in existence more useful by our alteration than they were before our alteration was introduced.16

Ellis engaged himself in writing vigorously in advocacy of the spelling reform, publishing numerous small pamphlets, as well as popular sized books, in ordinary spelling, pleading the cause of the movement. Even in the early days of the reform he anticipated the primary usefulness of phonotypy as an educational tool in teaching reading. Since the following pamphlet summarizes so nearly the arguments which were later frequently advanced for promoting the educational advantages of phonotypy, we have included it in its entirety, trusting the content may not be tedious. The pamphlet is entitled Address to Mothers (II:75):

Mothers! the first instruction of children falls upon you. Long before a child is old enough to attend school, he is capable of receiving instruction, and does receive it, for good or for ill, at your hands. . .

Reading and writing are not education; they are only the means of education. . . You are right then in thinking that it is most important for your children to acquire the art of reading; for without it they will never be educated; without it their minds will probably be dull, and will certainly be untutored. But you are wrong in

16Reported in the Advocate, II:44.
making reading and writing the sum and end of education. Those who can read will necessarily be much better than their neighbors who cannot; but reading does not make them wise. 

"Reading is therefore the first step to wisdom."

Those of you who have tried to teach your children to read will have found how slow and tiresome a task it is. Few of you attempt it. Most children go to the District, or the Private, or the Sunday School, unable to read. They have to acquire the art by a slow and fatiguing process; and many, very many, leave the schools without being able to read with that ease which will make them love reading and use it to acquire knowledge. What is the cause of this? Is it necessarily difficult for a child to learn to read?

It is not necessary that learning to read should be difficult. It may be made very easy; it has been made very easy.

The reason why learning to read has hitherto been difficult is, that the letters of the alphabet have been used in a variety of meanings, and that when a child had learned one meaning of a letter, it never knew when it should use it, or when it should use another. When a child knows hear, it cannot read heard or heart; when it has learned hoe, it does not know shoe; now will not teach it how to read know.

This is why children spend so many years at school over learning to read, and yet do not learn. This is the way they leave school having learned scarcely anything else, and not being able to do even this.

A plan is now open to you for teaching your children with ease to yourselves and with pleasure to them; to teach them to read in a few lessons. This plan is called Phonetic Spelling (pronounced fo-net-ic, speaking the net most strongly, which means spelling as we speak). A new alphabet has been made, in which each letter always has the same sound. No confusions occur, no double uses.

Do not be afraid of using this new alphabet---you will be able to read it yourselves very easily; it will tell you how to pronounce every word you see correctly. The New Testament is printed in it, several periodicals, and a great number of little books for children. But what is more, when your children have learned to read well in this alphabet---and it will not take them long to do so---they will easily learn to read in the old way. Indeed, the shortest way of learning to read in the old way is to begin in the new way.

Phonetic spelling is essentially a gift of the poorer classes. They have the least time to spend on learning, and they therefore require the easiest way to be found out and presented to them. Phonetic spelling is the easiest way of learning to read. 

Every one of you may be a teacher of her children or
her neighbors. Those who have seen children gaping and crying over their spelling books are surprised at their intelligence and pleasure in learning phonetic spelling. There is no list of words to be learned by heart, for children naturally use phonetic spelling.

Mothers! this is what we offer you; a means of teaching your children to read, without the labor to yourselves, and with pleasure to them; a means of sending them to school able to read. Will you accept our offer?

In addition to putting out pamphlet propaganda and working at refining the printing alphabet, Ellis published during the early stages of the movement a book of 180 pages in which he made an appeal, in the ordinary orthography, for the adoption of a phonetic system of writing. This publication became the source book for a great many promotional articles in the Longley periodicals. The book went through several editions, and evidently was widely circulated both in England and in America. Ellis also continued working on the project with which he was occupied when he became acquainted with Pitman. This involved developing an international alphabet phonetically based.

Though this work first appeared under the title An Ethnical Alphabet; or The Alphabet of Nature, the title of the second edition, Essentials of Phonetics, was more familiar by the time the Longley firm, with whom this study is primarily concerned, entered the scene. The substance of the alphabet is summarized editorially in the first number of Pitman's Journal for 1848. It contains the English phonotype alphabet plus sufficient additional symbols, according to the author, to write any word in any language.

---

17J. Ellis, A Plea for Phonotypy and Phonography, Bath, England; I. Pitman, 1845. 2nd edition changed the title to A Plea for Phonetic Spelling; or The Necessity of Orthographic Reform.
Though we must not assume that Pitman was concerned only with his shorthand program, it is only natural that he should have given it a good deal of attention. As he and Ellis worked together, we notice Ellis assuming more and more leadership in the phonotypic activities, and Pitman devoting more and more time to his shorthand, or phonographic, publications. In 1848 Pitman turned over the editorship of the *Phonotypic Journal* to Ellis in order to be able to devote more and more of his time to four lithographed shorthand publications, *The Phonographic Correspondent*, *The Phonographic Star*, *The Phonographic Magazine*, and *The Phonographic Reporter*. When Ellis relinquished the editorship, it was turned over to Fred Pitman, brother to Isaac, and the *Journal* continued to be identified with the general spelling reform movement rather than with phonography.

Isaac Pitman had begun the publication of his *Journal* in 1842 as a trade organ for phonographers, and continued to use it to some extent as a promotional platform for a reformed orthography in general. However, under the editorship of Fred Pitman, it assumed the primary mission of a general magazine printed in phonetic type. Still Isaac Pitman did consider shorthand only one aspect of the entire spelling reform movement, and thought of phonotypy as its reasonable companion, as attested by this remark made at the same Manchester meeting previously referred to (II:36):

> We know from all our experiences during these many years we have been at the work, that, but for phonography, we should hardly have had a chance of success in proposing a phonetic system of printing. But by leading people into the way of writing by sound, they soon appreciate the benefit of printing in the same manner, and thus become friends of the reform without having first intended it.
The difference in the objectives of these two processes which were growing up together, phonetic shorthand and phonetic printing, are clear. Phonetic shorthand could be promoted by an appeal to purely selfish motives such as the saving of time, space, and therefore, money. Its appeal was directed at business and professional men who needed an efficient system of notation, as well as to professional stenographers. Phonetic printing, on the other hand, could be promoted only on the altruistic ground of making the learning of reading easier to those who were unable to read. Since any literate person could pick up the principles of phonotypy without instruction, the process of teaching it touched only professional teachers of children and the few philanthropic individuals who undertook teaching illiterate adults out of the goodness of their hearts. Learning Pitman's system of shorthand, however, was another matter, and while a self-taught person might acquire a knowledge of the phonetic values of the various strokes, he probably could not gain proficiency in the art of transcription without a teacher. Since the acquisition of shorthand skill was an economic gain to many persons, it was not difficult to form paying classes for teaching the skill. It was largely from income obtained by teaching shorthand that phonetic printing was supported during its infancy.

The sincerity of Pitman's devotion to the phonetic reform movement, and the whole-heartedness with which he turned every resource to its promotion, is attested by this editorial comment by Longley in the Advocate (II:144),

Mr. Pitman is a practical worker—he is a laboring man in the fullest sense of the term; his heart, head, and hands, are entirely engaged in the great reform. He began his experiments in the year 1837, and that is the date of his first publication
on phonetic writing. For twelve years, therefore, he has been devoting his whole time, and all the means he could command, to the promotion of his great design. He has not attempted to heap to himself riches by means of his position; against the advice of his friends, he refused to take out patents for his invention, but on the contrary has always sought to assist others in obtaining the means of competing with himself, if they were so disposed. His publications have always been sold at the very lowest living prices, and many of them at less than cost. His Phonotypic Journal, for instance, containing 16 closely printed pages monthly, is sold in London at 23 cents per annum. It is cheaper than ours by one half, and we have put ours down below the usual price of such a periodical. At the same time he gives away to ministers, teachers and others 1000 copies every month. He realizes some profit from his shorthand works, all of which, however, is faithfully devoted to the spread of phonetic truth. In short, it seems as though he has no other object in view, nothing to live for, but to furnish the means of universal education, which his system of spelling promises to speedily bring about.

The development of the two processes of phonetic shorthand and phonetic printing in parallel manner necessitated the introduction of a new series of technical words into the English vocabulary. Phonetic shorthand had already developed, from the Greek, the designation phonography, with derivative forms phonographer, phonographic, etc., so that it was an easy distinction to label phonetic printing with parallel Greek derived terms, phenotype, phonotypy, phonotypic, etc. Shortly after the development of the printed phonetic alphabet, a new need arose. If phonotypy was to succeed as an educational movement, there needed to be a cursive form parallel to the manuscript form of the old alphabet for use by persons who had neither the inclination nor the incentive to learn shorthand phonography. When such a system was devised, confusion developed over the proper designation of this style of writing, for, since it was plainly "writing by sound" it still came under the broad meaning of phonography. The process by which an agreement was reached as to the proper distinction
has not been uncovered at the present time, but in every case found where it is necessary to distinguish phonetic manuscript from shorthand, the term phonetic longhand is used for the former and phonography for the latter.

Another group of words was introduced into the English vocabulary by the necessity of distinguishing spelling in the old manner from spelling in the new, or phonetic, manner. The same distinction was needed to refer to the differences in the old and the new system of printing, and the old and new system of writing. The term romanic was used to designate the entire system of reading, writing, or printing involving the use of Roman letters only. The term is directly contrasted with the word phonetic. The process of spelling using variable values of the Roman letters was referred to as heteric spelling, a term directly contrasted with phonetic spelling. The process of printing in heteric spelling was referred to as heterotypy, a term directly contrasted with phonotypy. Since it is intended to use these terms occasionally in this study, with the same meanings, it is appropriate that this explanation be presented here.

While Pitman and Ellis were engaged in the development of phonotypy and phonography in England, a number of events were taking place on this side of the Atlantic. As early as 1768 Benjamin Franklin had proposed phoneticizing English orthography.  

---

18 For a fuller discussion of Franklin's system, as well as other early phonetic systems in this country, see: Cj Stevens, op cit.
In 1818 a phonetic system had been produced by a certain Isaac Garretson, advancing, according to the editors of the Advocate (II, p. 178), approximately the same ideas and arguments as were being advanced by the middle 18th century spelling reformers.

The following is a sample of Garretson's thinking in these matters:

The English language, consisting originally of parts of other languages, and abounding with a number of simple sounds which are not, perhaps, to be found in any of them, and more particularly in the ancient Roman, from whose alphabet, to avoid the trouble of making a new one, our alphabet was taken as a something which would answer the purpose for a while; and with this alphabet made for another language, and not ours, and containing only a part of the simple sounds in our language, we have been endeavoring to hobble along, even to this day; and a number of laborious exertions have been made to patch up rules to unite the simple sounds in our language with this alphabet, in order to form the compound ones with some degree of precision, when in truth, as the boy told the great Alexander Pope, who was said to be crooked and unshapely, and who in a surprise on a certain occasion, exclaimed God mend me! "God mend such a crooked being as you are," said he, "he could sooner make a thousand new ones."20

Garretson then undertook the creation of a new alphabet based on a system supposing the English language to have 31 basic sounds. His alphabet is given as follows with each of the symbols paired with the equivalent I.P.A. symbol. The value of the symbols is derived from the phonotype symbol with which Longley had interpreted them. Note that most of the symbols do not involve the creation of any new form, but resort to a simple inversion of ordinary type faces. This

19 Isaac Garretson, The English Language Corrected, Wm. B. and James Underwood, Carlisle, Pa., 1818, (cited in The Phonetic Advocate II:179)

20 Ibid.
was Garretson's system:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \ (\mathcal{a}/), \ \text{e} (\mathcal{ae}/), \ \text{t} (\mathcal{a}/), \ \text{h} (\mathcal{a}/), \ \text{b} (\mathcal{b}/), \ \text{d} (\mathcal{d}/), \ \text{e} (\mathcal{i}/), \\
\text{a} & \ (\mathcal{a}/), \ \text{f} (\mathcal{f}/), \ \text{g} (\mathcal{g}/), \ \text{h} (\mathcal{h}/), \ \text{i} (\mathcal{a}/), \ \text{l} (\mathcal{i}/), \ \text{j} (\mathcal{3}/), \\
\text{k} (\mathcal{k}/), \ \text{l} (\mathcal{l}/), \ \text{m} (\mathcal{m}/), \ \text{n} (\mathcal{n}/), \ \text{o} (\mathcal{o}/), \ \text{u} (\mathcal{u}/), \ \text{q} (\mathcal{q}/), \\
\text{p} (\mathcal{p}/), \ \text{r} (\mathcal{r}/), \ \text{s} (\mathcal{s}/), \ \text{t} (\mathcal{t}/), \ \text{v} (\mathcal{v}/), \ \text{z} (\mathcal{z}/), \ \text{x} (\mathcal{x}/), \ \text{c} (\mathcal{c}/), \ \text{y} (\mathcal{y}/).
\end{align*}
\]

The editors note that Garretson did not include a symbol for the sound of o in not, or for the sound of u in pull, evidently thinking that /o/ (or /a/) and /u/ were sufficient. As for the diphthongs, he preferred writing them with two symbols rather than assigning a single symbol to each of them, as did Pitman and Ellis. The same principle was applied to the affricates, making them (tx) and (dj) rather than giving them separate symbols, as had Pitman and Ellis. Garretson also rejected the concept of consonantal w and y, using (u) for the former and (i) for the latter.

Garretson also set down a system of rules for writing, which he claims to be taken from "Thomas Sheridan's Prosodical Grammar, which is prefixed to his Dictionary." The editors of the Advocate first set down a portion of these rules using Garretson's system of symbolization, evidently for the purpose of showing the impracticability of the system, and then printed the remainder with their regular phonotype. These rules give a fair statement of the principles of phonetic notation, though the movement was not yet thoroughly under way. The

---

21The practice of indicating phonotypic symbols by the use of parentheses, explained in the Introduction in detail, is employed here to indicate the phonetic symbolization of Garretson.
quotation from Sheridan, transcribed in ordinary orthography, follows:

When written words are considered as the types of sounds, in order to make them coincide with their archetypes, the four following rules should be strictly observed, thus

1st. No character should be set down in any word which is not pronounced.

2nd. Every distinct simple sound should have a distinct character to mark it, for which it should uniformly stand.

3rd. The same character should never be set down as the representative of two different sounds.

4th. All compound sounds should be marked only with such characters as will naturally and necessarily produce those sounds, upon their being pronounced according to their names in the alphabet.

Garretson then comments on these rules as follows:

These rules were strictly observed by the two justly celebrated languages of old Greece and Rome; insomuch that the knowledge of their alphabet alone, together with their mode of joining letters so as to make syllables and words, enabled every one, without further aid of rules or masters, to pronounce their words properly in reading; and the practice of a few weeks only, might render them adept in the art; whereas in the English all these rules are frequently violated or rather indeed so totally disregarded, that little or no assistance can be derived to pronunciation from books; and the art of reading properly requires the labor of many years.

The orthographic reform had been tied in with the general educational reform for some time before the advent of phonotypy. Among those interested in such a phase of education was a certain Joseph Neef, a disciple of the Swiss educational reformer John Henry Pestalozzi. Having been brought to the United States by William Maclure in 1806, Neef began his teaching in Philadelphia, and is credited with having written the first strictly pedagogical work to be published in the United States.

In this work Neef proposed that Congress appoint a group of learned men to analyze the language, ascertain its sounds, and, with a group of mathematicians, make an alphabetic system such that each sound would have a symbol and no symbol would represent more than one sound. A feature which he stressed was that the characters should be so designed that there would be no difference between the hand written characters and the printed ones. This idea was highly objectionable to Longley, who stated in a footnote to a discussion of Neef's proposal (II:111),

This proposal originated in ignorance of what is distinctly required for the two arts. It is positively necessary to have different forms for the writing and printing letters.

In Pitman's Journal for 1843 an American writer by the name of M. Carey is quoted serially (March through September) from his book entitled Philosophy of Common Sense (no publication data given). Carey is quoted as saying that many of the orthographic reformers are "so wild and extravagant as to be unworthy of the slightest attention." Carey is then alleged to have grouped the various efforts in these orthographic reforms into three classes: first, those who would virtually "create a new language"; secondly, those who would "soften and harmonize the language"; and thirdly, those who would only "reject superfluous letters." Neef is cited, together with a certain Dr. Thornton, as representing the first class; a certain Richard Heron is cited as representing the second class; and William Pelham, Noah Webster, and Thomas Grimke are cited as representing the third class.

\(^{23}\text{Neef, op. cit., p. 56.}\)
Carey comments briefly that Webster's efforts at spelling reform consisted of little more than a few minor changes in orthography "when the discrepancies were very great," and quotes from him as follows:

The following collection consists of Essays and Fugitiv Pieces, written at various times, and on different occasions, as will appear by their dates and subjects.

Most of those pieces, which have appeared before in periodical papers and magazines, were published with fictitious signatures; for I very early discovered, that although the name of an old and respectable character gives credit and consequence to his writings, yet the name of a young man is often prejudicial to his performances.

In the essays, written within the last year, a considerable change of spelling is introduced by way of experiment. This liberty was taken by the writers before the age of Queen Elizabeth, and to this we are indebted for the preference of modern spelling over that of Gower and Chaucer. The man who admits that the change of hushdons, mynde, ygone, moneth, into husband, mind, gone, month, is an improvement, must acknowledge also the writing of helth, breth, rong, tung, munth, to be an improvement. There is no alternative. Every possible reason that could ever be offered for altering the spelling of words, still exists in full force; and if a gradual reform should not be made in our language, it will prove that we are less under the influence of reason than our ancestors.

The above excerpts are alleged to have been taken from A Collection of Essays and Fugitiv Writings: by Noah Webster, Jr. The inconsistencies in Webster's orthography are so glaring that we cannot consider his system to be phonetic.

The third writer mentioned by Carey was Thomas Grimke. He is of little significance in the total spelling reform movement except for the fact that his single publication, Lecture on American Education,
which was delivered in 1835 and published in 1836, incorporated certain orthographic revisions which indicate that the idea of reforming English spelling was gaining increasing foothold in the schoolroom. A number of Grimke's new spellings are listed by Carey, and said to be taken at random from the address cited. The list includes:

"Achievements, expensiv, calld, dutys, resolv, deservd, accomplished, intelectual, opportunitys, esentialy, parallel, loathsom, seckend, afection, efects, preserv, accumulations, leav, loathsomness, wilfully, impuritys, unearthd drunkenes, groveling, motv, beautifully, expressd, imagins, afects, reservd, endowd, consciousnes, capacitys, favorit, comparativ, miserable, deterrd, ordaind, enlightend, purifyed, motivs, testimonys, helplessnes, luster, receiv, exquisit, fil, impuls, energys, difficult, preservativ, emphaticaly, undisturbd."

The reference to all this activity and thinking on the part of educational philosophers in this country serves only to point up that the time was ripe for the acceptance of any reasonably orderly and systematic propaganda in behalf of spelling reform. Many were seeking a practical and adequate system for reducing English spelling to a more nearly phonetic basis, but none of them had yet introduced a system capable of capturing the public fancy. The system of Pitman and Ellis was gaining popularity in England, though the promotion of their system lagged in the United States. The cause of phonetic spelling reform awaited a man who could promote it in America with the same sort of zeal and enthusiasm which Pitman and Ellis were demonstrating in England. Such a man was Elias Longley.

25 The Dictionary of American Biography, (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1932), p. 636, "Grimke," states: "He outlined and himself adopted a reformed orthography which omitted silent letters and emphasized consistency, justifying the system on the ground that it was appropriate for America and for democratic, mass education." The lecture above mentioned is cited as the source.
The entrance of the Longleys into the field of phonetic publishing can not be presented from any single source, but may be pieced together from a variety of letters, editorial remarks, and "reading between the lines" of some casually dropped remarks. The Longleys were not the first in America to promote the Pitman system. Pitman printed in his Journal (III:183) a letter from Stephen Pearl Andrews of New York dated March 28, 1844, who indicated his intention to abandon his law practice in order to devote his whole time to the promotion of the spelling and writing reform. In this letter he announced his intention to begin publication of a Journal similar to Pitman's as soon as possible, but indicated the branch of the reform in which he is interested by the remark,

... but shorthand is the car that is to put in motion the train which will carry us on to the complete triumph of the new system of printing as well as writing. .....

In February, 1845, Mr. August F. Boyle, an Englishman living in this country, and who was independently attempting to invent a phonetic alphabet, heard of Pitman's system, and came to New York City from upstate New York to consult with Andrews concerning it. He became convinced of the practicability of the system, and abandoned his own efforts. Andrews and Boyle cast their lot together, and began publishing shorthand books, which were printed from engraved plates by S. N. Dickenson and Company of New York. They both engaged themselves, in addition to their publishing activities, in teaching phonography, or phonetic shorthand. In September, 1845, they obtained a small font of type from Pitman (Journal V:67) from which they had additional type cast by S. N. Dickenson and Company. 26

26 Pitman mentioned only that he had sold the type. Mention of the casting of additional type appeared in The Anglo Saxon, Andrews and Boyle Publishers, Boston, December 5, 1846, p. 2.
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It was not until December 5, 1846, however, that they were able to issue the first number of their phonetic newspaper, *The Anglo Sacsun*. This delay robbed them of the honor of being the first newspaper in the United States to make use of phonetic type, for they mentioned in their first issue a Boston paper known as the *Chronotype*, of which they said,

> Everybody knows the Chronotype. Everybody does not, perhaps, know, however, that to it belongs the honor of being the first newspaper in the world to lead off in the great literary reform of the age, by clothing a portion of its columns in phonotypes.\(^{27}\)

The first report of the use of phonotypy in the United States for teaching illiterates concerns Mr. Boyle's demonstration with a small group of illiterate Negro adults in Boston, March, 1846. A total of 70 hours was involved in teaching them to read by phonotypy.

The report of the committee asked to witness the demonstration is given in Pitman's *Journal*, (July, 1846, p. 222) together with extracted reports of the occasion from the Baltimore *Saturday Visitor* and the New York *Anti-Slavery Standard*. (These two papers I have been unable to locate.) The same report appears in the first issue of the *Anglo Sacsun*, together with the comment that,

> Mr. John Dickson, a phonographic teacher in Cincinnati, had under more favorable circumstances obtained the same results with a class of ignorant colored adults within the space of 48 hours.

However, when the *Anglo Sacsun* did appear in December, 1846, the type used was copied from that of Pitman's 1845 alphabet. Since it was the first complete newspaper published entirely in phonotype, it

\(^{27}\) Ibid.
rapidly gathered a following, spreading the influence of the spell-
ing and writing reform in many directions. The degree of success
they met in their publishing activity is not known, though Andrews
and Boyle are reported to have involved themselves personally to the
extent of "several thousands of dollars" in promoting the cause of
the phonetic reform.

Teachers of the Pitman system gradually filtered westward, until
by 1848 the phonetic movement had become well established in the city
of Cincinnati, Ohio. A number of persons of that city had become
sufficiently interested in both phonography and phonotypy to form an
organization known as the Cincinnati Phonetic Society. Among those
taking an active part in this society were the two Longley brothers,
Elias and Servetius.

Elias Longley was the oldest of five brothers, of whom only
Servetius was sufficiently mature to assist him in promoting the
spelling reform. Elias and Servetius were particularly suited for
their role of leadership in the phonotypic movement in this country.
In the first place, the Longley brothers had been reared in an atmos-
phere of reform, and were, either by nature or by training, "enthu-
siasts," or zealots in a number of movements and philosophies which
at that time were revolutionary. They were also interested in a
number of minor reform movements. For example, they were outspoken
for the cause of women's rights, and especially for a reform in
women's clothing so as to promote a greater degree of health. They
felt that the prevailing costumes for women were so confining as to
make sufficient healthful outdoor exercise impossible, and even went
so far as to suggest women occasionally adopt masculine apparel in
order to be more able to hike, hunt, fish, and enjoy other supposedly masculine activities with proper vigor and pleasure. They were vigorous exponents of a general educational reform, criticizing the incompetency of many teachers who taught only as a "get-by" until they could get into some other occupation. They advocated raising the level of teaching by establishing schools specifically designed to train teachers in the art of pedagogy, in order to establish a profession equal in standing and respectability to other professions. They early advocated a principle which is still being discussed, viz., that in order to accomplish this equality of ability and respectability there should be comparable compensation. An editorial reflection of their attitude in these matters is here given (II:149):

The business of school teaching has always heretofore been a mere stepping stone to something else, it is seldom looked upon as a profession in which one will spend his life. The students of law, medicine, and theology, make it a temporary means of support, while they are qualifying themselves for what they imagine a more desirable and honorable profession; hence, but little time is devoted in preparing themselves for the duties of the school room. But we are glad to observe a disposition manifested, among educational men, to remedy this matter. The most effectual influence that can be brought to bear upon the minds of teachers, and one which the nature of the case requires, is a liberal compensation—one having some approximation to the lucrative income of other professions.

Other causes which they occasionally espoused editorially were, free schools, Negro education, single moral code for the sexes, labor unions, and slum clearance. They also vigorously opposed the use of alcoholic beverages, and advocated abstaining from the use of tobacco, coffee, and tea for reasons of health. They condemned capital punishment, slavery, sweat shops, and religious hypocrisy. But the cause to which they were most vigorously devoted was that of the spelling and writing reform, which they held to be more important than all other reforms,
using the logic that since most social evils are the result of ignorance, and since ignorance can best be fought by means of a reformed phonetic spelling which would enable people to read with greater ease, the adoption and promotion of the spelling and writing reform was tantamount to taking the sword against all the social evils caused by widespread ignorance.

Perhaps many of the attitudes of the Longley brothers were the direct result of the influence of their father, A. H. Longley. The elder Longley was a Universalist minister, as well as an ex-school-teacher, who had come under the influence of Francois Marie Charles Fourier, a French social theorist of the latter 17th and early 18th centuries. The Fourier theories were a sort of pre-Marxian brand of communism, and Mr. Longley, père, had been, prior to coming to Cincinnati, a member of the Fourier phalanx (as their communal groups were known) at Clermont, Ohio.

Elias and Servetius had both been apprentice printers, prior to coming to Ohio (II:178) (having learned the printing business in Indianapolis, Ind., under J. W. Osborn, who published a temperance paper.) As journeymen printers they opened a shop when they moved to Cincinnati. Evidently their first business, located on Walnut Street between Fourth and Fifth Streets, was only a job-printing establishment, but when they became interested in the spelling and writing reform, they undertook to publish a magazine devoted to the reform. In order

\[28\text{Dictionary of American Biography, p. 389, "Alcander Longley."} \]
to do this they required a font of phonetic type, which they ob-
tained from England, as had Andrews and Boyle. Meanwhile, Pitman had
made some rather striking revisions in his former alphabet, at the
insistence of the Phonetic Council, who had voted 19 to 6 for certain
changes in direct opposition to Pitman's own preference. As a result
of these changes, the font of type received by the Longleys was not
the same as that used by Andrews and Boyle. With the beginning of
publication of the Longley's periodical in July, 1848, at first called
the Fonetic Magazin, a division arose between the two firms. At first
Andrews and Boyle tried to influence the Longleys to use their system
of type forms rather than those of Pitman, offering to "puff" the
Longley magazine in their own pages should the Longleys agree to the
change. By implication, they let it be understood that they would
not put in a good word unless such change were made. The Longleys
took this move as either a threat or the offer of a bribe, and em-
phatically refused to sacrifice what they felt to be a principle for
the sake of a "puff" in the Anglo Sacsun. Andrews and Boyle replied
that they would ignore the Longley magazine and go on their own way
regardless of how much damage might be done the Longleys by such
action.

However, the course of Andrews and Boyle was unwise. They con-
tended that there should not have been any changes in the phonotype
alphabet, in spite of the fact that both Pitman and Ellis had accepted
the verdict of the Phonetic Council and adopted the changes. In the
March, 1848, issue of the Journal (p. 101), Ellis, who had taken over
the editorship of this publication by then, wrote,
We have only to regret that Messrs. Andrews and Boyle still persist in using our alphabet of 1845, instead of introducing the recent improvements. . . .

We are prepared to push the printing business in a manner which will necessitate the Americans to adopt our types, because they will see that it is of more importance to them to use the same types as the English than to insist upon using some of our rejected schemes, for the sake, apparently, of independence.

At about this same time a third alphabet was being promoted vigorously by Andrew Comstock, which he designated as the "Pamphonic" alphabet (obviously from pan-phonetic). This alphabet is mentioned in order to assist in accentuating the ascendency of the Longley publication as far as phonetic activity in the United States was concerned. A brief description of and commentary on Comstock's alphabet as used in the periodical The Phonetic Telegraph, appeared in Longley's Phonetic Magazine (1:69):

As to the claims of his alphabet, it would do if we could get no better. We know nothing of its origin, but it is evidently derived from Pitman's. He employs forty-four characters—all of the old alphabet, and five of Pitman's characters, together with thirteen new letters, selected mostly from the Greek. . . . Of the old letters, he has transposed the sounds of six. . . .

. . . It requires considerable study and experience to enable a person to read it fluently; and with the written characters the difficulty is increased—his new letters being more difficult of formation than Pitman's. . . .

It may be thought Longley's commentary was biased, since he had adopted Pitman's system. Though a complete copy of Comstock's alphabet has not been obtained for this study, those portions which were objectionable were given in a letter from Dr. Stone of Boston to a

---

29 Andrew Comstock, The Phonetic Telegraph, published monthly in Philadelphia, 1847 -?
certain Mr. Stout of Tennessee which letter is printed in the Advocate (III:166). The following discussion is based on this letter.

Comstock made use of Roman letters in unfamiliar patterns, assigning them values not commonly associated with these letters in English. For example, he gave the value of /a/ to the letter a, and the value of /e/ to the letter e, both of which are continental values. The letter i was assigned the value of /ai/ which is neither a continental or a consistent English value. The French sound /j/ was assigned to the letter j, which violated virtually all English usage. Even more difficult for ready reading was his use of the letter c for the sound of /ʃ/ and the letter q for the voiceless w, /ʍ/. It can be seen from the above that Comstock committed a serious practical blunder, since it is demonstrably easier to learn new forms than to relearn altered values of familiar forms.

Thus at the time the Longley's began publishing their phonetic periodical there were three principal alphabets striving to be "the alphabet" of the reform: the old 1845 Pitman alphabet promoted by Andrews and Boyle, the "Pamphonetic" alphabet of Comstock, and the revised Pitman alphabet used by both Ellis and Pitman in England and adopted by Longley in the United States. Comstock's alphabet did not become popular because the difficulty of learning new values for familiar symbols was too great, and also because the forms of the new letters caused the material printed with his alphabet to appear radically different from the familiar orthography.

Something of the same objection attended Pitman's earlier attempts, and though his alphabet of 1845, as used by Andrews and Boyle, was superior to that of Comstock (or of any of the others which had been
presented up to that time), the public gave it only tentative support. However, when the revised alphabet of 1847 appeared, many of the objections to the earlier alphabet were overcome. When Longley's magazine appeared in the new type, many deserted the Anglo-Saxon for the new organ. Numerous letters printed in Volume I of the Fonetic Magazin comment on the superiority of the new type to that of Andrews and Boyle. Though these letters were printed for their propaganda value, it is interesting to note that a large number of them are from former phonographic teachers who had been associated with the New York Phonographic Institute, an organization which was headed by Andrews and Boyle, and that many of their names continue to appear in later years, indicating them to be active supporters of the Longley periodical.

It has been pointed out that both Andrews and Boyle had financially obligated themselves personally to a considerable amount. Their firm also incurred considerable indebtedness to their printers, Leavitt, Trow, and Company of New York. Evidently the printers began to feel insecure when a rival publication appeared, for when open war was declared between the Longleys and Andrews and Boyle, the printers of the Anglo Saxon attached all the assets of the latter firm for their indebtedness. This action caused the Anglo Saxon to cease publication in September, 1848, though Andrews and Boyle did print an occasional small sheet in ordinary type at irregular intervals of from four to six months until February, 1850, in a vain effort to make a comeback. The irregularity of their paper, together with their inflexible attitudes, caused most of their supporters to desert them and to support the Longley periodical. This fact, together with the fact that Pitman also
threw his influence toward Longley rather than toward Andrews and Boyle, caused the center of activity for the spelling and writing reform in the United States to shift by the latter part of 1849 from New York to Cincinnati. This situation confirmed the periodical published by the firm of Longley and Brother as the primary organ for the spelling and writing reform movement in this country. The paper held its position of leadership for some years, even though numerous other newspapers and magazines adopted phonotypic fonts obtained from Cincinnati.
CHAPTER II

PHONOTYPY: A PROCESS OF PHONETIC PRINTING

"Where there is much desire to learn, there, of necessity, will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions: for, opinion, in good men, is but knowledge in the making."

Milton

One of the problems confronting an attempt to create a phonetic alphabet for any language is that of determining which are the significant sounds, and of limiting according to these sounds the number of symbols to be employed. Though the phonotype alphabet was largely the joint work of A. J. Ellis and Isaac Pitman, aided by an unnamed host of others who expressed critical opinions on their efforts, Ellis gives Pitman credit for being the originator of the process in these words,

And although it may, with great justice, be called the joint invention of Isaac Pitman and Alexander John Ellis, yet, as great inventions take their name from those who first started and gave practical form to the idea, even though the completion of their inventions may have been wholly or partially the work of others, future generations must look up to Isaac Pitman, the inventor of Phonetic Short Hand, as the Father of English Phonetic Spelling.¹

It has been pointed out in the first chapter that the idea of phonetic printing grew out of Pitman’s application of the phonetic process to manuscript shorthand. In this chapter we shall attempt to trace the development of phonetic printing from this beginning to its later stages when the type forms became fairly stable.

The first radical departure which Pitman made from previous non-phonetic alphabets was to reject the unsystematic mixing of vowel and consonant symbols in listing the letters. Noting that many previous

attempts to speed up manuscript writing had involved the omission of vowel symbols, and possibly observing that certain languages did not use any symbol for vowels, Pitman evidently came to the conclusion that the consonant symbols were more significant for distinguishing written words than were vowels. Following this reasoning, he developed his phonetic shorthand alphabet on the principle that the consonant values should be indicated with strokes or lines and the vowels by dots and ticks in various positions relative to the consonant line. Thus, if the vowel indicator was before a vertical or diagonal consonant line, or above a horizontal line, the vowel was indicated to precede the consonant, while if the same vowel indicator was after a vertical or diagonal line, or below a horizontal line, the vowel was indicated to follow the consonant. For example, a heavy dot mid-way of any consonant stroke signified the vowel /i/. When this was combined with the light vertical stroke for the consonant t it indicated the word eat if before the stroke, thus, |•|, and tea if after the stroke, thus, |•|.

On this basis, then, Pitman's first phonographic or phonetic shorthand alphabet contained 21 strokes which he felt were needed to show all the significantly distinct consonant sounds in English. In addition to these there were a number of vowel and diphthong indicators which we shall discuss more fully later. Since we are not concerned with Pitman's short hand per se, we will not examine the revision which he made in his short hand alphabet from the time of the first printing of Stenographic Sound Hand in 1837 to the beginning of his attempts to develop a phonetic printing alphabet. However, the arrangement of the symbols in the shorthand alphabet of 1840, upon
which the phonetic printing alphabet was based, needs a brief considera­tion.

Pitman first listed four pairs of sounds which he earlier called "mutes" but later called "explodents." (It is strange that both voiced and voiceless sounds should have been designated by the term "mute.") These were the initial consonants sounds in the words peach-beach, teem-deem, cheer-jeer, came-game. Then he listed four pairs of sounds which he designated as "semi-vocals." These are the final consonant sounds of safe-save, wreath-wreath, place-plays, and the medial consonant sounds of vicious-vision. Next he listed two sounds which he designated as "liquids," the ordinary sounds of l and r, and finally three sounds which he designated as "nasals." These last are the normal nasal sounds of English as represented in the final sounds of seem-seen-sing. In the first two groups, the "explodents" and the "semi-vocals," which in English are normally divided into voiced and voiceless pairs, the voiced member of each pair was indicated with a heavy stroke while the voiceless member was indicated with a light stroke.

In accord with his concept of vowels being merely indicators to show the manner in which the consonants were vocalized or joined together, Pitman designated the vowels with dots or ticks placed in various positions relative to the consonant stroke, which we have illustrated on a preceding page. The significance which Pitman

---

2This accords with Noah Webster’s terminology as expressed in his Dissertations on the English Language (Boston: Isaiah Thomas and Company, 1789), p. 86 ff.
attached to the consonants as being the visible skeleton of the word
was expressed by Elias Longley on a somewhat later occasion as he
commented editorially on the Report on Phonography made to the Ohio
State Teacher's Association. He said (Advocate, II:128f),

Consonants serve to articulate the vowel sounds; that is, they
separate them, and keep them from blending together in a
confused sound; they may be considered as the skeleton, the
bones and sinews that give outline and strength to a word.
How proper, therefore, that they should be represented by
the lines and curves; as from the skeleton of an animal we
can recognize its species, so from the consonant outline of a
word we can generally give its sound. This is the case even
in typography, and much more so in shorthand; while to
exhibit the vowels in a word, will fail of enabling one to
read it.

In determining the number of vowels to be shown, it is possible
that Pitman was guided by mathematical considerations as much as by
acoustic perception. The vowel scale he developed was a series of six
pairs of acoustically related sounds. He noted that certain vowel
sounds were capable of either terminating a syllable or of being
followed by a consonant within a syllable. The term "full vowel" was
employed to indicate this type of vowel. The vowels in this category
were those contained in the words feet, mate, bark, naught, note, and
fool. He further noted that certain vowels did not appear in open
syllables or in monosyllables terminated with a mute e. These he
designated with the term "stopped vowel" on the principle that the
freedom of the vowel was impaired or "stopped" by the following conso-
nant. This same idea is reflected in Cohen's designation of these
vowels as "checked vowels."³

The vowels in this category were those contained in the words fit, met, back, not, nut, and full. In effect, Pitman simply noted that a qualitative distinction existed between vowels that can be used terminally in a syllable from those that can not be so used. Since this concept of "full" and "stopped" vowels is to be treated in greater detail later in the discussion of the type alphabet, we will not consider it further at this point.

The first three pairs of vowels (feet-fit, mate-met, naught-not), which had the common quality of being unrounded, were indicated by a dot placed in one of three positions, high, medial, and low; the "full" vowels were indicated with a heavy dot, and the "stopped" vowels with a light dot. The first three pair of vowels, written here with the stroke for t, appeared like this: 'I', 'I', (eat-it); 'I', 'I', (ate-et); 'I', 'I', (art-at) (Art to be pronounced here in the southern or British manner). The second three pairs, which have the common quality of being more or less rounded, were indicated by a short dash in the same three positions, a heavy dash indicating a "full" vowel, and a light dash indicating a "stopped" vowel. These three pairs, written also with the stroke of t, appeared like this: "I", "I", (ought-Ott); "I", "I", (oat-utt); "I", "I", (oot, as in boot, -oot, as in foot.) Three diphthongs, the sounds in ice, out, and oil, were indicated by carets and inverted carets in either the high or the low position, in this manner: 'I', 'I', 'I', (ite-out-oit.) The sounds of w and y were combined with the vowels by the use of various shaped ticks in the various vowel positions (See Figure 1). The symbol for h was a small dot prefixed to each of the vowels slightly to the left of the vowel symbol, a procedure which gave either a double-dot or a dot-dash for
h plus a vowel. This method of indicating by a separate symbol the vowels characterized by a palatal on-glide, the vowels characterized by a lip-rounded on-glide, and the vowels characterized by an aspirate on-glide is suggestive of some modern thinking in phonemics.\(^4\)

According to this original system, there were 38 basic symbols plus a group of 2h modified forms for indicating the various on-glide qualities of the vowels. In addition to these modifications, there were two modifications for indicating the diphthongs /ai/ and /au/ with a rounded labial on-glide. This gave a total of 64 symbols and indicators, as shown in Figure 1, alphabet No. 1.

When Pitman first entertained the idea of printing by sound, his thoughts evidently turned toward adapting the phonographic alphabet to the printing press, so that the first proposal for phonetic printing was to have type faces made of the strokes and ticks of the phonetic shorthand alphabet, to standardize them linearly, and print them in disconnected sequence, as letters might be printed, rather than join them together in word complexes as in manuscript shorthand. For this reason the phonographic alphabet might be called the first experimental phonotype alphabet. In Figure 1 the first two alphabets are shown with parallel equivalents in the International Phonetic Alphabet.

The idea of using the shorthand strokes as type faces was immediately discarded in favor of a more stylized type form. However, the same analysis and arrangement was retained in the second experiment

Figure 1

Chart Showing the Shorthand Alphabet and the 1st Phonotypy Alphabet
as was held in the first. The consonant letters were in many cases either regular Roman type faces with parts cut away, or else were Roman letters turned or inverted. Sometimes Greek capitals or parts of Greek capitals were used, as in the case of the symbol for the sound of /θ/ in then and the symbol for the /θ/ in thin. A few of the symbols were creatively designed, as the symbols for the sounds /z/, /ʒ/, and /ŋ/. In addition to the symbols used in the phonographic alphabet, two new ones were added in the second alphabet, which are indicated as representing the sounds of /kh/ and /gh/. These are surmised to be the equivalent of [X] or [ڼ] and of [ʃ] in the symbols of the I.P.A. Many of the voiced-voiceless pairs are indicated by reversed symbols, and most of them, with the exception of those representing /p/, /d/, /s/ and /h/, have no similarity to their Roman equivalents.

The vowels in the second alphabet continue to follow the arrangement of six pairs of "full" and "stopped" vowels, but with only three diphthongs. The 26 modified forms of the vowels to indicate a palatal or a rounded-labial onglide are retained. The principle of indicating the vowels by light and heavy dots and dashes in high, medial and low position is retained, so that all the vowels present the appearance of modifications of the Roman letter І, and all the diphthongs the appearance of modifications of the Roman І. The second experimental alphabet appears in the second column of Figure 1. The alphabet indicated both capitals and lower case letters by printing the latter somewhat smaller.5

5Pitman's Phonographic Journal, 1:74 (1842).
At the bottom of this page appears the notation:

\[
\text{Sirsis bi Ciubipir Piubik}
\]

which requires some deciphering to read as "Success to Phonotypic Printing."

The next five alphabets\(^6\) adopt a system of 24 consonants and 14 vowels in pairs as previously arranged (Figure 2). There is little real difference between the theory behind alphabets 3 and 4 and alphabet 2. Whether it was intended that the omission of symbols for the diphthongs and for the vowels with the w and y onglides should indicate their non-inclusion in the alphabet, or whether such omission intended they should remain unchanged from alphabet 2 is unknown. At any rate, there is no mention of these values in the alphabet as listed.

Concerning these early efforts Pitman says in his \textit{Journal}, (III:82,91):

The intention at first, was to have a new series of letters for the alphabet, entirely rejecting the Roman forms. . . but after careful deliberation. . . it was considered that if it were practicable to carry the reformation to such an extent, it would be, at least inexpedient to attempt it at the outset, and a modified Roman alphabet, constructed on phonetic principles, has been adopted. . . .

In the vowel scale of alphabets 3 to 7, however, there is one radical modification. This is the arrangement which Pitman refers to as the "seven vowel scale," or the arrangement of the vowels in seven rather than six pairs. The seventh pair is said to be the full and stopped values of "uh," or the sound of the vowels in \textit{cur} and \textit{curry}. This sound becomes one of the most controversial of all the sounds during the next decade or more. The inclusion of this pair of vowels altered the

\(^6\) Pitman's \textit{Journal}, I:82,91.
Figure 2

**Chart Showing Experimental Alphabets 3 through 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL ALPHABET NO. 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>USUAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>P P Q P A A rope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>B B P B D D robe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>T G T T T fate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>D D T T D fade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>F J F J F etch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>K J K K K leek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>G K K K league</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>F F F F F edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL ALPHABET NO. 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>USUAL EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y Z L L E U “gh”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>L J L J L L L L L fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>F L R L V for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>N N M N N N seem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>U U U U U U seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>U M K K K sing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>H H H H H H hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOWELS IN PAIRS**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| i | i | i | i | i | i | i | i |
| e | e | e | e | e | e | e | e |
| a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| u | u | u | u | u | u | u | u |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| p | p | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| t | t | t | t | t | t | t | t |
| s | s | s | s | s | s | s | s |
| z | z | z | z | z | z | z | z |
| h | h | h | h | h | h | h | h |
| k | k | k | k | k | k | k | k |
| l | l | l | l | l | l | l | l |
| m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f |

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
central back pair so that they indicated the long and short values of /o/ rather than the full and stopped values.

The inclusion of the seventh pair of vowels came at the instigation of Ellis, as evidenced by this retrospective remark made by Pitman in a footnote to an article in the 1859 Journal (XVIII:434):

For the three years' loss to the reform, caused by the introduction of the seven vowel scale, . . . in 1844, and its abandonment in 1847, we hold ourselves responsible but only to this extent,—that we accepted the services which Mr. A. J. Ellis was willing to render to the phonetic system of writing and printing as compensation for what we believed to be a blot upon the system itself. . . . We carried on an almost daily epistolary discussion on various points of the embryo phonetic printing alphabet, and particularly on the disturbing influence exercised by r upon the vowels. It was in particular, one of Mr. Ellis' favorite ideas that the vowels in cur, burn, surf, should be marked by a different letter from that used in cut, bun, sup. . . .

In December, 1843, he made the adoption of the seven vowel scale the condition of his continuing to work for the reform. . . . With much regret we accepted the condition, and wrote to say so. . . . The seven vowel scale was then formally introduced to the public in the first number of the Phonographic Journal which commenced its existence as a phonotypic publication in January, 1844. . . .

Thus the phonotypic experiment lasted three years and a quarter. . . .

The statement that the seven vowel scale was introduced "in the first number of the Phonographic Journal," and that this periodical "commenced its existence as a phonotypic publication in January, 1844," is in error. The Phonographic Journal was first published in 1842, and it is in the November issue of 1842 (I:82) that the first reference is made to the use of a seven vowel scale.

Alphabet number 5 indicates the first effort to modify the familiar Roman letters to the uses of phonotypy. Though the vowel scale follows the same principles as the others, based on the phonographic
idea of positional indicators, the consonants begin to take on a familiar look. All the Roman style letters ordinarily used in English are employed except Q, W, X, and Y, and to each is assigned a value approximately equivalent to that for which it is usually employed, with the exception of the letter C, to which is assigned the value of the ch of cheer. Though there were still some attempts to design an alphabet without regard to the Roman letters, as in alphabets 6, 7 and 9, the values assigned to the Roman consonant letters in alphabet 5 are fairly constant from this point on.

An examination of some of the letters in the experimental alphabets which were built on a mathematical basis rather than on Roman letters shows occasional striking resemblances between the forms of some of the symbols and those developed some twenty years later by Bell in his Visible Speech.7 However, since Bell was teaching elocution in the University of Edinburgh during the time phonotypy was being developed,8 and since his publication did not appear until phonotypy was fully developed and had been in practical use for over two decades, any similarity between his symbols and the early phonotype designs of Pitman and Ellis is probably coincidental.

Alphabets 6 and 7 experimented further with the idea of reversed symbols as used in alphabet 4, but with different designs for the


symbols. There is little difference in the consonant designs in alphabets 6 and 7, and the vowel scale of the latter is only a refinement of the former.

There is only one more attempt to create an alphabet entirely independent of the Roman letters. This is the alphabet listed as number 9 (Figure 3 following page 51), which is given in the Phonographic Journal for September, 1843, and reprinted as a supplement in the Phonotypic Journal for that same year. This goes back to one of the principles of the first alphabet, in which the difference between the voiceless and the voiced members of the consonant pairs is indicated by light and heavy lines. In this case, a portion of each symbol is heavy for the voiced member of the pair, and the corresponding portion of the symbol is light for the voiceless. The vowels, however, make the distinction between "full" and "stopped" members of the pairs by having a dot or a dash on opposite sides of a vertical line in the three phonographic positions previously discussed. In this vowel scale, however, only one symbol is used for the sound labeled "uh," rather than two as in the former alphabets. One additional symbol is employed in this alphabet which is not used again in any of the later alphabets. This is a symbol for the voiceless w, or the sound of [w].

Precisely when Pitman first conceived the idea of modifying the Roman alphabet to the uses of phonetic printing is not exactly known. Evidently, though, his thought turned tentatively in this direction as early as the latter part of 1842 (evidenced from alphabet 5), and by the early part of 1843 this idea had taken firm root. At some time prior to the Birmingham Phonetic Festival in July, 1843, Pitman had
corresponded with Mr. T. W. Hill, who in a later explanation of his part in the initiation of phonotypy wrote:

...the plan which you had conceived and communicated to me on our first acquaintance, was that of retaining all that was retainable for phonetic purposes in the established alphabet, and proposing no more new letters than were needful for supplying the deficiency. The only merit which I can claim on this occasion is that of comprehending at a glance the value of your proposal; of becoming, as I conceived, the earliest subscriber to a phonetic fund, and of proposing the adoption of your plan at a general meeting which had been called for phonetic purposes at Birmingham.\(^9\)

In September, 1843, the phonotypic alphabet got its first design along the principles which were to be ultimately adopted. The Phono-
typic Journal for 1843 contains a supplement from the Phonographic Journal of the same year which is reported to have been lithographed from the same stone; consequently it bears the same pagination. This supplement contains alphabets 8, 9, and 10. Nine has been dis-
cussed already. Eight and 10 are identical in the formation of the consonants, except that 10 omits the symbols for "kh" and "gh" which had appeared in all the alphabets up to this time (See Fig. 3) The main difference between alphabets 8 and 10 lies in the vowels. It was decided at this time that the horizontal bar used to distinguish the "full" from the "stopped" members of the three front pair of vowels should properly be assigned to the "full" vowel, rather than to the "stopped" vowel as it had been in alphabet 8. It was further decided that the vertical bar used in distinguishing the members of the three back pair of vowels should be changed to a horizontal bar

---

to correspond with the front vowels, and that this indicator should also be assigned to the "full" rather than to the "stopped" member of the pair. The same reversal was made with regard to the central vowels, which are here referred to as the "obscure vowels." This revision is illustrated in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>ʊ</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>ʊ</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>ʊ</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>ʊ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet 8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet 10</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was little change from alphabet 10 to alphabet 11, which was the one in which the third volume of the Phonotypic Journal was partly printed. Ten appeared in October, 1843, and such minor modifications as were felt to be needed were made shortly thereafter, so that it was possible to have type case for the eleventh alphabet in time for setting up and printing the Journal for January, 1844, with the new type. This alphabet might properly be called the first practical phonotypic alphabet, for the ones before it were so experimental that type was never cast for them. The early forms had been worked out during extended correspondence in phonetic longhand between Pitman and Ellis, and were hand lettered by Pitman for lithographing in the Phonographic Journal.¹⁰

Though type was cast and the Journal partially printed in phonotype, the year 1844 was still a year of considerable experimenting with the alphabet. The first printed phonetic material appeared entirely in capitals, for there had evidently been no attempt to develop a

¹⁰Journal, VIII:42.
distinct lower case form, aside from approximately the same forms in smaller size which had been briefly considered in the second alphabet. Since this principle would have necessitated two fonts of type, the first appearance was in small capitals only. Capitals were felt, evidently, to be more distinct in form than lower case letters, though Pitman also expressed the idea that a line of printing presented a better appearance if all the letters were of uniform height and size without having some reach above the line of the rest and some below it. To use both capitals and lower case letters was also, perhaps, felt to violate the principle of one symbol per sound which is the basis for phonetic representation. The various changes that were made between January, 1842, and September of that year are tabulated in Figure 3. In reading this chart, a blank line in a space is to be taken as indicating that no change had been made since the last one shown in the column. A large X across a space indicates that the symbol last shown in that column was discontinued for that particular period. By way of interpreting and summarizing the material in Figure 3, we give the following information:

Alphabet 11 was the one which appeared in January, 1842; 12 appeared in April of the same year; 13 appeared in July of that year; and 14 in August. At the time of the adoption of alphabet 11 in January, the idea of using Roman letters as much as possible had become fairly well fixed. Since the values to most of the consonants was reasonably stable, there were few changes in the phonetic consonant tables from this time on. A few slight modifications were tried, which we shall mention only briefly here. In the April alphabet (12) the use of a form similar to a lower case b was tried for the voiced bilabial plosive. This was discarded in July. The old Roman capital C
Figure 3

Chart Showing Experimental Alphabets 8 through 14
was tried for the value of the voiceless affricate /tʃ/ in the
twelfth alphabet, but in the thirteenth alphabet an attempt was made
to indicate this value with a digraph consisting of the two elements
of the sound. This gave the forms (Tf and Dj). This idea was
discarded, however, in August, after only a brief trial. The forms
for the voiced and voiceless interdental fricatives were not yet
stabilized, and an experiment was tried with a form similar to the
shape of a Potent cross (‡) for the voiceless member of this pair
and with the Greek letter Pi (Π) for the voiced member. This was
not popular, though, and in July another new form, an inverted and
reversed capital Λ was tried for the voiceless th, and the Greek
Delta was reinstated as the symbol for the voiced th. The latter
was retained until September, but in August the symbol for the voice­
less th was again changed, this time to an inverted but not reversed
capital Λ.

In July the greatest number of changes in both the vowel and the
consonant scale occurred. In addition to the alterations already
mentioned, an experiment was tried with the blade sibilants /ʃ/ and
/z/, using a capital Σ for the latter and an inverted Σ for the former.
It was also decided at this time that separate symbols were not needed
for the sounds of /ʒ/ and /w/, sounds which had formerly been indicated
by Y and W, since these could be represented by Ε(/i/) and U(/u/)
respectively. Though some minor changes had already been made in the
forms of the symbols during April, a number of other experiments were
also tried in July. For a short period it was conceived that the
vowels in naught and not would be more correctly represented with a
symbol based upon the letter A rather than upon the letter Ω. A
round-topped capital A was adopted for the former and a similar form without a cross bar for the latter. It was decided that a single symbol was sufficient for the sound of /o/ rather than two symbols for its long and short values as in previous practice, and since the symbol e was now freed, it was assigned to this value. The next significant change was reassigning to the "obscure vowel" of cur and curry the symbols used in the alphabet 10, which were based on the letter E rather than on the letter U. The symbols for the high back vowels /u/ and /v/ were modified to U and Y respectively. The single symbol for the diphthong /OI/ was rejected, and a digraph consisting of the two elements of the diphthong was tried.

In August several of the innovations of July were rejected, and the symbols returned to their previous forms. W and Y were returned to the consonant scale, but the single symbol for /OI/ was not reinstated until September. The symbols for [ɔ] and [ɔ] were returned to a form based on the letter O rather than the letter A. This necessitated returning to a symbol used in the alphabet 12 to indicate the sound of /o/. Another experiment which was tried at this time, but not well received, was the use of forms based on lower case e and u, but of the same height as the capitals, for the sounds of the "obscure" vowels /ɨ/ and [ʌ]. The shape of the potent cross which had been rejected as a symbol for the voiceless th was re-introduced at this time as a symbol for the diphthong /aɪ/. With the slight modification of shortening the horizontal member, this symbol was stabilized as the capital letter for this sound. The symbol for the diphthong / au/ was also stabilized at the same time, though a brief experiment with another form did occur in October, 1814.
During September, 1844, the idea developed that both lower case as well as capital letters could be used in phonotypy without violating any phonetic principle, and the first lower case alphabet was designed. Since the forms of the consonants did not change from this time until 1853, with the single exception in June, 1845, of adopting the Roman letter c instead of the letter k to indicate the value of the voiceless velar stop, the consonants as presented in Figure 4 were the basic arrangement. A few vowel symbols were also stabilized at this time, though generally the vowels were still being subjected to experimental changes. The symbols for the "stopped" high front vowel /i/, the "stopped" middle front vowel /ɛ/, the "stopped" low back vowel /ɑ/, and the "stopped" high back vowel /u/ were stabilized at this time and remained so for many years. From Figure 4, the time at which the various symbols became stabilized into their final forms may be determined.

Since Figure 4 traces the development of the phonotype alphabet from the first use of lower case letters to the acceptance of what is referred to in later years by Pitman, Ellis, Longley and others as "the alphabet of 1847," we have shown in the bottom row the vowel scale finally adopted, which was retained for several years unaltered. The capitals are not repeated, since the last capital shown in each column is the one retained in the final alphabet.

Several interesting observations may be made from the symbols of Figure 4. The first thing we note is that it had not occurred to anyone until the latter part of 1846 to assign any other symbols to the "full" high front vowel and the "full" middle front vowel than some modification of the letters i and e. Until this time the idea underlying
TABLE OF CONSONANTS - BASIC ARRANGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>dʒ</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>ɡ</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>θ</th>
<th>ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER CASE</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ɡ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ɡ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>θ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>ʃ</th>
<th>ʒ</th>
<th>ɹ</th>
<th>ɬ</th>
<th>ɮ</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>ɳ</th>
<th>w</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
<td>ɮ</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɳ</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER CASE</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
<td>ɮ</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɳ</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE OF CHANGES IN VOWEL SCALES

| No. | Date       | I | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
|-----|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | OCT. 1844  | C | ɪ | ɛ | e | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 16 | JAN. 1845  | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 17 | JUNE 1845  | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 18 | JAN. 1846  | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 19 | APR. 1846  | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 20 | MAY 1846   | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 21 | JUNE 1846  | C | ɪ | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |
| 22 | AUG. 1846  | C | ɛ | ə | æ | o | ɔ | η | ʊ | ʌ | ʊ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ | ʌ |

Figure 4
Chart Showing Experimental Alphabets Using Both Capitals and Lower Case
the design of the vowel symbols had been that there should be similarity of form within each pair of "stopped" and "full" vowels. In August, 1846, however, it was decided to sacrifice this principle for the more utilitarian one of maintaining as nearly as possible a visual similarity between phonetic spelling and conventional spelling without sacrificing phonetic truth. We shall consider the reasons for this decision a little later.

During a brief period considerable cry arose that there were not enough front vowels to indicate the precise pronunciation of such words as care, air, fair, etc. To satisfy this demand an additional symbol was introduced in June, 1845, which is described as being equal to the German umlaut a or the French circumflex e. This was plainly a concession to those who demanded the additional symbol, and was probably made with the intention that such persons should assign to it whatever value they were wanting to express in words of the care-air variety.

The alphabet of June, 1845, is particularly noteworthy in that this was the alphabet adopted by Andrews and Boyle for their American newspaper The Anglo Sacsun. The symbol for the sound of the vowel in care, air, etc. was retained in their alphabet, even though this symbol was rejected the next month by Pitman and Ellis. The retention of this symbol was a source of considerable dissension later on between certain eastern groups in the United States who had become accustomed to The Anglo Sacsun's use of the symbol and an increasing western group who preferred the alphabet used by the Longleys. More will be said about this vowel in the next chapter. In spite of their retaining this particular sound, Andrews and Boyle did make some other changes in the alphabet of June, 1845. They adopted the symbols for the sounds of /u/ and
[ju] in which Pitman did not introduce until April, 1816 (Alphabet 19), though they exchanged values for the symbols. That is to say, Andrews and Boyle used the type forms U and w for the sound of /u/, while Pitman used these same forms for the sound of [ju]; they also used the type forms U and w for the sound of [ju], while Pitman used these symbols for the sound of /u/. Andrews and Boyle also reversed the values of the symbols for the sounds /a/ and /æ/ (A-a and Ω-Ω) in the same manner that Pitman did in alphabet 18, which was first used in January, 1816. And so it may with propriety be said that the alphabet adopted by Andrews and Boyle was a combination of all the alphabets from June, 1815, to April, 1816, bearing some features of each.

The year 1816 saw a great many changes in the alphabet, mostly in the vowel symbols. Ellis remarks of the first change that was attempted in January, 1816,

In this alphabet a mode of representing the vocal 'l, 'm, 'n was again introduced for the first time since April, 1814. It consisted of slightly varying the forms of "l, m, n," thus "L, M, M, Mn," = 'l, 'm, 'n, respectively.  

He further remarks concerning the theory governing their experiments during this year that,

The year 1816 was prolific in alterations. The above alphabet was due to the theory that, as both the brief and stopped vowels were short, they should be represented by the same sign, while the long vowel sign should represent long vowels only; hence, all the vowels were arranged in pairs, and even Ω had to be split into two, "Ω', Ω'."

\[\text{11} \text{Pitman's Journal, VII:12 f.}\]

\[\text{12 Idem.}\]
April, 1816, is remarkable in that at this time the concept of a long value of the central vowel was rejected. Of this decision Ellis says, "...we had found it impossible to use it consistently in spelling English." In June, 1816, certain other basic conclusions were reached. It was decided, for example, that the two similar forms of the letter i did not properly indicate the two high front vowels. Pitman remarks concerning the frequent occurrence of these sounds,

This condition so cluttered up the appearance of the page that we were led to give up the attempt to preserve a resemblance in the printed forms of the approximative pairs of vowels, as we were able to do in the Phonographic Short Hand; and at last the great change was made in August, 1816.13

To have made such a change at this time, however, would have been both embarrassing and confusing, for the June number of the Journal had already gone out, in which the following pledge had been made (V:171):

Messrs. Pitman and Ellis distinctly pledge themselves not to make any further alterations in the forms or uses of the letters of the practical Phonotypic Alphabet of the English Language given in this number of the Journal, or in the theory upon which it is founded. Whatever books they publish in Phonotypy will be printed in accordance with this alphabet, and no other.

Whether by conspiracy with Pitman or alone, we do not know, but in the August, 1816, issue of the Journal a letter anonymously signed "A Reformer" was printed which accused Pitman and Ellis of acting too hastily in making a pledge of no further change. The writer held that such a pledge should not have been made without consulting the Phonetic Council to determine whether further changes were thought necessary.

13 Idem.
"A Reformer" then listed several suggested alterations, and called for a vote from the council whether they should be incorporated in spite of Pitman's and Ellis' pledge. These changes were based on the rationale that since the same letters were commonly employed in meter-metrical and labor-elaborate, the proper form of the "full" high front vowel should have been some form of the letter E, and suggested the use of a modification of the Greek Epsilon. By the same reasoning, the proper form for the "full" middle front vowel should have been a form of the letter A, and "A Reformer" suggested the printed italic form a. This violated the philosophy that acoustically similar vowels should have symbols of similar design. "A Reformer's" suggestion was accepted by the council, and in August this significant change was made. It was not until some time later, after the decision of the Council had been accepted, that it was revealed that the anonymous letter had been written by Ellis himself. Though the final decision to make the change was announced in August, it was not until September that type was set up in this manner for printing the Journal.

After this decision there was only a slight modification of the shape of the symbol for /a/, using a symbol hitherto untried (A-a). Though the lower case form of this symbol was later rejected, it was used satisfactorily during the remainder of 1846. The symbols (a) and (α) were re-assigned to represent the sounds of /e/ and /æ/ respectively. Of this alphabet of August, 1846, Ellis said,

As a printing alphabet, this was unobjectionable, and it was used till the end of the year, the first edition of the "Primer" and "Instructor" having been prepared in accordance with it. The difference between this and the alphabet of 1847 is so slight, consisting only in using "a, a" where we now use "a, q", that there is no need to give any example of its use. The slight change just mentioned, which was made at the commencement of 1847, was introduced for the
purpose of having a convenient long hand written alphabet answering to the printed one. There did not appear to Mr. Pitman any way of getting over the difficulty he felt in arranging this long hand alphabet, except by the slight change already alluded to, and it was consequently made with the sanction of the Phonetic Council.14

During the course of the various experiments, both Pitman and Ellis designed forms for the new sounds not represented by the regular Roman alphabet. Of the 34 new forms, capitals and lower case, Pitman designed 15 and Ellis designed 18, while one was designed by a certain "Professor Clark, of Aberdeen." This single symbol of Professor Clark's was, however, the symbol for eng, or the sound of final ng, the symbol which is still in use in the International Phonetic Alphabet. The assignment of values to the symbols was likewise a cooperative enterprise, Pitman being credited with assigning 15 of the symbols, Ellis with assigning 15, with the remaining three credited to both of them.15 During the course of the experiments there were three basic sizes of type considered, the original small capitals, the large capitals of a later date when both capitals and lower case letters were used, and, of course, the lower case letters. Of the various small capitals suggested, 33 were ultimately rejected; of the large capitals, 23 were ultimately rejected; and of the lower case letters, 54 were ultimately rejected. This made a total of 110 symbols that were cast in type, used in printing, and rejected by the time the alphabet became stabilized in January, 1847. The "alphabet of 1847" is given in Plate II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Sounded as</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Sounded as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>robe</td>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>league</td>
<td>Gg</td>
<td>Gg</td>
<td>league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jj</td>
<td>Jj</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tt</td>
<td>Tt</td>
<td>fate</td>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>cackle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee</td>
<td>Ee</td>
<td>ell</td>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>olive</td>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>Yy</td>
<td>Yy</td>
<td>yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>dace</td>
<td>Zz</td>
<td>Zz</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gg</td>
<td>Gg</td>
<td>league</td>
<td>Vv</td>
<td>Vv</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>hay</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ll</td>
<td>Ll</td>
<td>hull</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vv</td>
<td>Vv</td>
<td>virion</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>hiss</td>
<td>Tt</td>
<td>Tt</td>
<td>wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee</td>
<td>Ee</td>
<td>ell</td>
<td>Ll</td>
<td>Ll</td>
<td>hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>safe</td>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>mum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>mule</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yy</td>
<td>Yy</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>hay</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>hay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate II

Phonotypic Alphabet of 1847 (Facsimile from the Phonetic Advocate)
Having examined the historical background of the phonotype alphabet of 1847, which was adopted by Longley and Brother for their phonetic publications, let us briefly examine this alphabet, and consider some of the ways in which it was employed. During the experimental days of developing an alphabet for printing, the philosophy of phonetic printing changed considerably. Where it had been the original intention to develop a system that was mathematically exact, with related sounds being represented with symbols which bore some relationship to each other, in the later days of the experiment the idea began to emerge that phonotypy was not likely to surplant conventional orthography immediately, in spite of its philosophical desirability. From this realization arose the principle that if phonotypy were to serve for educational purposes it should resemble conventional spelling as nearly as possible. It was this principle that led to the development of both capital and lower case forms. In lower case letters the analogies with conventional Roman letters were a bit closer than with capitals. However, this was probably felt not to be a serious handicap, for certain of the Roman capitals bear little or no resemblance to their lower case counterparts, as, for example, A and a, or R and r. To a literate person, the associations between capital and lower case forms of the Roman letters would be already established, and only a slight amount of memory work would be required to establish the new forms. With persons not yet able to

---

16 The phrase, "mathematically exact" derives from the theory underlying Pitman's shorthand symbols, which were based upon straight lines in horizontal, vertical, and oblique directions for the "explodent" consonants, and upon mathematically related arcs of the circle for other acoustically related consonants.
read, learning dissimilar capital and lower case forms for the new symbols would involve only slightly greater effort than learning the same sort of dissimilar forms for many of the Roman letters.

In determining the forms of the symbols for sounds not covered by the Roman letters employed, the inventors of the phonotype alphabet decided that any distinctive sound of English, whether elemental or complex in its phonetic structure, i.e., whether a "pure" vowel or a single consonant on the one hand, or on the other hand a diphthong or an affricate, should be represented by a single symbol. Without expressing the concept of the phoneme, as it came later to be accepted, Pitman and Ellis were nevertheless thinking in the same manner as did such phoneticians as Henry Sweet, Daniel Jones, Paul Passy and others over a half century later. That is to say, they developed the principle of disregarding individual differences in sound production, and of identifying by means of a single symbol any broad group of related sounds which bore distinctive differences to other broad groups of related sounds. Ellis also recognized the principle of the vowel continuum, pointing out that in reality there was an infinite number of shadings as one progressed through the vowel scale. After Pitman and Ellis had developed the phonotype alphabet and had presented it in stable form to the public in 1847, Ellis collected the principles which had governed their thinking and published them in a book entitled *The Essentials of Phonetics*. The following excerpt illustrates his treatment of some of these matters (III:52 f.):

In the preceding pages we have endeavored to analyze human speech, as employed in forming significant sounds of the language, without any secondary consideration, such as practicability or advisability of constructing an alphabet for expressing these sounds, simple enough to admit of being used by every one who can speak and guide a pen. But as significant sounds are the readiest mode we possess for interchanging ideas, it will manifestly be of the greatest importance to invent a means of recalling those sounds, which shall be easy both to the framer and inspector of the symbols employed. We proceed therefore to an examination of this most important but difficult subject, the invention of a practical alphabet, that is, an alphabet which can be used by even the dullest intellect, for none should be debarred from enjoying the blessings of reading and writing.

Any one who has paid attention to the sounds of speech, will have observed, that there is great difficulty in determining the qualities of the real vowel sounds; that, in fact, the vowel scale instead of consisting of a number of isolated and well defined sounds, such as those which we have previously discussed, must be practically considered as consisting of an infinite number of sounds, each infinitely little different from those which immediately precede and follow it. It would be, of course, impossible to symbolize every one of the resulting infinite number of vowels; and all we can hope to do practically, is to establish certain groups of sounds producing about the same effect upon the ear, and call each group a single vowel. Even in this case, the greatest diversity is likely to occur in assigning the number of groups, or the individual members of each group. As it is probable that no two speakers use precisely the same vowel series, it is very unlikely that any two writers should precisely agree as to the groups that should be made, or the symbols that should be employed. Besides this inconvenience, it will be found in practice, that different listeners possess very different powers of appreciating differences of sound, and that in hearing unusual sounds they have great difficulty in discriminating between them, confusing vowels which to an educated ear are remarkably different. This is particularly remarkable in the vowel sounds of the different languages; . . .

The practical problem which confronted them, then, was the creation of an alphabet which was capable of representing distinctive sounds in such a manner that the symbols employed would consistently call up the same word images in the mind of the writer and of the
reader. It was expected that persons with slightly different provincial
dialects would interpret the key words in terms of their own dialect,
so that a symbol would have the same significance to them as to other
persons interpreting the key words in terms of another dialect. It
was hoped, though it was admitted to be more of a dream than a hope,
that in time it would be possible to level the English language by the
use of a phonetic system of writing, so that dialectal differences would
gradually disappear. In the following additional excerpt from the im-
mediately preceding citation, the task of reconciling dialectal dif-
ferences is considered:

Very few persons know the pronunciation of any
language but their own. A few lessons from a single
individual, do not suffice to convey a notion of
vowel sounds. No one who has learnt from a single
master only, is likely to be phonetically well acquainted
with a language. Few persons, indeed, know what the
pronunciation of their own language is. They insensibly
acquire the sounds used by the people with whom they are
in daily communication, and they believe that all the
nation pronounces in the same manner.18 In our task of
phonetic spelling, we have many times been surprised at
this ignorance of diversities of pronunciation. We
have received assurances that "nobody said so," or that
"every one said so," while perhaps we have ourselves
heard both pronunciations.

18 The same principles as expressed here underlie the philosophy
behind all dialect studies, and is expressed formally by Bernard Bloch
in the introduction to his Ph.D. Dissertation written at Brown
University, 1935, in these words: "...the speech of one person,
born in a given community of native parents, if he has spent all...
of his life in the place of his birth...may be considered typical...
of the dialect spoken in that community by persons of the same gene-
ration and social status." This concept is consistently followed
in selecting informants for any type of dialect geography study.
We think that the introduction of a phonetic system of writing may in a great measure tend to remove these difficulties, but not entirely. Persons learning the alphabet in different parts of the country, will involuntarily and unknowingly attach different values to the symbols; . . . Still we think it possible, that, by making the phonetic construction of an alphabet more apparent, and by instructing the teachers of popular schools, much may be done towards rendering pronunciation tolerably uniform, and approximatively [sic] fixing the sounds of the principal vowel groups.

In his Essentials of Phonetics, according to a quotation given in the Advocate (III:138), Ellis is alleged to have analyzed and commented on the sounds of English in the following manner,

Long vowels, 8; brief vowels, 9; stopped vowels, 7; breathings, 6; continuants, 12; liquids, 14; explosents, 10; diphthongs: [sic] total 66.

This alphabet would be very difficult to use, even for a practical phonetician, and must be certainly quite beyond the powers of the average writer.

The philosophy expressed in this comment led to the idea that "an alphabet of about 40 letters is sufficient for all practical purposes."

An innovation which appeared at this time, though it had been experimentally used in correspondence since 1844, was the development of a cursive or longhand alphabet. This met with some objection on the part of scholars, some of whom felt that the phonetic principle of one symbol per sound had been violated far enough by the use of both capital and lower case forms. To such persons, the introduction of an additional manuscript alphabet, also containing capitals and lower case letters, was carrying things too far. Though the arrangement actually did give four symbols per sound (and if we consider the shorthand symbols which were also familiar to most of the supporters of the movement, there were five), Ellis and Pitman justified the use of such an arrangement on grounds of the practical application of phonetic principles to educational needs. Cursive forms of letters had
been used from the days of the Greeks for manuscript writing, and most European alphabets had long established printed and cursive forms. It was their hope that the principles of phonetic writing would be spread to others not familiar with the reform by means of the manuscript alphabet. Pitman recommended to friends of the reform that they carry on their correspondence with the manuscript phonetic alphabet, and employ it in every place where ordinarily manuscript writing was used. In order to facilitate the spread of the knowledge of phonetics in this way, slips were printed containing the longhand alphabet. These were to be enclosed in letters to persons not familiar with the system. In addition to this, in 1848 Pitman began printing stationery which contained the phonetic longhand alphabet at the top of the sheet.

The alphabet of 1847 contained the 40 sounds previously discussed, which were divided as follows: 21 consonantal sounds, 12 vowel sounds and 4 diphthongs. For the consonant sounds, the final decision was to adopt the regular Romanic letters as much as possible, rejecting q, k, and x (which were assigned in the Ethnical Alphabet to certain non-English sounds), and to design forms for the remaining sounds bearing as close a resemblance to the familiar Roman letters as possible. The principles underlying the vowel scale were slightly altered by this time. Since it was agreed that similar sounds did not need to have similar symbols, the division of the vowel scale into "full" and "stopped" vowels in pairs could be made on the basis of their most familiar representation in the common spelling. By definition, "stopped" vowels appear only in closed syllables, and can not appear in monosyllables except as terminated with a consonant (See Page 40). That is to say,
the sounds of /i/, /e/, /æ/, [ɒ], [ʌ], and /u/ do not normally appear as terminal sounds in a word or in a syllable. By contrast, then, the sounds of /ɪ/, /ɛ/, /æ/, /ɔ/, /ɔ/, and /u/ can form terminal sounds. Both "stopped" vowels and "full" vowels had both a long and a short value, which was not shown in the form of the symbol, but was indicated by the rules of accentuation. These rules are frequently given with the phonetic alphabet, and are included in all instruction books. In practice, the "accented" or stressed syllable is usually to be considered as a long vowel, and the unstressed syllable as a "brief" or short vowel. The principle of "stopped vowels is explained by Ellis in these words:

Short vowels are of two kinds, which we distinguish as brief and stopped; a stopped vowel is always distinguished from the brief by being "brought to an untimely end" by the action of the following consonant. In the practical division of syllables, the stopped vowel is always taken with the following consonant, but the brief vowel never is; on the contrary, it is usual in syllabizing to prolong the brief vowel, and replace it by its corresponding long vowel, when such a vowel exists in our language, as is generally the case; hence the brief vowel is always represented by a long vowel sign, except in the two cases... where no corresponding long vowel exists in English. It is this impossibility of separating the vowel from its consonant which has rendered the preceding analysis necessary.19

This use of the phonotype symbols for both long and short "full vowels and for long and short "stopped" vowels is given by Pitman in his Journal (V:112). In the following list which Pitman gave, the underscored letter designates the vowel referred to (the vowel is stressed only when it is shown to be long, and is unstressed when shown to be

short):

(e) long: evil, being, achieve, antique, decency, theory, precedence, inveigle, bumbazine

(e) short: jubilee, pedigree, Galilee

(i) long: pity, billow, brilliant, liquor, quadrille, idiot, privilege, banditti, illicit, indivisibility.

(i) short: belong, debar, repent, any, money, ability, institute, article, indivisibility.

(a) long: acre, strata, chicane, campaign, knavery, radiant, oasis, obeisance, insatiate.

(a) short: essay, Sunday, Monday, westgate, female, detail, wholesale, gateway, AEonian, Israel.

(e) long: better, effort, allege, gazette, transcend, burial, felony, already, celebrate.

(e) short: satellite, bonnet, target, brooklet, hunted, watches, possesses, alphabet.

(q) long: father, Llama, mama, papa, balmy, laughable, lethargic, sardonic.
Note: the words mama and papa are evidently stressed on the final syllable, and the word sardonic is stressed on the first.

(q) short: armada, harmonious, Sardinia. (Found only before r)

(a) long: ample, ambulate, tripan, apparel, emphatic, allergy, mechanical, veracity.

(a) short: among, afraid, comma, cridenda, omega, constant, buckram, lilac.

(e) long: August, awful, auspice, daughter, author, autumn, thralldom, appall, applause.

(e) short: august, authentic, audacious, authority, autumnal, Renshaw, kickshaw.

(o) long: college, quadrant, absolve, extole, docible, ominous, abhorrence, honorary.

(o) short: command, complain, oppose, conceal, conduct.

(u) before r accented: turn, curfew, survey, adjourn, superb, usurp.

(u) before r unaccented: permit, curtail, father, ever.

(u) long: lover, bustle, thorough, affront, covetous, discourage, insulting, antepenult.
The decision that the members of each pair of vowels did not have to bear a design relationship to each other paved the way for modifying all the vowels according to the particular Roman letter most commonly associated with the sound. Thus there were five groups of designs: a group designed around the Roman letter A, which we designate as "Symbols of the type of A"; a group designed around the Roman letter E, which we designate as "Symbols of the type of E"; a group designed around the Roman letter I, which we designate as "Symbols of the type of I"; a group designed around the Roman letter O, which we designate as "Symbols of the type of O"; and a group designed around the modified
Roman letter U, which we designate as "Symbols of the type of U."

The rationale of choosing the forms of the letters is given by Ellis in the following words:

There are two letters "q, a," one of which was used in the Italic, and the other in the Roman style of printing, the former, as the simplest, was retained for the stopped vowel, the latter, as the most complex, was given to the long vowel. If, then, we do not reckon "q" as a new Roman letter, there were only 16 new forms to be provided. The small letters are, "e, a," a variation of "e, a," or of the Greek "epsilon," or of two of the letters "e" one placed over the other, since "ee" is the most certain representative of this sound in historical orthography; "u," a variation of "a," consisting in lengthening a portion of it, as the sound "u," is a practical elongation of the sound "a," in English; "e" is "o" with the long mark "o" running through, instead of over it, as it is the prolongation of "o;" "e" is a variation of the Greek "omega," made to harmonize with the Roman alphabet; "u, w, u, w," are variations of "u, w," by which the latter sound is generally, and the former often, expressed, especially after "r," in the historical spelling; "u, w," as being less complete, is used for the stopped vowel. Among the diphthongs, "i" is a variation of "i," by which this sound is most usually expressed in the historical spelling; its rounded tail hints at the letter "a," which forms the other part of the diphthong; "e" is a variation of "oi," only the dot of the "i" being retained and fastened to the "o" with a little flourish; "y" is a variation of the common Greek contraction for the diphthong "omicron upsilon," which we English generally so pronounce in reading Greek...it is also intended to remind the reader of the digraph "ou," by which this diphthong is often expressed in historical spelling; "u, u," is a variation of the historical "uu," and the tail may be considered as hinting at the two extra strokes required to make up "iuu." 20

Having examined the rationale of the vowel symbols, let us now turn our attention briefly to the forms of some of the consonants, particularly to those which did not use strictly Roman forms. The first of these in the phonetic list of consonants is the affricate represented by the I.P.A. symbol [tʃ]. Ellis' explanation of this symbol is, that

20 Quoted in Pitman's Journal (VII:29) and also in Longley's Phonetic Magazine (I:230) and credited to A. J. Ellis' book The Essentials of Phonetics. Subsequent discussions of the rationale of the choice of other symbols is from the same source.
it was "a variation of 'cj' or 'ci' from which the sound etymologically arose; it is intended to recall the digraph 'ch'. . ." The form for this symbol in phonotype was (\(\gamma\)). The capital letter for the symbol (\(\gamma\)) was a capital C with a cross bar, thus: \(\Gamma\). The choice of this symbol was justified by Ellis in the proportion \(\varepsilon: \varsigma: \iota: \iota\). The voiced counterpart of this sound is represented in phonotypy with the letter \(\mathfrak{y}\) both capital and lower case, since this letter commonly represents such a sound in English.

The symbol for the voiceless th sound, which is represented by the I.P.A. symbol /θ/, was alleged to have been "a form of the Greek Theta, but turned to the right instead of to the left," thus: \(\Theta\). The symbol \(\Delta\) for the voiced counterpart of this sound was described as "a variation of the old Anglo Saxon letter which expressed this sound, and may, therefore, be considered as a restoration of the ancient orthography." The capital forms of these symbols, (\(\Gamma\) and \(\Delta\)), were said to have been chosen "on account of the long hand written forms" for the letters T and D which some writers are alleged to have used as secondary forms for such letters. Since many of the early experiments had been carried on by correspondence between Pitman and Ellis, a phonetic long hand had been developed early and used by both the men in their correspondence. These secondary forms of the manuscript T and D were first adopted into the phonetic longhand alphabet for the sounds of voiced and voiceless th, and the printed capitals were adapted from them. Ellis pointed out that it was purely accidental that these symbols are reversals of the capitals of the fourth and second letters respectively of the Russian alphabet, i.e., \(\Gamma\) and \(\delta\).
The symbols \( \jmath \) and \( \zeta \) were explained to be mere modifications of \( s \) and \( z \), while their capitals were the capital Greek sigma and a reversed sigma, respectively, thus, \((\Sigma \text{ and } \Xi)\). This is the only case in the final phonetic alphabet in which reversed symbols are used for the voiced-voiceless members of a pair of sounds, though this practice was common in the early days. This reversal was justified by Ellis by the fact that \( s \) and \( z \) are in fact only reversals of each other, therefore the proportion \( \Xi : \Xi :: s : z \) is reasonable.

The symbol \( \eta \) is formed from the letters \( ng \), and was originally adapted from the manuscript alphabet in which the cursive \( n \) added the lower loop, or tail, of the cursive \( g \). This is the only symbol for which neither Pitman nor Ellis takes credit, the invention of the symbol being, as indicated earlier, attributed to a certain Professor Clark.

The alphabet settled upon at this time was not felt to be perfect, but rather practical. Pitman writes in his Journal (Vol I),

It is not a mathematically perfect alphabet, because the delicate construction of such an alphabet would render it useless in practice, and only persons of delicate organs, and with considerable knowledge of phonetics, would be capable of using it properly, and even they would sometimes feel at a loss. We are aware of the defects of this alphabet, but think that they are of such a nature as to facilitate its practical use, and we write for the multitude rather than for the learned phonetician.

In speaking of the letters it is necessary to give them names, even though they are not designated by name in teaching their values. The vowels are spoken of in two ways, the "full" vowels being designated simply by their sound, and the "stopped" vowels with their sound values plus a terminal \( t \), as: \( it, et, at, ot, ut, ut. \) Naming the consonants followed the policy usually employed when reciting the
Roman alphabet, viz., uttering the consonant with a vowel sound either before or after it. Since the vowel was not always the same as that normally used in reciting the English alphabet, we shall give here, in terms of the I.P.A. symbolization, the names which were assigned to the consonants: [pi, bi, ti, di, tʃe, dʒe, ke, ge; ɛf, vi, ði, ðs, zi, ɪʃ, ʒə; er, ɛl, æm, ɛn, ɪŋ, ɪə, ə, ɛ, ɛ] . The name of the symbol h was later changed to hash rather than hay, on the ground that certain Englishmen confused it with the vowel a, (I.P.A. ɛ/). The English designation for the symbol z is ordinarily zed. This was changed to /zi/ for the sake of uniformity. The name of the symbol r was changed to /ɛr/ rather than /qr/ because "it was found that Londoners would otherwise confuse the consonant r with the vowel ɒ" (I.P.A. /ɑ/).

This explanation of the names of the letters evidently appeared in Ellis' booklet The Teacher's Guide to Phonetic Reading, for a letter from Mr. James Vetch, whose address is not given (II:165) mentions observing this explanation in his copy of the Teacher's Guide, and states, his objection in this manner:

"This reason is no doubt good in England, where many persons drop the sound of h in such words as house, hog, hope... But I do not think that this pronunciation prevails to any great extent in this country; and as the name ha [I.P.A. ɛ/] is much more natural and easy I see no good reason why we should not use it instead of hash."

Longley expresses agreement with this idea, and states that he will follow it in future indications of the names of the alphabet.

---

In using the alphabet, the general intention was to follow the practice of the dictionary makers and to represent each word as it might be deliberately pronounced in isolation. In some of the early experiments, attempts had been made to write the sounds of words as they were heard in rapid conversational speech. Though some supporters of the movement felt this practice should be retained, Pitman rejected it because as he once said, such speech "slurs over unaccented sounds." Representing the unstressed vowels with the obscure vowel u would lead, he felt, to developing slovenly habits on the part of children learning to read. He also felt that deliberate, careful syllabic pronunciation was the only way printed phonotypy could attain any degree of uniformity.

The alphabet of 1847 which we have just described, was the system of phonetics adopted by Longley and Brother, Printers, in Cincinnati in July, 1848 when they decided to engage in the business of phonetic printing in the United States. This alphabet was a good choice, since the attitude of the Longleys, particularly the elder brother, Elias, was that phonotypy was primarily an educational reform movement. It is doubtful that he would have been satisfied with any of the earlier alphabet attempts as practical approaches to such reform.

According to the practice explained in the preface of avoiding hereafter the awkward reference to the Longley brothers when editorial expressions from their periodical are mentioned or quoted, we shall use the singular term, Longley, to indicate the senior editor of the firm, unless it is specifically known that some other member of the firm is

---

22 Pitman's Journal (V:11).
speaking.

In evaluating what were felt to be primary objectives of any reformed orthography, Longley wrote (I:280),

1. The new alphabet must be \textit{practically} phonetic, that is, it must be scientifically arranged, and in its use, conform to fixed laws of order—each letter the sole representative of a definite sound. 2. The forms of the characters must be symmetrical and harmonize with each other, 3rd. The sounds used in the language must be so distributed to the letters, that the new spelling will be as nearly similar to the old as possible,—in order that those who have learned the old spelling may readily read the new, and those who learn the new may easily read the old. . .

In 1851, as the first echoes of possible change in the alphabet were being detected, Dr. James W. Stone, of Boston, expressed this same point of view in a letter to a certain Mr. Stout (no initials given), of Tennessee (city not given) (III:166).

To make phonetic printing successful, as great a degree of resemblance to romanic printing must be obtained as possible. . . the resemblance between the two alphabets must be so strong that an individual having learnt one can read the other with scarcely any additional difficulty.

As we have already mentioned, the intention of Pitman and Ellis, when they began to recognize the educational possibilities of phonotypy, was to obtain this strong resemblance to romanic spelling and at the same time retain the larger phonetic principle of one symbol per sound. By the arrangement of many of the phonetic symbols as modifications of the Roman letter frequently associated with a given sound, many common words were scarcely altered in appearance when transliterated from the common spelling to phonetic spelling. Longley's early effort to follow Pitman's lead in phonetic spelling is reflected in the following comment, from the \textit{Phonetic Magazine} (I:19),

When we began setting type for these pages, the latest number of the Journal was for January, 1847. This we laid on the case before us, and endeavored to conform to its spellings; but we had to vary a little, the
pronunciation being so different here from what it was in England. . . Understand our position: we use the same alphabet as Mr. Pitman, and "in the same sense"; the only difference is caused by the varied pronunciation in the two countries. . . ."

The attitude of Pitman toward the differences that appeared between the spelling of the Longleys and his own spelling is reflected in this statement, made in reply to a letter from Mr. Henry M. Parchurst of Boston, Mass.:

We wish it to be particularly understood, that we are only advocating the use of the same types in the same sense both in America and in England. . . We do not insist on the Americans adopting our mode of spelling, because we wish them to represent their own pronunciation, provided they will only do so consistently.23

One of the main sources of difference in the phonetic spelling of the Longleys and that of Pitman and Ellis was in the difference in the dictionaries used. The English writers relied rather heavily on Walker's dictionary. Since Walker's pronunciation was probably colored by his elocutionary outlook, he tended to indicate the pronunciation of unstressed syllables in the form they would have (or which he and other elocutionists felt they should have on the basis of the ordinary orthography) when such syllables were given full stress. One of the early critical commentators on the new spelling was Samuel Stehman Haldeman, philologist and linguist, who wrote this sarcastic comment on the attempts to indicate in phonotypy an "elegant pronunciation" (II: 257):

A pronunciation to be "elegant" and "refined" must differ somewhat from the natural flow given it by those who made and developed it, or to whose keeping it was originally confided by the Almighty. Hence, Walker finds two forms of a word in use, and recommends that to be the most "refined" which is the least common, . . .

Webster, on the other hand, rejected many of Walker's pronunciations as being contrary to the actual usage of educated men, at least in America. Webster mentions, for example, that:

It has been already remarked that Walker's notation of the sound of i and y short, in unaccented syllables, which he directs to be pronounced like e long, is contrary to all good usage, and is rejected by all other orthopoeists except Jamison.24

Generally speaking, the practice of Longley was to spell a word in phonotype as he thought it to be generally pronounced, and when in doubt to consult a dictionary. Both Webster's and Worcester's dictionaries stood high in the esteem of many people of that day, but there is some evidence that Longley leaned a little more toward Webster. Edwin Leigh wrote (IV:146):

Of the authority of Webster's dictionary, permit me to say that many persons place it in the highest rank. Others consider it to be second to none for its definitions and second only to Worcester for its orthoepy and orthography. . . . But both these dictionaries are of the highest authority.

Longley's preference for Webster, however, is indicated by a remark by Adams Jewett, of Dayton, Ohio. Andrews, of the New York Propagandist, a paper which succeeded the former Anglo Saxun, had made a disparaging remark about Webster in his paper, and Jewett wrote a reply which is printed in the Advocate (IV:31) as follows:

This last item of information will doubtless occasion you some surprise, as it did me, . . . and as it must have done to Mr. Longley, who has always been in the habit of appealing

---

24 Quoted in the Advocate, III:202, and credited to Noah Webster's Dictionary, p. 64. Another reference in the Advocate, III:31, indicates that Longley used, and was evidently referring to at this time, Webster's An American Dictionary of the English Language edition of 1840.
to Webster as the very best authority in matters of pronunciation. . . . Noah Webster. . . has done more, as I supposed was universally admitted, than any other person, perhaps I should say than all others, to influence American pronunciation and render it uniform.

Evidently Webster's system of diacritics did not occasion any difficulty except with unstressed syllables. Jewett quoted Webster's own explanation of the value of the vowel in unaccented syllables from "the last edition of Webster's dictionary"—probably the edition of 1840— as saying (IV:31), "Whenever an unaccented syllable ends in a vowel other than (e) mute, this vowel has an obscure and faint sound." Jewett then pointed out that some phoneticians of the time, including Longley, were in error in concluding that this remark intended the use of the "stopped" value of the vowel. He goes on to explain that Webster only intended to indicate a somewhat shortened value of the vowel.

Edwin Leigh commented on this same problem as follows (IV:46):

It has been said that Webster does not indicate the pronunciation of unaccented vowels. No dictionary does this perfectly, but Mr. Jewett in his admirable communication in the last Advocate, has shown that he does mark the difference. . . .

He then submits a list of words from Webster's dictionary purporting to demonstrate the manner in which Webster marked the words to show the difference in the vowels of unstressed syllables. Following this list he comments (idem):

Now compare this notation with the rule and explanations quoted by Mr. Jewett. . . ., we see that when Mr. Webster divides words so that the unaccented syllable ends on a vowel, it is the 'open' [sic] or full & @, etc., somewhat shortened, that is indicated, but when the syllable

---

25 This edition was the latest one at the time Jewett wrote the above comment.
ends with a consonant, the stopped e, o, etc., is indicated. Evidently Webster's syllabication practices were well understood not only because of his dictionary, but also because of his spelling book, commonly referred to as the "blue-back speller." The only difficulty lay in the differences in interpretation of what Webster meant. Generally speaking, however, Longley's practice in indicating the pronunciation based on his interpretation of Webster's representation was satisfactory to the readers during the early volumes of the Advocate. However, and this is to his credit, Longley did not presume that his interpretation of the proper pronunciation was infallible, but admitted openly that matters of pronunciation are dependent on the background and training of the individual and that they vary from one section of the country to another. Consequently, he offered to print any article or letter in the phonetic spelling of the writer provided that such communication be written in phonetic longhand rather than in shorthand (I:165). However, communications written in phonetic shorthand were interpreted in terms of Longley's own pronunciation, or in terms of Webster's indicated pronunciation.

The influence of Walker's dictionary was not inconsiderable, however, for Walker had his followers among phoneticians as well as in other circles, as evidenced by occasional letters in praise of Walker which were printed in the Advocate. Still other readers of the Advocate felt that Worcester's dictionary was preferable to either of the others mentioned since he had concentrated on an orthoepic dictionary rather than either an orthographic or a lexical dictionary.26

---

It is not necessary to mention individually all of the consonants in the phonotype alphabet in the manner of their use by the Longley's. Generally they agreed with the usage of Pitman and Ellis, and with the rather standardized interpretation of the values of the English consonants that exists even to this time. Their employment of the letter c, however, according to the 1847 alphabet (following the practice of Pitman and Ellis), caused some offense to followers of Andrews and Boyle, who employed k for the velar stop according to the 1845 alphabet. For instance, a certain John Linsley of Evansville, Indiana wrote (II:133)

I am very well pleased with the Phonetic Advocate, but I would be better yet with a little amendment of the alphabet. I can not admit that k should be thrust out of the alphabet and c take his place, when k has always been faithful to its constituents, and even helped c when he could not help himself; and let c take the place of that crooked basket capital and pothooked small letter, to represent the sound of vicious, champagne, etc. . . .

The reference to the "crooked basket capital and pothooked small letter" is to the use of the capital Greek sigma and the long-s (ʃ) for the sound mentioned.

Editorially Longley replied to the objection, giving these reasons for employing the letter c instead of k (II:133),

We have only room to say, that the element we represent by c is oftener thus represented in the old spelling than by k; we therefore use it, so that phonetic spelling may be as similar to heteric spelling as possible, by which two desirable objects are gained—namely, those who read the common spelling can with but little difficulty read phonotypy; and those who learn to read phonotypy first, may with little trouble learn to read the common spelling. k is used in the alphabet as applied to foreign languages; and c is not at all uniform in representing the sound ʃ; t and sh more frequently represent that element.
Though in most words Longley followed rather closely the practice of Pitman and Ellis, there was one group of words in which he evidently felt justified by his own hearing in departing from them. This group contained words ending in iar, ial, and ion, as in familiar, filial and union. Pitman preferred to transcribe these with the symbol i, as iar, ial, iun, while Longley preferred the symbol y, as yar, yal, yun. The reason for this preference for the palatal glide over the vowel was that the use of the vowel was thought to indicate another syllable, which Longley did not believe really existed except in Pitman's mind.

Though some readers advocated, and some other printers practiced at a later date, the use of the affricate symbol ɹ in nature, lecture, etc., Longley's practice held with Pitman's and Ellis' in spelling them with trɹ, which is roughly equal to [tjur] in I.P.A. symbols.

There was no great difference between the American use and the English use of the symbol ɹ. It appeared both pre- and post- consonantally in the practice of phonetic printers in both countries. That this usage establishes that a pre-consonantal ɹ sound actually existed at this time in the speech of both England and the United States is not positively attested. There seems to be general agreement that the ɹ was trilled as late as the time of Franklin, based on Franklin's description of the manner of making the sound.27

---

In an analysis of Franklin's essay, Wise\(^2^8\) concluded that the trilled \(r\) was used even in words like *murmur*. However, the modern practice of spelling with an \(r\) those words which have a historic \(r\) regardless of whether the \(r\) is pronounced (which practice we note in dictionaries of all periods) leaves us in considerable uncertainty as to the actual sound intended by this symbol when it is used pre-consonantally. There is reason to suppose, however, that the absence of the sound of \(r\) would be noted by the leaders in the phonetic movement. Men such as Ellis and Pitman in England or Leigh and Stone in the United States (all of whom revealed their phonetic acuity during the consideration of the alphabet revision, to be presented in the next chapter), would not have been likely to continue to assume the presence of the sound of \(r\) pre-consonantally unless such sound actually existed. At least the arbitrary use of the symbol for analogical reasons would have been mentioned by someone during these discussions. We will not ignore, on the other hand, the fact that the avowed intention was to give phonotypy as close a resemblance to ordinary spelling as possible, a philosophy which we have already discussed, and that this intention may have allowed the inclusion of the symbol \(r\) pre-consonantally as a concession of romanic orthography. We can not justifiably assume that since no one mentioned such a concession it was not made.

The only other consonantal symbol that warrants any special attention is the symbol \(y\). This symbol is used as the equivalent of the I.P.A. \(/j/\), except that it is not used in connection with the vowel \(/u/\).

---

Words such as *yet, yea, year, yoke*, etc. are regularly spelled in phonotype with the symbol $y$ initially, while words such as *you, youth, use*, etc. are indicated with the diphthong $u$ initially. The desirability of using this diphthong initially in words of the type cited is challenged many times later, so that ultimately it was changed, and the consonantal $y$ written in this type of words. Since this change did not take place until some time later, and the discussion of these later changes in the alphabet is the subject of the next chapter, we shall reserve the discussion of the change until that time, mentioning only that during the time of the first several volumes of their publication, and throughout the other printed materials published by Longley during these earlier years, the consonantal $y$ was reserved for use before any other vowel sound except long $u$.

Since the vowel scale was generally the most controversial, both at the time of the beginning of Longley's publishing activities and throughout the first six years of their phonetic printing career, we shall consider briefly the various types of words in which each of the vowel symbols was used, in order that we may more nearly establish the spread of the phoneme covered by the symbol. Though there was not always complete agreement with Longley's phonetic spelling practices, and though he did not always follow the spelling of Pitman and Ellis, the various objections to the system of 1847 are the subject of another chapter, together with the modifications of the alphabet which occurred as a result of these objections.

Let us now turn our attention to a few of the types of words represented by each of the vowel symbols in the phonetic typography of the Longleys. Though these words are lifted at random from the pages of
the first three volumes of the *Advocate*, we have selectively avoided those passages deliberately printed in the non-standard symbolization of certain writers who desired to demonstrate what they felt to be a phonetic spelling superior to that employed by Longley. We have also avoided taking samples from the early numbers of Volume I, since Longley had not, by his own admission, completely stabilized his spelling, and was occasionally experimenting with new ideas. We have further avoided taking samples from the later volumes, since experiments with the alphabet began to cause it to be in a state of instability during 1852 and 1853.

As we have pointed out, the vowel scale was, at the time the Longleys began phonetic printing, composed of six pairs of vowels, grouped according to a "full" and "stopped" concept which we have already discussed. In considering the vowels we shall follow their normal numbering in the phonotypic alphabet, giving first the "full" and second the "stopped" member in each pair. This numerical order became sufficiently stable that during later discussions of changes in the alphabet the vowels could be, and frequently were, designated by number only.

Number 1, "full" (ɛ, ĕ) as in eel

This vowel was roughly equivalent to the sound represented by the I. P. A. symbol [i], and the symbol indicates a tense high front vowel. It was regularly used for the vowel of the definite article the regardless of whether such article appeared before a vowel or a consonant. This symbol was regularly employed in open syllables conventionally spelled with the letter e following a consonant or a consonant cluster. Examples of such words are: *renew*, *begin*, *precise*,


devotion, secure, mechanical, petition, select, phenomenal, felicity, period, disrepute, unbecoming, insecure, etc., and in monosyllables ending in e, such as me, be, etc. It was also employed in words in which the letter e alone formed a syllable, as in slope, or telegraph. This symbol was regularly used in words ordinarily spelled with the letter e when followed by consonant-plus-o, as in complete and fete, and in words of the type of here and mere. This symbol was also used for the sound of the vowel in many words ordinarily spelled with ei and ie, such as believe and receive, and in the words either and neither. Words ordinarily spelled with ee, and many words spelled with ea and eo, as in meet, meat, people, were represented with this symbol, except when the Roman vowels were disyllabic. This especially applied to words ordinarily spelled with ea plus r, such as dear, or year. This usage may be traceable to the tendency to pronounce words of this type as if they contained two syllables, with the sound of the final r becoming either "vocalic -r" ([ɤ]) or schwa. Occasionally the letter e appears before another Roman vowel disyllabically, as in theory, idea, Napoleon, etc. In such cases, the value of the letter e was indicated by the "full" vowel symbol, ε.

A good many other words usually pronounced with the high tense front vowel [i] were probably indicated with this symbol in phonotypy. Such a list might include such words as Caesar, phoebe, and other words with unusual spellings, but since the phonotypic representation of such words has not been verified, we shall omit them here with the observation that all words indicated by Webster to have the high front vowel [i] could be expected to be written with (ε) in phonotypy.
Number 1, "stopped" (I, i) as in ill

The Roman letter was chosen for this sound probably because when this orthographic vowel is used in closed syllables in English, it is more frequently pronounced /i/ than in any other manner. Thus, this letter becomes the primary form for symbols of the type of I. It is therefore most commonly employed to represent the value of the letter i when alone in a closed syllable in ordinary spelling, as in with, it, did, etc. In polysyllabic words the dictionary syllabication (usually Webster's) dictated whether this "stopped" vowel was employed. Generally, if the vowel occurred before a double consonant or before a consonant cluster, the syllable was shown to be closed, though in a few cases, such as the word vicinity, the syllabication must have been different then from what it is now to have represented each of the syllables as closed. Words ending in ian, such as Christian, were subject to some controversy, some readers preferring the spelling (yan) rather than (ian). Longley, however, contended that this indicated a slovenly pronunciation, and regularly employed (ian) in the same manner as did Pitman. Words ordinarily spelled with the letter y in a stressed syllable, such as system, indicated the vowel of such syllable with the "stopped" symbol (i). Final unstressed y, as in easy, and study, as well as the y in the adverbial ending ly, was indicated with this symbol. The preterite of weak verbs ending in y in the present tense was also written with (i) as the vowel, as in such words as carried, studied, though in other preterite forms the ed when syllabic, was written with the vowel (e)--I.P.A. /ɛ/. Prefixes beginning with the letter i, such as il, in, ir, etc., were written with the symbol (i).
This list is not exhaustive of all the types of words in which the symbol (i) was employed, and doubtless other types of words may have been written in phonotype with this symbol. However, since we have not verified the representation of unusually spelled words pronounced with this sound, we shall omit them here.

Number 2, "full" (Å, æ) as in ale

In selecting the Roman lower case letter for the sound ordinarily given to the letter when reciting the alphabet, the developers of phonotypy were evidently attempting to make a concession to ordinary spelling. However, this sound and this symbol became the subject of much controversy later, as we shall see in the next chapter. Ordinarily, this symbol was always used for the diphthongal sound [ei] in such words as day, say, and other words ending in ay. It was also used for the sound of the Roman letter a followed by consonant-plus-e, whether in monosyllables such as make, and came, or in polysyllables such as illustrate and imitate. This spelling was retained even when such words dropped the final e before the participial ending ing or the preterite ending ed. The letter a in ordinary spelling before tion, as in invitation, nation, was spelled with this symbol, as was the letter a in other open syllables such as in baby, paper, or Mary. Following the principle of a followed by consonant-plus-e being written with this symbol, words ending in are, such as care, spare, farewell were written with the same symbol as ate, cake, etc. Many persons felt this practice did not agree with the sound they heard in these words, and the objection ultimately reached sufficient strength to cause the addition of another symbol to the alphabet for this class of words as we shall note in the next chapter. The large number of words ordinarily spelled
with ai (and a few spelled with ei, of which eight is a type) which are pronounced with the sound of long -a ([æ]), as in sail, paid, etc., were represented with the symbol (a), and, by analogy, words conventionally spelled with air, such as repair, and affair, were indicated with the same symbol. This usage raised the same objection that was mentioned regarding words ending in are: Words of the type of care and fair were thought to have the same vowel, but were felt not to have the same vowel as cake or paid.

Number 2, "stopped" (E,e) as in ell

Using the same reasoning by which they assigned the Roman I to the sound of the lax high-front vowel, the originators of phonotypy assigned the Roman E to the lax mid-front vowel, or the "stopped" member of the second pair. This symbol represented the sound of the letter e alone in closed syllables regardless of position. However, many words ordinarily spelled with the letter a in an unstressed syllable were represented by Longley with the symbol (e), as in the final syllable of such words as language, primary, fortunate, January, Senate, accuracy, solace, etc., this usage did not, however, agree with that of Pitman and Ellis who preferred the "full" vowel (a). In a few words of the type of certain and again the vowel in the syllable spelled ain was indicated with the symbol (e). However, in the word maintain, only the first syllable was so represented, the second syllable being shown by the symbol of the "full" vowel (a). For no evident reason that I can determine, the single word were was written with this symbol (e), a phenomenon which indicates considerable overlapping of the phonemes /ɛ/ and /æ/. However, Longley did not follow Pitman's practice of indicating the vowel of final unstressed er with this symbol.
Two further categories which were regularly spelled in phonotypy with the symbol (e) were: words ending in *ege* and *edge*, such as *college* and *knowledge*, and words spelled with *ea* before *sure* such as *measure*, *pleasure* and *treasure*.

Number 3, "full" (A, a) as in *arm*

This symbol was always used to indicate the vowel ordinarily spelled with the Roman letter *a* when it occurred before *r* in the same syllable, except after the sound of *w*. This symbol was also used to indicate the vowel in words spelled with *alm*, as *palm*, *psalm*, etc., and for the vowel of the expletives *ha* and *ah*. Though this symbol was occasionally employed by the Longleys for the sound of the vowel in those words containing the "broad-a" in British and New England speech, it was not consistently used. There appears to have been some uncertainty as to the use of the "broad-a," so that the two words most consistently written with this symbol were *half* and *laugh*.

Number 3, "stopped" (A, a) as in *am*

Choosing the italic form of the Roman letter *a* for the lower case form of symbol allowed many closed monosyllables such as *bat*, *hat*, *cat*, etc., to appear familiar to persons acquainted with heterotypy, and made the change from phonotypy to ordinary spelling much easier. By the same principle that governed other "stopped" vowels, this symbol was employed in all closed stressed syllables ordinarily spelled with the letter *a*. It was also used to express the vowel of unstressed closed syllables, whether initial, medial or final, when they were ordinarily spelled with *a*, as in *about*, *attend*, *academy*, *arose*, etc., or as in *assistance*, *reciprocal*, *valuable*, *thousand*, *extravagant*, *photograph*, *phonography*, *hydropathy*, etc. Compounds of the word *man* such as *backwoodsman*,
workmanship, etc., expressed the vowel of that syllable with the symbol (a). In a few words where the ordinary spelling ea, ia or ua is disyllabic, as in idea, appeal, social, individual, suavity, the sound of the second vowel was indicated with the symbol (a).

Sometimes it is difficult to justify the use of this symbol as a "stopped" vowel which appears, theoretically at least, only in closed syllables, unless the syllabication were different from what it is today. For example, words of the type of catalog, pyramid, and liability, must have been divided syllabically as: cat-\text{-}al-og, pyr-am-id, and li-ab-il-it-i in order to have been able to employ this symbol as they did. An isolated pronunciation is the word data, the first syllable of which is written with the long-a—\text{I.P.A.} [\text{\epsilon i}] — and the second with the "stopped" third vowel (a)—\text{I.P.A./\text{\ae} /}.

Number 4, "full" (\Theta, \epsilon), as in all

A symbol of the type of \text{o} was selected for this sound evidently on the ground that some words in English ordinarily spell the sound with \text{o} or with some modification of \text{o}. In phonotypy, many words ordinarily spelled with \text{o} before r-plus-a-consonant, such as storm, north, etc., as well as the monosyllables or and for, were represented by this symbol. The vowel in words of the types of ought, of cause and of law were represented with this symbol, as were also words of the type of war. Words ordinarily spelled with all, ald and alk, such as tall, bald and talk, as well as words derived from all, such as already and almost, indicated the vowel with this symbol. The Roman letter \text{o} before ff or before f-plus-another-consonant, such as offer, and often, was usually represented by this symbol. A few single words appeared with this symbol in spite of the fact that others in their class did not use the same symbol. For example, mock is spelled
in phonoty whole the symbol (\(\varepsilon\)), while lock is not; water and wash, which are frequently pronounced with the same vowel, were represented in phonoty whole with different vowels, water having the symbol (\(\varepsilon\)) and wash having the symbol (\(\alpha\)) = \(\text{I} + \text{P} + \text{A}\).\(\nu\).

Number 4, "stopped" (O, o), as in on

This symbol was regularly used for words ordinarily spelled with o in a closed syllable, and was felt to represent the most common sound of the Roman letter o. The exceptional pronunciations of the letter o have already been discussed under the "full" member of this vowel pair. In addition to representing the sound of o in a closed syllable of ordinary spelling, this symbol was used for the sound of the letter a when preceded by w or wh and followed by a consonant other than r or by a vowel, as in watch, Watt, quality, what, etc. The only exception, as we have already mentioned, is the word water, at least so far as we have been able to determine. A single exception to the use of this symbol for the Roman letter o in a closed syllable, so far as we have presently found, is the word mock, which we have also previously mentioned. While the letter o in ordinary spelling followed by r-plus-another-consonant was usually represented with the "full" vowel (\(\varepsilon\)), the letter o in ordinary spelling followed by rr was represented with the "stopped" vowel (o).

Number 5, "full" (O, o), as in ope

This was the symbol for the sound which the Roman o takes in open syllables and in syllables in which the o is followed by consonant-plus-o. Words illustrative of this usage are: so, proceed, holy, open, hope, note, more, etc. Exceptions to this are the words one, come, and gone and their derivatives. Many words ordinarily spelled with ou and
ow are pronounced as some variety of /o/, which usually has a complex nucleus containing an initial element approximately mid-back and a terminal element somewhat higher back. Such words generally receive either primary or tertiary stress. Examples of such words are: pour, owe, window, etc. The vowel in words ordinarily spelled with oa, when these Roman vowels are not disyllabic, as in boat, loan, etc., were usually represented with the symbol (ə), as were also the vowels in words ordinarily spelled with old, olk, and olt, such as cold, folk, bolt. Some words borrowed from the French and spelled in French with eau or ot, as in beau and depot, were spelled in phonotypy with this symbol. In many words in which the Roman letter o is preceded by a different vowel disyllabically, and in which the o does not receive primary stress, such theory or geographically (but not geography, in which the o has primary stress), and in many words followed by a different vowel disyllabically and in which the o receives either primary or weak stress, as in poetic, poetry, heroic, the value of the o is indicated with the phonotype symbol (œ). This symbol is also used in representing the vowel in a few unclassifiable words which have analogical forms that are not pronounced with the same vowel. For example, this symbol is used for the vowel in both but not in moth, in forth but not in north, in know but not in now, in postage but not in hostage, in door but not in poor, in most but not in lost, in though but not in thought, all of which were of the type used by spelling reformers to

29The use of the term "complex nucleus" in this sense, and the concept of stress employed here, is according to the definitions in: Trager and Smith, op. cit., p. 35-41. Subsequent references to these terms are based on this source.
demonstrate the follies of ordinary spelling.

Number 5, "stopped" (U, u), as in up

This symbol was used for a wide range of ordinary spellings of words containing a central or centralized vowel in stressed position, and for a number of centralized vowels commonly represented by the I.P.A. symbol schwa. In stressed positions this symbol is used for the vowel in many words spelled ordinarily with o plus a nasal, such as one, done, Monday, come, London, and in certain other words ordinarily spelled with o plus ther, such as other, mother, brother, smother, but not in the word bother. This symbol is regularly used for the sound of the Romanic letter u in closed syllables, as in but and public. A few suffixes not spelled with the letter u are indicated with this symbol, as in such combinations ordinarily spelled with ous, ion, ose, in words of the type of generous, action, and purpose. In two respects, however, Longley differed from Pitman in his use of this symbol. The first was his employment of this symbol for unstressed syllables containing r, as in the final syllables of summer, color, or in the first syllable of perhaps. (Probably this same sound with other letters in such words as tapir and satyr would have been written in phonotypy with this symbol, but this fact has not yet been verified by finding such words in phonotype print.) The second difference between the usage of Longley and that of Pitman was in stressed syllables of words of the type of work, bird, learn, her, turn (and perhaps in words of the type of myrtle, though this last has not been verified). Longley regularly used the symbol (u) for words of this type, while Pitman preferred the symbol (e)—I.P.A. /ɛ/—(except for those spelled with ur or ir in ordinary orthography).
Number 6, "full" (ʊ,u), as in wooed

Strictly speaking, this symbol was intended to represent the long oo, and words ordinarily spelled with oo, except those in which the oo is followed by k or d (exclusive of the single word food) and also except the words wool and foot. In addition to words spelled with oo, this symbol was used to represent the sound of long u when preceded by r, as in true. Several other words containing a high-back tense vowel after r, though spelled ordinarily in a variety of ways, were written with this symbol. This included words of the type of through, grew, prove and lose, though analogical forms such as trough, grove, and close made use of a different vowel sound, consequently a different symbol, a fact which gave additional ammunition to the propagandists of the spelling reform. In a few words, such as who, do, to, two, (and their derivatives, the vowel was represented by this symbol.

Number 6, "stopped" (ʊ,ʊ), as in wood

This symbol occurs in the fewest word types, being designed to represent the short sound of oo in words ordinarily spelled with ook and ood (except the word food) and in the isolated words wool and foot. In addition to this use, this symbol was employed to represent the vowel in a few words of the type of could, and in the isolated words woman, bosom, push, and sugar.

The Diphthongs

Before entering into a discussion of the diphthongs, let us review the philosophy underlying their formation. The makers of the phonotypic alphabet evidently felt that since in English certain simple elements
were in contrast to certain similar elements having either an off-glide or an on-glide (as in the pairs bat-bite, ball-boil, mass-mouse, and food-feud) they were justified in using a single symbol for each of these. However, the diphthong symbols were recognized as containing two distinct elements, and in Ellis' book The Teacher's Guide, teachers were instructed to show pupils the sound of the diphthongs by placing cards containing the two elements of the diphthong far apart, and have the pupils pronounce the elements separately, then, by drawing the cards increasingly closer together, have the pupils pronounce the two elements in increasingly more rapid succession. Having thus first learned the sounds of the diphthongs, the pupils were to be introduced later to the single symbol representing the sound. The elements chosen for the first diphthong, or the sound of i in fine, were: an initial sound of the a in father, with a secondary, or off-glide, element of the sound of ee in see. The elements chosen for the second diphthong, or the sound of oy in boy, were: an initial sound of the a in ball, with a secondary, or off-glide, element of the sound of ee in see. The elements of the third diphthong, or the sound of ow in how, were said to be: an initial sound of the a in father, with a secondary, or off-glide, element of the oo in pool. The fourth diphthong, or the sound of ew in few, was said to be composed of the sound of the ee in see initially and the sound of the oo in pool terminally. There is no statement to the effect that the initial element of this fourth diphthong had the nature

30The information given here is quoted in the Advocate, II:6f., and attributed to the book mentioned. However, no documentation is given for the book.
of an on-glide, though it can be reasonably assumed the diphthong was pronounced with the stress on the second element.

Diphthong Number 1, (ɪ, ɨ), as in isle

This symbol was used to represent the "long" value of the Roman letter i. It was employed for the first person singular personal pronoun, I, and in words ordinarily spelled with the letter i followed by a consonant-plus-e, as in wife, pipe, white, as well as in words ordinarily spelled with y followed by consonant-plus-e, as in type. This symbol was also used to indicate the vowel sound in words ordinarily spelled with the letter i followed by such combinations as id, gh, ght, and gn in such words as mild, sigh, might, and sign and their derivatives. Words having primary stress or tertiary stress on final y of ordinary spelling respectively illustrated by the types apply and occupy, employed this symbol for the final vowel. Preterite and participial forms of verbs in these two classes also employed this symbol for the final syllable of the root. A few words ordinarily spelled with the letter i followed by a different vowel disyllabically, such as science and riot, and a few unclassified words such as isle and pi (printer's pi, meaning jumbled type) employed this symbol for the vowel.

Diphthong Number 2, (ɔ, ʊ), as in oil

This symbol is a member of the group of symbols of the type of 0, since it was evidently felt that in English the initial element of the diphthong was most commonly represented by the letter o in ordinary spelling. The value of this symbol is commonly represented in ordinary spelling with the letters oi and oy.
Diphthong Number 3, \( (X, \gamma) \), as in \( \text{owl} \)

This symbol most commonly represented the sound of many words ordinarily spelled with \( \text{ow} \), as in \( \text{how}, \text{now}, \text{brown}, \text{cow}, \) etc., though the inconsistency of pronunciation in words so spelled is such that the ordinary spelling \( \text{ow} \) did not dictate the use of this symbol. This symbol was also used for many words spelled with \( \text{ou} \) in closed syllables, such as \( \text{out}, \text{account}, \) and \( \text{house} \). This symbol was not used for the sound of a diphthong in a syllable receiving either weak stress or tertiary stress, but was used only in those syllables receiving primary or secondary stress. In a German poem published in the \textit{Advocate} (II:31), this symbol is used for German words spelled with \( \text{au} \), as in \( \text{auf} \).

Diphthong Number 4, \( (U, \eta) \), as in \( \text{mule} \)

Since this symbol was intended for the long value of the Roman letter \( \text{u} \) as that letter is ordinarily pronounced when reciting the Romanic alphabet, it was used whenever the letter \( \text{u} \) occurred in an open syllable in ordinary spelling, as in the first syllables of \( \text{bureau}, \text{Lucy}, \) and \( \text{pupil} \). It was also used when the letter \( \text{u} \) followed any consonant except \( \text{r} \) and was in turn followed by consonant-plus-\( \text{e} \), as in \( \text{mule}, \text{allude} \) and \( \text{nature} \), as well in derivatives of such words. When in ordinary spelling the letters \( \text{ew} \) appeared after \( \text{f}, \text{n}, \text{j}, \) and \( \text{i} \), as in \( \text{few}, \text{new}, \text{Jew}, \) and \( \text{view} \) and words of their type, this symbol was used for the vowel sound. The letter \( \text{u} \) initially, as in \( \text{use} \), as well as the combination \( \text{eu} \) initially, as in \( \text{Europe} \), was represented by this symbol, though this use was often objected to, and was later changed. The pronoun \( \text{you} \), as well as some other words spelled with \( \text{you} \) initially, such as \( \text{youth} \), was represented by this
symbol, though this was also objectionable and was later changed. The vowel in certain other words spelled ordinarily with ue, when not following r, was represented with this symbol. Examples of such words are Tuesday, value, pursue, as well as in the derivative of the last-named word pursuit. The word humor and its derivatives were shown without initial aspiration, and, consequently, were printed in phonotypy as beginning with this symbol.

A few isolated words deserve attention before we leave the subject of the manner of Longley's use of the phonotype alphabet. These are noted because they usually indicate pronunciations different from those which they commonly receive today, and, since no objection was made to them, it can be reasonably assumed the pronunciations indicated were common at the time. For simplicity, we shall append these words in a list, with the pronunciation used shown in I.P.A. symbols. There is no intended order to the list.

towards |tɔːrdz|
militia |mɪlɪʃi|
chemistry |kɪmɪstrɪ|
suggest |sʊdʒɪst|
Philadelphia |fɪlɪdɛlfi|
evenness |ɪvnɛs| or |ɪvɛnɛs|
(The phonotype representation was |ɛvˈɛnɛs|)
subscribers |sʌbˈskraɪbəz|
condemned |kɑnˈtɛmd|
aerial |eəˈriəl|
haunts |hɑnts|
harrowing |hɑrəʊŋ|
Phonotypy, as we have seen, did not spring full grown from the heads of its inventors, but rather grew slowly from an uncertain beginning in phonetic shorthand into a system of printing that was capable of being used successfully in the practical business of printing both newspapers and books. During the first four years of its existence, phonotypy was highly experimental, but by 1848 an alphabet had developed which was used by the Longleys (who after all are the immediate subjects of this study) for approximately five years without any major change, and with only minor changes for approximately fourteen years. During this period there was a gradual drifting apart of the American printers and the British printers, particularly Longley and Pitman. We shall not again consider the British activity in phonotypic printing, but shall examine the applications of the completed alphabet of 1847 by the American printing firm of Longley and Brother. We have given representative words from their publications during the first three years of their periodical, during which the alphabet of 1847 was being used without perceptible variation. From 1851 to 1853 considerable experimentation took place in the United States, and a subsequent revision of the phonetic alphabet was made. These experiments and revisions form the subject of the next chapter.
There never was in the world two opinions alike, no more than two hairs, or two grains; the most universal quality is diversity.

Montaigne

Despite the early promises that the alphabet of 1847 was to be the final one and that no further experiments were to be undertaken, the expected stability was not attained. After phonotypy became, with Pitman and Ellis' final revision in September of 1846, a practical method of printing, it remained unaltered in form for about three years only (Fig. 5). By 1850 certain developments began to be evident which were designed to revise the alphabet. There were two main courses of experiment; the first of them was in England under the leadership of Pitman himself, prompted, evidently, by his own dissatisfaction with the alphabet; the second was in America, and can not be said to have been under the leadership of any single individual. It is with the latter current of change that we are concerned in this chapter.

During the first two years of the publication of their periodical, the Longleys appeared to believe that the phonetic alphabet, as they used it, would never change. This does not mean that it was universally satisfactory, however, for there were some even in the early days of the publication, who felt that certain alterations were needed. Such persons often wrote letters expressing their particular suggestions for revision. Though he often published these letters, Longley did not allow them to alter his course of action. Toward the end of the second year, of the Longley's publication, Pitman began to agitate
### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>ʌ</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>Ο</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.C.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>ai</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>oi</th>
<th>uu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS.</td>
<td>Α</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ο</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.C.</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ο</td>
<td>ω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.A.</th>
<th>tʃ</th>
<th>dʒ</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>θ</th>
<th>ʌ</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>ʒ</th>
<th>η</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.C.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Other Roman consonants except k, q, and x, are used in their usual significance)

---

**Figure 5**

The Vowels, Diphthongs, and Non-Roman Consonants of the 1847 Alphabet
rather strongly for certain changes in the alphabet. Since Pitman's Journal and his other publications had considerable circulation in this country, his mention of possible changes was interpreted by some in the United States as throwing the doors open for criticism of the alphabet. Assuming that a revision of the alphabet was being actively promoted, many readers began pouring their suggestions into the offices of the Advocate. During the time of the third volume a great deal of informal discussion was held through the columns of the Advocate regarding the merits of various proposals, and by the end of 1851 the movement to revise the alphabet reached sufficient momentum to be formally organized. Since the Advocate was taken as the organ for the official consideration of the problem, Volume IV devoted a large part of each issue to this discussion.

Without considering the English revisions taking place at approximately the same time, we shall study the American activity in this respect, which divides itself into two parts; first, the early informal and disorganized objections and suggestions spontaneously arising from among the subscribers to the Longley periodical; second, the formal and concerted attempt to reach an agreement after it had been decided that a revision was desirable. We shall consider these two aspects of the movement in the order mentioned.

Since the consonants were generally more stable than the vowels, with less room for individual interpretation as to their value, there are fewer instances of objection to the manner in which they are employed or to the form of the symbols. In considering the early spontaneous objections to the alphabet, then, we shall take up this smaller group, the consonants, first, before considering the various
changes that are suggested in the vowel system.

Whether the editors chose not to print in Volume I letters dealing with the subject of alphabet change, which is doubtful, or whether there were not any letters of this sort, which is more likely, the fact remains that very few letters criticizing the alphabet appeared. In one of the few that were given, however, a certain Dr. John McLane, of Jackson, Michigan, wrote (I:237) that there should be a symbol for the wh of which. He suggested that the Roman letter k might be used for this sound, since it was not otherwise employed, and gave a short sample using k in this sense. Longley pointed out in reply that the Roman k was already assigned, in the international alphabet, to represent the sound of ch in the German ich. He also mentioned that the use of a familiar letter in an unfamiliar sense would be confusing, and that the suggestion, therefore, was not practicable. McLane further suggested the use of the Roman letter x in place of the digraph cs (/ks/) which Longley and other phonotypic printers used. These suggestions were largely disregarded, however, though they were printed as part of the correspondence received.

Another fairly early objection was mildly made by Rev. A. E. Marshall of Etonville, Georgia, one of six members of a committee appointed for the purpose of promoting the publication of a phonotypic New Testament in the United States, who wrote (II:14),

I am now pretty well satisfied with your representation of spoken language. I could wish that you would print
"(cwesgün, ręgus, leçegur)," instead of "(cwestyun, rętyus, lectyr, natup)," etc. . . .

This suggestion was not an isolated whim, however, for this was the spelling used in the **Chronopress**, a Boston paper credited with being the first American newspaper to use phonotype in its printing. ²

Longley editorially objected to this usage by the **Chronopress**, contending that it was a corruption of good pronunciation (II:217).

Mr. John Lindsley, of Evansville, Indiana, made a suggestion which was the first hint of a more serious conflict to appear later. His remarks follow (II:133):

> I am very well pleased with the Phonetic Advocate, but it would be better yet with a little amendment of the alphabet. I can not admit that k should be thrust out of the alphabet and c take his place, when k has always been faithful to its constituents, and often helped c when he could not help himself; and let c take the place of that crooked basket capital and pothooked small letter, to represent the sound of vicious champagne, etc. . . .³

The editors commented on this suggestion by pointing out that the element they represent by c is more often represented by this letter in the old spelling than it is by the letter k, so that their usage affords a greater similarity to the ordinary spelling than does k. As to the reassignment of c to represent the sound / /, they point

---

³As explained in the introduction, when it becomes necessary to retain the phonotypic spelling in a quotation which is otherwise transliterated into ordinary orthography, the retained phonotypic spelling will be separated by parentheses.

²This fact is mentioned in Chapter I, and credited to the Anglo Saxon, Dec. 5, 1846.

³Though this letter has already been mentioned in Chapter II, it is repeated here because its appropriateness to this discussion.
out that in only a few instances does the sound in ordinary spelling, and it would therefore be confusing when making a transition from the old form of spelling to the new.

Another example of a spontaneous reaction to the phonetic alphabet of the Longleys is reflected in this remark by W. C. Hoffman of Maryland (city not given) (II:225):

*I do not know what dictionary you make your standard of pronunciation, but I think the Anglo Saxson better than the Advocate in that respect. You spell ("humb'l") instead of (umb'1), ("pronunsiafun") instead of (pronunsiafun), according to Walker. You should have a standard and let your patrons know what that standard is.*

To this remark the editors of the Advocate commented that they were eclectic, using the standard which seemed most generally to agree with their observed usage among good speakers, though admitting they leaned more strongly toward Worcester and Webster than toward Walker.

One of the earlier scholars to write critically on the phonetic spelling reform was Samuel Stehman Haldeman, a scientist, philologist, and linguist, and possibly one of the earliest experimenters in linguistic geography. He wrote several critical articles for the Advocate during the time of its existence, and in one of the earlier letters to the editors, dated October 15, 1849 (II:72), he pointed out that the English affricates are more properly designated by (tʃ) and (dʒ) than by a single symbol. This idea was not unknown, however, for Ellis had earlier mentioned in his book The Essentials of Phonetics the fact that these sounds were actually composed

---

4 In discussing Haldeman, the Dictionary of American Biography mentions that in one of his European trips in the 1830's he "investigated more than forty varieties of speech and established the boundaries of their vocal repertoire."
of two elements, and had given the rationale for the use of the single symbol. Haldeman's letter, evidently written in phonetic longhand and printed exactly as he represented the spelling, is the first printing that has come to my attention in any of the phonetic publications I have seen in which the sounds of \textit{ch} in \textit{church} or of the \textit{j} in \textit{just} are represented with the digraphs \textit{ts} and \textit{dj} respectively.

Although all of these ideas were brought back occasionally when the phonetic council was later deliberating the exact changes that should be incorporated into the American Phonetic alphabet, only one of them was ever ultimately adopted. This was the use of \textit{k} rather than \textit{c} for the voiceless velar stop. The controversy which later developed over this symbol, however, should properly be reserved until later when the discussion of the official considerations of alphabet revision is undertaken.

A consideration of the vowels divides itself into two parts in both the spontaneous suggestions and in the later organized discussion. These parts are: (1) a consideration of single vowel changes, and (2) a consideration of the different "vowel scales" which affected the entire group of vowels employed. In considering each of these two main parts of the discussion of the vowels, we shall examine first the suggestions relating to single vowel changes, and then the suggestions relating to the entire vowel system. Suggestions of the latter type were more common during the later period of formal discussion than during the earlier period of spontaneous comment from various readers.
One of the earliest objections became the basis for one of the most persistent controversies. This concerned the proper representation of the vowel in her or in the last syllable of better. During the first four numbers of the first volume of the Advocate, Longley departed from the practice of Pitman, and represented these sounds with the symbols ur. This practice, however, was discontinued in the fifth number, and the Pitman manner of representing these sounds by the symbols er was adopted. Almost immediately the Pitman practice was attacked. The most outspoken objectors to the spelling er were Adam Jewett of Dayton, Ohio, and George Kellogg of Birmingham, Connecticut. These men both expressed the general idea that though they could not argue with Pitman whether the Englishman pronounced these words with the sound er, they were certain no American ever did. After printing with the Pitman system for two issues, the Longleys editorially admitted that this was not a good representation of American pronunciation, and that the numerous objections to the practice which they had received, many of which they acknowledged without printing, convinced them of their error and of the desirability of returning to the spelling ur for words of this type. This attitude was, perhaps, one of the strong early factors in establishing good will for the Longleys, and of solidifying their standing as potential leaders in the American spelling reform. Thomas M'Connell expressed that idea in a letter (1:239 f.) by pointing out that the attitude of admitting the correctness of Jewett and Kellogg, rather than of hard-headedly castigating them for presuming to disagree, was the one thing which had convinced him of the integrity of the editors and had persuaded him to become an ardent supporter of their paper and their work.
With the beginning of the second volume of the Advocate, the phonetic alphabet was printed with both the type forms of the letters and with the longhand forms. Whether the Longleys were thought responsible for the design of the longhand letters has not been determined, but another one of the earlier objections dealt with the cursive forms rather than with the type. It is made by Timothy Davenport of Woodstock, Ohio (II:48). Davenport thought that some of the longhand symbols were too similar, and that they were necessarily made very much alike in rapid writing. He especially noted the symbols \( \odot \) and \( \odot \) (I.P.A. /\odot/ and /\odot/), which were written in phonetic longhand as \( \odot \) and \( \odot \). He suggested that instead of the diagonal or perpendicular stroke through the \( \odot \) for the second sound, a dot could be placed over the former, thus, \( \odot \). The editors of the Advocate pointed out that the original longhand form for this symbol was written with a dot over it, and that they personally were continuing to write it in that manner, giving the dot a "tail" (downward stroke) for even greater distinctiveness. Though a conformity to the published alphabet was recommended for users of phonetic longhand, still it was felt each writer had the right to minor deviations of this sort, so long as he was consistent, and so long as the deviation was made clear to his readers.

Most objections of suggestions, however, did not touch the forms or the symbols themselves but rather dealt with their application. One of the most commonly recurring problems was that of the proper symbol to use for the indistinct vowel of unstressed syllables. The difficulty arose from the lack of the symbol schwa, or an equivalent symbol, with which the I.P.A. expresses the value of this indefinite unstressed
central vowel. The practice of the English phoneticians, Pitman and Ellis, was to use the symbol which would represent the restressed value of the vowel, such restressing to be predicated upon the letter used in ordinary spelling. Longley did not agree with this practice, preferring to indicate most weakly stressed syllables with the symbol $\mathbf{u}$ (I.P.A $[\mathbf{u}]$).

After he had expressed the same preference for $\mathbf{q}$ (/tʃ/) rather than $\mathbf{ty}$ (/tʃ/) in words of the type of lecture, question, etc., which Marshall had raised earlier (see p. 105), Kellogg again raised a problem. This concerned the use of the symbol $\mathbf{a}$ (/æ/) (II:34). He objected to using $\mathbf{a}$ before $\mathbf{r}$ in such pairs of words as Mary-mare, Cary-care, fairy-fair, etc., contending that there should be two different vowels in each of the pairs listed. He suggested either the introduction of a new symbol to represent the vowel in care, fair, etc., or else the adoption of Ellis' method, which consisted of putting two dots over the long $\mathbf{a}$ to indicate this variation. This was the first suggestion of a change which became one of the main focal points in the later discussions of the revision of the alphabet, and expressed a need which was ultimately met by adding a new letter to the alphabet. The vowel, according to a description of it, was evidently thought to be a sound somewhere between /æ/ and /ɛ/. The editor of the Advocate objected to either of the courses Kellogg proposed, but admitted, editorially, that he was willing to print any discussion of the use of the alphabet, even though he might not agree with the proposal made.

\footnote{Ellis, Essentials, op. cit.}
This open-mindedness increased his prestige as a leader of the American phonetic reform, and was doubtless a strong factor in his being overwhelmingly elected later to be Secretary of the American Phonetic Council, and in the selection of his periodical as the official organ of that body.

In the October 1, 1849, issue of the Advocate (II:58 f.), Kellogg had another letter printed in which he raised some more objections to certain spellings. Actually, though, his objection was not so much to the spelling as to the pronunciation which the spelling indicated. This objection was, doubtless, prompted by his New England background. He objected, for example, to the non-use of the "broad-a" in certain words which customarily contain this sound in British and in some New England speech. He was of the opinion that the spelling indicated by Pitman (representing British diction) was superior to that of Longley. The editor of the Advocate reminded him, however, that the sound q(/a/) is too broad a sound for ordinary American ears, and pointed out that when teaching phonography from the Pitman manual (which used the broad-a in the shorthand indication of the vowel in certain words), his midwestern pupils, when reading from this manual, were often perplexed as to what word was intended. He further pointed out that Webster indicated a sound which had a compromise, or medial, value. This, evidently, referred to the low front, or "French a" sound, /a/. He further pointed out that Ellis gave this sound a different symbol from either the a of hat or the a of father.6

6Ibid.
Kellogg further objected to the use of \( u (\text{}/u\text{/}) \) rather than \( \gamma (\text{}/\gamma\text{/}) \) in many long-\( u \) words which he said were pronounced with this sound in New England. The objection was answered briefly by pointing out that few, if any, except in the East, use any sound but \( u \) in such words. The words in question were *truth, sure, conclusion, fluency*, and "many similar words."

S. D. Newbrough, of Lansing, Michigan, expressed the thought that the vowel in *wear, hair*, etc., was the same vowel which he had heard in the southern and western pronunciation of *bag, bad*, etc. He contended that this sound was actually diphthongal, and that therefore it was entitled to a separate symbol just as was the vowel in *boy*.

Concerning the question of the correct representation of the vowel in *care, wear, hair*, etc., which had been raised by Kellogg and Newbrough, Longley gave his viewpoint in an editorial reply to Kellogg as follows (II:59):

On this point we venture to present a new idea, (new to us): The rule that when \( a \) is followed by \( r \) it takes a modified sound, as in *care*, has a very few exceptions; but we observe that all these exceptions are cases where a syllable divides the \( a \) from the \( r \) as in various, a-b-c-da-rian, nefarious, etc. Now let it be understood, that when \( a \) is followed by \( r \) in the same syllable, its sound is thus modified, and all difficulty will be obviated.

Somewhat later this problem of the vowel in *care, fair*, etc., was still being discussed. James W. Dufield wrote (III:134) that he felt there was no problem of a different vowel, for he believed the sound of \( a \) in *fair* (fare) was as near to the sound of \( a \) in *fame* as the sound of \( i \) in *fire* was to the \( i \) in *fine*, or that the \( o \) in *four* (fore) was to the \( o \) in *foam*. His position was that the presence of \( r \) exercised an acoustically perceptible influence which was not necessarily distinctive. This point of view reflected the same position held by
modern phoneticians regarding allophones. For the reason given, Dufield insisted there was no need for a separate symbol to represent the sound of a in care, fair, and other words subjected to the influence of r.

John B. Burns, a phonetics teacher working out from the Cincinnati office, believed, however, that representing the a in care with the same symbol as the a in mate was a representation of a gross error in pronunciation. He held the position that the vowel in care was the same as that in cat except for a difference in length. To support this position he said (IV:27),

*I have instructed hundreds of pupils, including children and adults, in phonography and phonotypy, during the last four years; and they have without a single exception, to my knowledge, discarded the unphonetic use of (a) in such spellings as there, fair, prepare, etc.*

He then explained how he had experimented in this respect. He said he would teach the pupils to analyze the sounds in a word, carefully avoiding words of the class in question, and, then, after they understood the principles of phonetic analysis, he would give them some words such as care, fair, etc. He said that without knowing the practice of the Longleys or anyone else, they would analyze the words with the vowel a (/æ/). Then, he said he would show them how these words were usually represented in phonotypy with the vowel a (/e/), and that "they would pronounce it an absurdity."

---

*As pointed out in the introduction, since words in Romanic spelling are shown in phonotypy by the use of parentheses, and since we are using parentheses to indicate phonotype words retained in a quotation transliterated into common spelling, it is necessary to italicize such words in quotations, though they are not italicized in the original.*
A certain John B. Jillson, of Kenosha, Wisconsin (IV:27), took a position regarding some sounds that is now held by some modern phoneticians. This concerned the propriety of representing words ending with er, or, and other combinations of vowel-r, in stressed or unstressed syllables, by the single letter r. He claimed that to his ear the sound of ur was identical with the sound of r alone. According to his explanation, better would be transcribed (betr) instead of (betur), and first would be transcribed (frst) instead of (furst). Jillson also believed that there was no need for transcribing a vowel in the terminals ble, tle, and ple, but that these should be indicated by adjacent consonants. For example, little, table, ripple, would be transcribed respectively (litl, tabl, ripl) instead of (litul, tabul, ripul).

The practice of indicating the omission of a vowel (or of showing a syllabic consonant) by the use of ' was common both in England and the United States. However, there was some objection to this practice as used by Longley, by James Allen of Canton, Ohio (II:22):

What is the necessity, will you please tell me, of placing an apostrophe (' before the "l," in such words as bible, people, &c? It seems to me to be as useless there as it would be before the "m" in schism, chasm, &c. I am decidedly radical in my reformatory notions, and go for a thorough rooting out of all unnecessary and cumbersome letters and characters from the new orthography.

The practice persisted for some time, however, and nearly a year later we note another objection to the practice voiced by A. Nicols, of Montrose, Pennsylvania in these words:

What could possess the phonotypists to think it necessary to separate by a point the liquids from the consonants.

See: L. Bloomfield, Language; Kantner and West, Phonetics.
when no vowel occurs between them? Would not the absence of the vowel be sufficient? It seems to me to be as superfluous to insert the point in *table*, *Sutton*, *prism*, as it would be in *blame*, *claim*, etc.

He illustrated the absurdity of the last proposition by writing the words *blame*, *claim*. Though Longley did not take any immediate action as a result of these objections, he did decide to omit the apostrophe with the beginning of Volume IV without there having been any action on the question by the Council.

The practice of certain English phoneticians was disparaged by Haldeman in a lengthy article entitled "Elegant Pronunciation," which appeared in two parts in the *Advocate* (II:257 f. and 267 f.). He objected to the assumption by the leaders of the phonetic movement that "men of letters may determine that they alone are the sole judges of these questions," when they are generally "grossly ignorant of the laws upon which they depend." This was followed by mention of the assumption that "a pronunciation to be 'elegant' and 'refined' must differ somewhat from the natural flow given to it by those who made and developed it." He cited Walker as holding that when two forms of pronunciation are to be found, the one which is least common is the more refined. Ellis was reported to recommend that *vocal* and *ideal* be spelled with *el* (/ɛl/) in the final syllable, "not because any one speaks thus, but because this spelling 'approaches the indistinct sound usually uttered, more nearly than any other distinct sound in our language.'" Haldeman wanted to know why Ellis should choose to indicate a distinct sound when an indistinct one was wanted.

In discussing the proposition: "what might be taken for asininities among literary people, are really spontaneous refinements," he pointed out the development of certain hyperurbanized forms into the
standard, or elegant, pronunciation in preference to certain more natural dialectal forms. Haldeman then pointed out certain differences in Greek dialects, as well as differences for the word four in Hebrew, Arabic, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Chaldee, Syriac, Ambaric, and Maltese, and suggested, "It would be extremely interesting to know which of these forms is the most 'refined' according to the judgment of some refined word doctor." He noted that Pitman admitted his name to be pronounced Pitmun, but that he customarily regarded the final syllable as man. Haldeman asked, "If this is 'oratorical' or 'solemn' or 'deliberate,' how are we to deduce the 'deliberate' form of Ashmun, Washington, Jackson?" He held that neither the language of the "men of letters", or the literati, nor the language of the lowest stratum should be the standard by which a language is represented phonetically; the former because they will not view their language apart from the conventional spelling or in the light of phonetic reality, and the latter because their range of ideas is too limited for the wants of an advancing civilization. He proposed that the language of the middle classes should be made "the basis of the phonetic and grammatic systems."

Haldeman believed the arbitrary division of languages into the classes "phonetic" and "hieroglyphic" to be another foolish mark of "upper-class" or "literary" philology, and that a division into "written and unwritten," or "horizontally written and vertically written" would be as satisfactory. The distinction made concerns their written form, and not their spoken character. Therefore, he contended, any language, regardless of the way it is written, is phonetic.
The sooner, according to Haldeman, that phoneticians divest themselves of their habitual spelling habits and stop insisting on differences in the quality of the "obscure vowel," or of putting vowels where there are only syllabic consonants, the sooner the false ideas respecting the pronunciation of English will disappear.

James P. Stewart objected to the practice of the American printers (specifically the Longleys) of always representing the "indistinct" vowel before $r$ with the symbol $u$. He suggested an arbitrary distinction by which the sound would be represented by $\text{ur}$ in stressed syllables and by $\text{er}$ in unstressed syllables. This distinction, he claimed, would make it possible to distinguish between the adjective perfect, which would be spelled phonetically ($\text{purfect}$), and the verb perfect, which would be spelled phonetically ($\text{perfect}$). Stewart also objected to the practice of certain English printers of using the same vowel before pre-consonantal $r$ that they used before double-$r$. He said (II:129),

"But I am very certain our English phonographers blunder most horridly, when they attempt to show the same sound in the first syllable of the following words: Perry and perfect, ferry and furnish, merry and mercy, and so forth.

Stewart also pointed out that the designation "stopped vowel" is misleading in that it implies that these vowels are identical with the long, or "full," vowels except that the sound is "stopped" before the vowel is completed. He believed that the sound of the so-called "stopped" vowels was actually the "last extremity" of the long vowel rather than the initial element, and stated that this fact could be demonstrated by making an unusual prolongation of the "long vowels." Under this circumstance, he claimed, the sound of the "stopped" vowel could be readily detected as the end of this prolonged vowel. The
developers of phonotypy, as has been noted, believed that though a
diphthong is separable into two parts, it functions as a single unit,
or, as modern phonemicists would say, each diphthong is a phoneme.
Each was, consequently, represented by a single symbol. These diph­
thongs include /ai/, /au/, /eu/, and /eu/ (I. P. A. symbolization),
which were represented by the symbols (ι, ξ, ơ, ϊ) respectively.
These symbols were generally acceptable, though there was some ob­
jection to the manner in which the symbol ϊ was employed. John
Linsley wrote a letter (II:192) questioning the advisability of using
the single symbol of the diphthong ϊ as the representation of the
pronoun you and of the spelling you in its derivatives. He suggested
that in words containing the sound /ju/ initially the cause of clarity
would be served by writing the vowel preceeded by a ϊ (equal to I.P.A.
/j/). The single symbol would be appropriate for the diphthong (or
vowel) in such words as flute, mute, suit, etc. The position of
Longley, and presumably that of Pitman and Ellis, as they rationalized
the system, was thus (II:192):

"We admit that the words you, youth begin with the con­
sonantal sound of ϊ, as much so as yea, year, but it is less
easily distinguished from the pure sound of ϊ, as it more
completely unites with it; from this circumstance, and the
fact that these two sounds so frequently occur together, ϊ
has been used as a diphthong of ϊ and u or ϊ and ın.
But then it is also employed where there can be no
sound of ϊ, in such words as mute, allude, pursued; which
makes us chargeable with using a single character to represent
both a diphthong and a simple vowel. This is a fault, we
confess, and it will no doubt some day be remedied; but
at present we are not fully satisfied how it shall be done.
Meantime, it is not causing any serious difficulty; nor will
a slight change of this kind make any confusion in the mode
of teaching, or with those who have learned to read by a
phonetic alphabet."
Linsley raised another problem, one which is still being discussed by twentieth century phoneticians. This is the question of the consonantal value of $w$. He suggested that the character $w$ be eliminated from the phonetic alphabet, since its value is the same as that of $uu$ (/u/). The editors rejected this concept that the power of $w$ is the same as that of long $u$, contending that $w$ is not properly a vowel sound. They pointed out that Linsley was inconsistent, since he accepted and used the symbol $y$ (/j/), when the value of $y$ was as appropriately equal to $e$ (/i/) as the value of $w$ is equal to $u$ (/u/). Longley pressed his point by citing the words *wood* and *wood*. Since there were felt to be as many syllables as there were vowel sounds, the employment of a vowel symbol in place of $w$ in such words as these would result in their being shown to have two syllables each. Since no one pronounced them with two syllables, such a representation would, the editors felt, add considerably to the confusion of a student just learning to read.

Another question was raised, evidently, by a person known only as "L.B." (A common practice of the editors in their column "A chat with our Correspondents" was to address the correspondents by initials only.) The editors replied thus to L.B.'s problem (II:215):

> . . . we are happy to agree with you on all points except the final vowel in *early*, many, copy is ($e$); nor do we see how the spelling (*url* $i$, *men* $i$, *cop* $i$) cause any difficulty to the learner. It is no harder to give the sound (i) in such words than when it occurs in other situations: it is certainly easier to stop with (i), than to prolong the sound into ($e$), and the pronunciation strikes the ear more pleasantly.

---

There were very few attempts during the early days of the Longley publication to change the basis upon which the vowel scale was built. However, Andrew Spaulding of Augusta, Ohio, objected to the use of twelve different symbols for the vowels. He was of the opinion that six vowel forms are all that are needed, and that the "stopped" vowels can be indicated by a dot over the symbol (the "full" vowel employing the symbol without the dot). The editors disagreed with this proposition on three points; first, that such a large number of dotted letters would be confusing to the eye; second, that it would require more effort in manuscript writing to have to go back and dot that many letters; and third, that, in printing, the work of the compositor would be greatly increased by the use of that many dotted letters.

Because the earlier phonetic alphabets, and particularly the alphabet of 1845, which had been adopted by the Anglo Sacsun, were based on a system which gave continental values to many of the vowels, several persons, who had become accustomed to this usage through reading the Anglo Sacsun, objected to Pitman's 1847 alphabet as used by the Longleys, which assigned English values to the vowels. The editors of the Advocate commented on such persons in these words (II:155):

Many persons who have a smattering of the European languages, find fault with Pitman and Ellis, because they have not given to the old vowels the sounds they usually represent in those continental languages. They then cited a letter from Stone of Boston, who pointed out that English will rapidly become the international language because of the rapid increase in the numbers of the Anglo-Saxon race, and also because the use of the English language is increasing even more.
rapidly than the Anglo-Saxon population. For this reason, they concluded, it was desirable to give English values to the five vowels of the old Roman alphabet rather than to assign them continental values.

Few suggestions covering the entire alphabet appear in the early issues of the Advocate, though a few individuals were known to be working on phonetic alphabets independently. Among these were Andrew Comstock and Stephen Pearl Andrews. However, one alphabet does appear in the Advocate, which the editors print with this editorial comment (II:277):

We give it merely as a specimen of what thinking men have produced to supply the great necessity of a perfect alphabet, and as a remarkable coincidence in theory, with the present well established phonetic alphabet. Everyone will see, however, that it is very impracticable: . . .

This alphabet was designed by Caleb Simmons of Rough and Ready, Georgia, and was referred to as a "philosophical alphabet." It was based on one of the same principles that Pitman employed in his shorthand alphabet. This principle was to use heavy lines for voiced consonants and light lines for voiceless, and to use heavy ticks to indicate the "full" vowels and light ticks to indicate the "stopped" vowels. According to this principle, Simmons suggested printing the voiced consonants and the "full" vowels in boldface type and the voiceless consonants and the "stopped" vowels in standard type. He used the same six-pair vowel scale as did Pitman, but he omitted Pitman's fourth diphthong, \( \text{\textasciitilde} \), \(/\text{ju}/\). Thus, by using two type faces he obtained an alphabet of 39 symbols using only 22 of the letters of the Roman alphabet. The English unpaired sounds, usually indicated by \( \text{\textasciitilde} \), \( \text{m} \), \( \text{r} \), and \( \text{n} \), were represented in only one form. The letter \( \text{c} \) was used as a
symbol for the diphthong /a/. The limitations of the typewriter make it difficult to represent the two type faces exactly, but for illustration we have made a sample of this alphabet with news type.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
i & \text{as in fit-feet} \\
e & \text{as in fed-fade} \\
a & \text{as in fat-far} \\
o & \text{as in fop-for} \\
u & \text{as in nut-note} \\
v & \text{as in full-fool} \\
Diphthongs & \\
y & \text{as in toy-tie} \\
c & \text{as in noun} \\
Ambigues & \\
w & \text{as in yet-wet} \\
h & \text{as in hay} \\
p & \text{as in pay-bay} \\
t & \text{as in tie-die} \\
j & \text{as in chest-jest} \\
k & \text{as in kind-grind} \\
f & \text{as in fine-vine} \\
d & \text{as in thigh-thy} \\
s & \text{as in sown-zone} \\
z & \text{as in fish-vision} \\
n & \text{as in sin-sing} \\
m & \text{as in may} \\
l & \text{as in lay} \\
r & \text{as in ray} \\
\end{array}
\]

In addition to these symbols he recommended the use of a raised dot (•) to indicate the vowel in the last syllable of apple. Since this was his key word, it is difficult to determine whether he intended this as a syllabic mark, or as equivalent to schwa.

One change in the use of the phonetic alphabet was instituted without comment, insinuating itself so slowly as almost to escape notice. The change apparently came from the Longleys themselves rather than from outside suggestion, though there is one letter hinting at the practice (II:101). This change concerned the non-use of capital letters. Editorially, following this letter, Longley remarked,

We have only room to say, that it is contemplated to abolish the use of capitals altogether, after the public prejudices against the appearance of phonotypy have abated; . . .

The first capital letter that was eliminated, except initially in a sentence, was that of the first person singular personal pronoun. In
many other instances, also, the use of capitals was reduced to a few well established proper nouns. Some correspondents adopted the practice of omitting all capitals, and some signed their names in lower case letters only. However, in deference to the established practice of using capitals, and in consideration of the intended use of phonotypy in teaching reading, initial letters in a sentence were capitalized as were the initial letters of some proper nouns.

By 1850, three years after the phonetic alphabet was supposed to have been completely perfected, it became apparent that there was a lack of uniformity in the use of the alphabet, and many objections were being made to its form, both by some English phoneticians and some Americans. Many of these persons felt there were not enough symbols to represent the sounds which they heard, or thought they heard. Others felt there should be some sort of standardization of pronunciation, so that phonetic printers as well as manuscript writers would always represent words with the same phonetic spelling. The various pressures arising on both sides of the Atlantic necessitated some response on the part of the phonetic press. They could not afford to ignore these objections, because to do so would lower their own prestige by alienating many of their followers. One of the first suggestions of the need to recognize the increasing pressure to do something about these differences of opinion was made by Pitman, who wrote to Longley in December, 1849, as follows (II:156):

If my other engagements will permit of it, I propose in the course of 1851, to obtain the usage of above one hundred men of education, with respect to all words that are pronounced differently in good society. . . . Select twelve of the highest literary names in England, that have paid some attention to phonetics. . . . and one hundred and twenty men of education from the list of the Phonetic society. The members of this phonetic
council would be solicited to give their attention to the subject, for the sake of the common good, which will be greatly promoted by the introduction of phonetic spelling. The votes of the two classes would be kept distinct, and a majority of two thirds in either class would determine the phonetic spelling of such words for my own guidance in the printing office.

I recommend the same plan to be adopted in America, and by a comparison of the English and American lists, we may arrive at a settled spelling for every word in both countries.

However, the course of action proposed here was not followed, though it did serve to indicate the intention of doing something about the differences that were arising in the use of the phonetic alphabet.

In June, 1850, Pitman revived publication of a magazine entitled The Precursor, which had earlier served the purpose, during the formative days of the alphabet (1844-1846) of discussing the best forms of the letters. In this publication, Pitman said:

But the construction of an alphabet that gives general satisfaction, although not in itself a very easy task, is a pastime when compared with the establishment of a generally satisfactory use of it in spelling phonetically.

Generally there are two categories under which the differences can be classed; first, those words and classes of words in which one writer preferred one symbol while another writer preferred a different symbol; and second, those words and classes of words which were admittedly pronounced in two or more manifestly different ways. The former problem came from differences in the sound which different writers heard, or thought they heard, while the second problem was either the result of dialectal differences in pronunciation or the

---
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result of the coexistence of two or more acceptable pronunciations. Since phonotypy was designed to serve educational needs, the sacrifice of strict phonetic accuracy was evidently felt to be necessary, and a uniform spelling felt to be more desirable.

In order to accomplish this uniformity in spelling, Pitman proposed that the Phonetic Council (which had earlier served in the capacity of deciding matters concerning the form of the letters of the phonetic alphabet) be revived, and that it be set up at this time as a committee to rule on pronunciation and phonetic orthography. He suggested that the original council be expanded into a General Phonetic Council in order to embrace not only the British commonwealth, but also the United States, and any other areas where English was spoken extensively as a primary language. This council would include persons sufficiently interested in promoting the adoption of phonetic spelling to be willing to contribute articles and opinions to *The Precursor*, and would also include the makers of pronouncing dictionaries, existing writers on phonetics, phonetic printers or publishers, and professional lecturers and teachers of phonetics. A membership of 100 persons was suggested, distributed as follows: England, 40 members; United States, 40 members; Scotland, 10 members, Ireland, 10 members; with 5 members from the various colonies if they could be obtained. This totals 105, but the discrepancy did not appear to be noticed.

After these men had been selected, and their names published in *The Precursor*, they were expected to furnish to *The Precursor* the authorities and reasons for various orthographies, as far as they had had opportunity of making observations and of consulting books on the
subject. The Precursor was then to publish the various opinions and reasonings, and, after they had all had time to be aired, to request the members of the Council to submit their vote as to the best or most desirable representation. Mr. Pitman expressed the hope that the same style of spelling should be adopted in England and the United States and stated, "Mr. Longley, the editor of the Cincinnati Phonetic Advocate" is also most desirous for a uniform spelling in the two countries. . . ."  

Editorially, Longley objected to some of Pitman's assumptions and proposals, and suggested that since there were fewer uneducated people, in proportion to the total population, in the United States than in England, the United States should have a somewhat larger representation on the Council. He further pointed out that since Scotland and Ireland and the British colonies might be considered, to some extent, one with England on many matters of pronunciation, due to their social and political intercourse, they might be expected to vote with England. This would increase the disadvantage which Longley felt would accrue to the United States with the proportions suggested by Pitman, and result in the adoption of certain spellings which were clearly antagonistic to American pronunciation.

Pitman suggested the following names as a beginning list of members from the United States, and extended them a specific invitation to membership in the council: "Messrs. Andrews, Boyle, Longley, Webster, Burns; Drs. Child, Stone, and Comstock; and Professors Booth

---
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and Haldeman." To this list, Longley recommended the following additional names: G. B. Bradley of Cincinnati, Ohio; Dr. Adams Jewett of Dayton, Ohio; Dr. Asa Horr of Dubuque, Iowa; John McLane of Jackson, Michigan; George Kellogg of Birmingham, Connecticut; Henry M. Parkhurst of Boston, Massachusetts; Leroy Patillo of Monroe, Georgia; and Caleb Simmons of Jonesboro, Georgia. He indicated his fair mindedness by these nominations, for he pointed out that though these men had written on the subject of phonetics, more than half of them did not completely approve of the Longley system of phonetic spelling. Longley suggested further that in making nominations for the Council some men should be included who had an earned reputation as linguists, even though they were not actively identified with the spelling reform movement. Readers of the Advocate were urged to solicit the cooperation of those men who had these qualifications, and to submit their names as nominees for the council.\(^{12}\)

Continuing to quote from The Precursor in the following issue (II:276), Longley gave Pitman's analysis of the types of words on which a difference of opinion concerning the sound which is, or should be, spoken existed, and hence concerning the symbol that should be written. Pitman made the observation that in many instances the difficulty was not so much in "what to write as in what to say." This prescriptive approach to the problem of pronunciation may appear a departure from the idea of phonetic representation, but is, nevertheless, the same attitude held by the dictionary makers of about the same period, and which is still occasionally reflected in the teaching

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.}\)
of many teachers of English (and even of some teachers of speech). It is, simply, an expression of the desire to obtain a "standard" English pronunciation, and then to represent this "standard" pronunciation phonetically.

Some of the considerations on which there were differences in the manner of representation are listed in *The Precursor*, and are copied in the *Advocate*. Since a complete transcript of these analyses would be tedious to the reader, we shall only summarize them briefly, commenting where clarity may demand it. The questions and problems were:

1. Whether to consider the vowels in *ar* and *or* when not followed by a vowel as long sounds, while the vowels in *er* and *ur* under the same conditions are considered short sounds. (Pitman thought the vowel in each of the pairs of words such as *care-carry*, *for-forest*, and *cur-curry* to be the same, though many phoneticians thought them to be different sounds.

2. Should *er* or *ur* be used to represent the vowel before *r* in words of the type of *bird*, *herd*, *learn*, *word*, and *burn*? (Pitman preferred *er*, as we have mentioned, though Longley and other American phoneticians preferred *ur*.)

3. Is the vowel in the second syllable of *primary*, *barbary*, etc., more correctly represented by *a* (/æ/) or *e* (/ɛ/)? (This was a problem of syllabication. Should they be divided so as to make the syllabication *pri-mar-y*, *bar-bar-y*, or *pri-ma-ry*, *bar-ba-ry*? Since Ellis had allegedly expressed the opinion that this problem should be ignored, the question was not only which of two sounds to use, but, also, whether to attach any significance to the difference.)
4. Should words of the type of nature and educate be spelled with $c$ (/ts/) and $j$ (/dj/) or with $tj$ (/tʃ/) and $dy$ (/dʒ/)?

5. Should the "broad-a" be used in words of the type of staff, lath, lass, and splash. (This is Pitman's list, but the inclusion of lass and splash is curious.)

6. Should the vowel in words of the type of off, moth, moss, wash be written with $o$ (/ɔ/) or with $o$ (/o/)?

7. How should the vowel in the second syllable of the two words execute and execution (and other pairs of words with shifting stress) be indicated? Should they both be written with $e$ (/ɛ/), both with $e$ (/i/), or $e$ in one and $e$ in the other?

8. Should the vowel $o$ in words such as eloquent, allocate, desolate, etc. be written with $o$ (/ɔ/) or with $o$ (/o/)?

9. Should related words such as geometry-geometric, hypocrisy-hypocrite, lithography-lithographic, etc. be written with the same vowel symbol in the second syllable regardless of the shifting stress?

10. What symbol is preferred when the u or ew follows: $r$ as in rude or brew; $l$ as in blue, lute, or absolute; $s$ as in chew; $j$ as in June; $ə$ as in sure or issue; and $ʒ$ as in azure? Should the diphthong symbol $uə$ (/ju/) or the vowel symbol $uu$ (/u/) be used?

11. Should the symbol $s$ (/ts/) or $ʃ$ (/ʃ/) be used after $n$ in such words as French, pinch, inch?

12. Should the prefix dis be represented as ending in $s$ or $ʒ$?

13. The next question is worthy of more lengthy comment. The practice of using $ʃ$ to indicate a syllabic consonant was in use among both British and American printers. However, Pitman felt that the Americans overdid the use of this "vocalic" sign, using it when a vowel properly ought to be represented. He mentioned such words as
sudden, present (noun) as examples of American improper usage.

Pitman felt the Council should rule on the words which may properly be written with syllabic consonants and the ones that should not. The editor of the Advocate commented on this suggestion in an editorial insertion with the reprinted article, pointing out that he prefers not to use the sign at all, but prefers rather to indicate syllabic consonants by the expedient of omitting the vowel. Longley suggested that if it were found necessary to indicate some sort of very indistinct vowel in such final syllables, a new symbol should be invented, so that the apostrophe would not take on the value of a vowel. At this point Longley anticipated the need for schwa, and it is unfortunate that he did not follow up the idea and adopt such a symbol.

14. Should the nasal consonant in words such as income, tranquil, Hancock, incubus, and other words which divide syllabically between the n and the velar consonant, be written with n or with y?

15. Should the words such as Christian, Russian, India, etc., be written with the symbol y or i following the stressed syllable?

16. Should the vowel of the syllable spelled an be written with the same symbol in both words of such pairs as giant-gigantic, ocean-oceanic, organ-organic? (Pitman was of the opinion that the symbol a (/æ/) in both words in each pair so as to avoid confusion. Evidently he was more concerned with consistency than with phonetic accuracy. Pitman also believed there were different pronounced vowels in the second syllables of giant and client, as well as in other words distinguished by ant-ent or by ance-ence.)
17. Should the h be retained in geographical names such as Westham, Burnham, or in proper names such as Pelham and Chatham? (Though he admitted the h was not ordinarily pronounced, Pitman inclined to think it might be retained on the ground that when the word is pronounced by syllables, the h is sounded).

18. In words containing as, of, and with as part of a compound, as in whereas, thereof, and herewith, should the final consonant be voiced or voiceless?

19. Should the article a be written with a (/e/) or _ (/æ/)? (No question is raised that it might be pronounced as u (/u/), the only sound for which there was a phonotypic symbol acoustically approximating schwa).

20. Should the initial vowel in names such as Elijah, Eleazar, Eliezar, Elizabeth, and others not stressed on the initial vowel, be written with the symbol _ (/i/) or e (//)?

21. Should the "broad-a" be used in other words than those mentioned in problem number 5? It is not likely that British and American practice would ever have become uniform in this particular.

22. In words such as adjust, adjoin, etc., should the letter d be retained (as was the practice of some of Pitman's correspondents) for the sake of keeping the analogy with regular spelling, or rejected because the phonotype symbol j (/dʒ/) has within it the sound of d?

The foregoing questions and problems formed the bases for the controversy over the alphabet. Most of them concerned the usage of the phonotype alphabet symbols. However, as various phoneticians began to mention instances in which they heard sounds different from any of those represented by the symbols used, and as some phoneticians
contended that certain words often spelled alike in phonotype were not pronounced alike in the phoneticians' own particular sections of the country, the efforts of the council became more and more directed toward revision of the alphabet than toward ruling on the manner of employing the existing alphabet. From this point on we shall concern ourselves with a consideration of the actions taken by the American group on these and other questions, leaving the investigation of the continued development of phonotypy in England to another study.

Pitman's proposed allocation of seats in the General Phonetic Council was not well received on this side of the Atlantic. In addition to giving his own opinion, Longley mentioned hearing from many other phonographers of importance who agreed that Pitman was weighting the council too much in favor of England. One of the writers, George Kellogg estimated that a proportional representation should give the United States no less than 56 seats to England's 30 in a council of 100 members. Dr. James W. Stone of Boston suggested a fair distribution would give all the British isles 50 members and all the Americas 50, distributed as follows: England, 34; Scotland, 7; Ireland, 9; United States, 45; Canada, 4; British West Indies, 1.

Stone and others, then, began a movement by correspondence to officially get the election of an American Phonetic Council under way on the basis of 50 members for the Americas, following a recommendation by the Longleys to the effect that most of the important phonographers in the United States, they believed, would agree on this figure, and that Pitman could not possibly object to so equitable an arrangement. In July, 1850, Stone, through the pages of the Advocate (III:6), sent an official "call" for the election of members to the
council, which began with this preamble:

The undersigned phoneticians, resident of the United States, would hereby invite all Americans who favor the general cause of phonetics, to cooperate in the election of an American Phonetic Council...

It was proposed that all interested in this election should send up to, but no more than, twenty names each as nominees to the Council, and that the fifty receiving the highest number of votes be considered elected. The "call" was signed by Stone and thirteen other men.

Longley objected to this procedure (III:78) on the ground that if a total of fewer than fifty names were suggested, the council would be incomplete. He suggested that it might be better for each person to submit fifty names, thereby assuring the election of the entire council on the first ballot.

Between the time of the first announcement on August 10, 1850, and December 14, 1850, a number of names were mentioned by various persons as suitable nominees. Since the call had specified that the nominations must be made before January 1, 1851, Longley reprinted on December 14, 1850, the names of all the persons who had been suggested as possible candidates, and urged that the votes be sent in immediately. Tellers for the election were to be Robert Patterson, son of the director of the U. S. mint in Philadelphia, and Leroy Patillo, postmaster, Monroe, Georgia. It was pointed out, however, that persons were not limited to this list in their voting, and that it was intended to be suggestive only (III:78).

The results of the election were given in the Advocate for February 8, 1851 (III:110). According to an amended rule specifying that any person to be elected must receive at least 20 per cent of the total votes cast, 38 members of the Council were elected on the first
ballot, though one declined to accept. When the entire council was
not elected on the first ballot, Longley editorially remarked with the
equivalent of "I told you so."

Following this election it was proposed that all interested in
phonetics should also vote for a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer,
for the Council at the same time they submitted their second ballot for
the 13 vacancies. The date for completing this election was set as
June 15, 1951, in order to give plenty of time for discussing the
possible officers. Though there was occasional objection to this date
on the grounds that it allowed more time than was actually needed, the
election of the officers and of the remaining members of the Council
did not take place until the specified time.

Stone suggested that in the election of a Secretary, it would be
desirable to have someone in the phonetic publishing business. Pho­
netic publishing was not made a requirement of the office, but the idea
was adopted by common consent, and so the potential candidates for this
office were limited to S. P. Andrews, publisher of the New York Propa­
gandist (a successor to the former Anglo Sacsun); H. M. Parkhurst,
publisher of the Washington, D. C., Plowshaer, a phonetic periodical of
smaller size than the Advocate; E. Webster, publisher of the Philadel­
phia American Phonographic Journal, which was generally concerned with
phonography and only incidentally with phonotypy; and E. Longley, pub­
lisher of the Cincinnati Weekly Phonetic Advocate. Andrews declined
the nomination and declared himself in favor of Elias Longley. Park­
hurst also withdrew his name and declared himself in favor of Longley.
Webster, however, preferred to remain in the race, and some discussion
took place by letters to the Advocate considering the desirability of
each of the two publications to serve as the general organ of the Council. There appeared to be some objection to Webster's periodical because it was largely printed in phonography rather than in phonotypy, and was thought to have a more limited appeal than the Advocate. In the final election, Longley received a total of 3177 votes to Webster's 673. Each of the other publishers received a few "token" votes, and there was added, as a complimentary vote, the name of Leroy Patillo of Monroe, Georgia, to whom the ballots were being sent for tabulation.

James W. Stone of Boston was elected President with an overwhelming majority of 3792 votes out of a total of 3858 votes cast, in spite of his objections and repeated requests not to be considered for the office. Robert Patterson was almost unanimously elected Treasurer, only 7 votes being cast for other candidates.13 The complete list of the members of the first American Phonetic Council, alphabetically arranged, with their addresses, follows:

Andrews, Stephen P., 49 Ann St., New York
Balderstone, Lloyd, Port Deposit, Md.
Bishop, L., Rushville, Ind.
Blake, Freeman N., Barnstable, Mass.
Booth, Prof. Thomas C., 300 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Boyle, Augustus F., 158 Nassau St., New York
Bradley, George B., Cincinnati, Ohio
Burns, Mrs. Eliza, Care: Longley and Bro., Cincinnati, O.
Burns, J. B., Care: Longley and Bro., Cincinnati, O.
Burr, William Henry, 26 Rivington St., New York
Bussell, Dr. E. T., Lafayette, Ind.
Child, Dr. Henry T., 104 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Day, Rev. George T., Chester, Ohio (Geauga County)
Dillingham, Stephen C., Monument, Mass.
Forbes, A. A., Hinesburg, Vt.
Forte, Thomas M., Bellevue, La. (Bossier Parish)
Frazer, Robert, 141 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
French, James, postmaster, Melvin Village, N.H.
Gillingham, Clinton, 537 N. Front St., Philadelphia, Pa.

13 The results of the election appear in the Advocate, III, 194.
Even before the council was officially organized, there were rumblings of discord. Some felt the primary purpose of the council was to overhaul the alphabet, and proposals ranged all the way from adding one or two extra letters to doubling the total number of vowels. Of these, Andrews, former editor of the Anglo Saxsun, is alleged to have been the most radical, since he was himself working on what he designated as the "perfect alphabet." Commenting on Andrews' complex vowel schemes, Longley says,

There may be twenty or thirty vowel sounds in the language, or our scheme of twelve vowels may have fifteen or twenty modifications of sound; and a few close students may, by the aid of a knowledge of foreign languages, distinguish them in speech; but since the mass of the people can not distinguish
them, their representation would be worse than useless.

He then points out that most of these sounds have already been considered by Ellis in his book *Essentials of Phonetics*, so that anyone in need of a symbol for a sound not ordinarily found in the English six-pair vowel scale would likely be able to find a symbol already developed in Ellis's *Ethnical Alphabet*.

In addition to contributing, as Pitman had suggested, to *The Precursor* (to which they were expected to subscribe), it was felt that there should be an American outlet for the expression of various opinions. Since Longley had been elected secretary of the organization, the *Advocate* was suggested as the official organ of the American Council. At first, Longley suggested that a separate publication be supported for that purpose, but when he did not get sufficient interest aroused in this proposition, he agreed to allow a part of the *Advocate* for use as the organ of the council. Longley took the position that he would keep the columns of his periodical "open for a discussion of the legitimate business of the Council, but not for every whim that individual members may hatch up." This position necessitated a decision as to what constituted the "legitimate business of the Council," and the following formula was worked out (IV:30):

Any question for discussion should be sent in formally to the Secretary, to be published in the *Advocate*. Whenever the President receives requests from 7 members for the decision of the same question, he will forward such question to the Secretary, having numbered it, for publication in the *Advocate* as a question to be voted on within a fixed time—say three weeks. . . .

The first formal question submitted for discussion according to this procedure was, "Should there be any change whatever in the phonotype alphabet," and was offered for the purpose of determining whether
discussions of alphabet changes were in order, or whether the Council should concern itself only with the proper application of the existing alphabet.

Longley vigorously objected to the discussion in his periodical of any question of making a change in the alphabet. He reasoned that such discussions being read by ordinary laymen would tend to weaken the movement, destroy faith in the stability of the reform, and thereby cost supporters among the common people and among educators. However, he did establish a column entitled "Opinions of the Council," and during the latter part of the year 1851 published under this heading such comment as was submitted on the proper representation of certain words.

In December, 1851, however, (IV:78) after explaining that most persons had understood and appreciated his position in not printing discussions of alphabet change, he said,

But a few of the most prominent friends of phonetics have found fault with us--talked about "free discussion," "a free press," &c.; and some have even intimated that sinister motives had influenced our course; . . .
Now be it known that there is no greater lover of a free press than ourself; and that no one would sooner scorn a dollar and cent motive for the suppression of truth than we would. We simply thought the Advocate was not the place for such discussions; . . . But the Advocate belongs to the phonetic public--it is a free paper--and now write away, gentlemen, and see what will come of it. . . .

In making this concession we know we shall displease the majority and retard the progress of the reform; but we are not to be charged with restricting freedom of speech with mercenary motives. . . .

From this time forward the column "Opinions of the Council" was devoted almost exclusively to a discussion of changes in the alphabet.

The formal question "Should there be any change whatever in the phonotype alphabet," had been asked September 20, 1851, but it was not
until December that it was opened to discussion. In reply to this proposition, Epinitus Webster, the runner-up in the election of Secretary, suggested that the Council might more profitably concern itself with promotional activities rather than with wasting time wrangling over the alphabet. He suggested that if the council members would spend their time writing and circulating articles propagandizing the desirability of introducing phonetics into the school systems, they would serve the reform best. Editorially, Longley agreed, though he would not refuse the democratic principle of accepting whatever decision the majority of the council made.

Several other persons took the position that the council should leave the alphabet alone. Elisha Philbrook of Vicksburg, Mississippi, suggested (IV:58) that much of the wrangling and dissention over the alphabet and most of the misunderstandings over its proper use might be due to there never having been a clear definition of the terms full, stopped, long, short, and brief as they apply to vowels, and that if these terms were clearly understood, so that everyone would apply the same criteria to the choice of a vowel in any given instance, the present alphabet would be satisfactory. A. Nichols, of Montrose, Pennsylvania, attributed the difficulty in agreeing on certain vowel sounds to the sound of r. He said (III:191),

> If phoneticians throw away both the trilled and the gutteral r, and use the pure liquid r only, they would thereby settle at once and forever, about one half of the disputed points in regard to vowel sounds.

He suggested that it would be better "to prune our pronunciation and accommodate it to a most simple alphabet, than to make an alphabet that can be accommodated to a most haphazard pronunciation." James W. Dufield,
of Carrollton, Ohio, suggested (IV:106) that by changing the alphabet to include fine distinctions that are not even noticeable to some people there would be confusion rather than clearness among common people. He contended that with too close distinctions the ordinary person would be at a loss to know what symbol to write since he made no perceptual distinction between the sounds. This confusion would, he said, ultimately result in a phonetic spelling which would deliver people into the same sort of pitfall into which ordinary orthography had brought them.

Thomas Ranney, a teacher in the vicinity of Boston who had been using the phonetic system for some time, protested against the proposal to change the alphabet, contending that those who demand a vowel scale capable of all the fine distinctions of speech are extremists. After protesting that it was hard enough to get the concept of six pairs of vowels established in the average person's mind, which had become accustomed to the five-vowel Roman alphabet, he said (IV:138):

I suppose that those who voted for this change will not rest satisfied until they get their perfect alphabet of a 9 or 12 vowel scale, which will result in putting an end to all phonetic teaching in the country, for I am well convinced that not one person in fifty, (who had not given attention to phonetics,) could possibly be taught in twelve lessons to recognize nine pairs of vowels, therefore the idea of qualifying teachers for teaching phonotypy in our public schools would be hopeless, as it could not be done. . . . We have no objections to the Council getting up a universal alphabet like that of Mr. Ellis, if they choose, for scientific purposes, but I do most solemnly protest against their altering our present practical working alphabet, and giving us a complicated system which can never be taught to the masses.

Even after the vote on the question of whether or not to change the alphabet had been taken, S.C. Cavenaugh, of Columbus, Indiana, wrote, concerning those who were anxious for an expanded alphabet (IV:134):
Some of them are not so anxious for a change as they are to let us see what nice hearing they have, and how exactly they can discover the smallest difference in sound. I have never yet come across any word in the English language that I cannot represent everyone sound heard therein [sic] with our present alphabet of forty characters.

However, the case for an enlarged vowel scale was summarized most exactly by Mrs. E. V. Burns, a teacher of phonetics in Cincinnati and vicinity, and one of the earliest and most enthusiastic professional teachers of the system in America. Mrs. Burns said (IV:134):

Five years ago it was a hard matter to make people believe that there were any such things as sounds in the words we use, aside from the names of the letters which compose them. . . . When at length they began to see through the fog, it was only the most palpable distinctions of sound that could be appreciated; but now, . . . great distinctions are found to exist between sounds which a short time ago were thought to be a unity. The consequence is that an almost unanimous call has been made for an enlarged alphabet.

Mrs. Burns then expressed her own preference for an eight-pair vowel scale as being adequate for the necessary distinctions and yet not too refined in detail.

In spite of the fact that in the early conception of the phonetic alphabet its originators were on the brink of discovering the principle of the phoneme, they were never able to express the concept with sufficient clarity to recognize it. Consequently, as time passed their followers drifted farther and farther away from the principle to become lost in the uncertainty of phonetic detail. Had the phoneme concept been recognized during the time of the development of phonotypy, all the various problems with which they were concerned could have been easily and logically resolved, and the cause of phonetics would have been advanced by over a half-century.
Meanwhile the proponents of a changed alphabet were sending in their various proposals, as many of which were published in the Advocate as space would allow. Generally the discussion centered around either a seven or an eight-pair vowel scale, though there was one proposal for a nine-pair scale and one for a twelve-pair scale. The first question to be put to a formal vote, however, was the election of an Executive council (IV: 142). The following-named members were selected for this office: Stephen P. Andrews, New York; George B. Bradley, Cincinnati; Stephen C. Dillingham, Monument, Massachusetts; Ebenezer Smith, Boston; and Epinetus Webster, Philadelphia. At the same time the following set of rules was adopted as governing the Council:

1. The officers of the Council shall be a President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Executive Committee, who shall be elected biennially. This Committee shall be composed of 5 persons who shall take charge of the business arrangements of the Council.

2. All phonetic questions that have been voted for affirmatively by the British Branch of the Council, take precedence of any others.

3. Any individual may discuss any question connected with phonetics; but before it shall be voted on, a written request for a decision of it, signed by 7 members of the council, shall be sent to the President. This does not refer to the questions mentioned in proposition 2.

4. To decide a question against the romanic spelling, a vote of a majority of the whole Council and of two thirds of those who vote, shall be requisite.

5. A four-fifths vote of the Executive Committee shall be necessary to suspend the rules.

6. No bill shall be paid by the Treasurer unless approved by the President.

The first vacancy in the Council, which occurred when Electa N. Walton declined to serve, was filled at this time by the election of George D. Greenleaf, of Nappanee, Canada.
Another group of questions required the attention of the council before the primary question of whether to consider a change in the alphabet was brought to a vote. On the 7th of February, 1852, the council members were asked to vote at once on the following proposals (IV:110 f.), since seven or more persons had requested them:

1. Vote for three members of the council to fill the places of Messrs. Boyle, Hayes, and Burns.

2. Vote on the proposals for improvements in phonography dated December 1st, 1851, which have been adopted by the British branch of the Council and sent to all the members of the American Council by Mr. Pitman.

3. Vote on the propositions: Shall the President be authorized to submit to vote for adoption by the Council any question he may see fit?

4. Shall the President be authorized to lithograph and send to the members such improvements in the phonetic alphabet as may be sent to him by phonographers within one month after the passage of this vote?

5. Shall the President with the consent of the executive committee be authorized to procure such types as may be needed to print and send to the members, specimens of the alphabets which may receive the highest number of votes in favor of them?

6. Shall the final vote be taken on this question, "Which of the alphabets brought before the council shall be adopted?"

Stone listed the following names as having been mentioned as possible members for the vacancies:

Dan S. Smalley, Jamaica Plains, Massachusetts
Elbridge Sibley, Wilmington, Delaware
R. Gilbert, Business Corners, Iowa
F. G. Adams, Cincinnati, Ohio
John D. Pulsifer, Minot, Maine
Dr. Henry Spillman, Medina, Ohio
Edward Wright, Bath, Canada West
Miss Theresy Wolling, Keyport, New Jersey
Mark Rollins, South Albion, Maine
Henry E. Rockwell, Winstead, Connecticut
He suggested, though there was no rule specifying that it must be followed, that voters would be wise to vote for those persons living in areas not already heavily represented on the Council. In this letter appears a comment which touches an item which was one of the primary motivations for this present study. Stone, in mentioning the qualifications of the various nominees, says, among other remarks, "Mr. Smalley is the executor of the will of a gentleman who has left about ten thousand dollars for a phonetic dictionary." This dictionary was eventually published, and a reference to its having been printed by the firm of Longley and Brother, phonetic printers, in Cincinnati, Ohio, motivated this present investigation into the activities of the firm.

On February 14, 1852 (IV:114) Dr. Stone submitted a supplement to the list of questions which largely concerned the specific sounds of a group of controversial words. It was suggested that votes be submitted so as to reach the teller by or before the first of April, 1852, but the various questions were not all settled at the same time. One of the first returns to come in from a sufficient number of members to make a decision possible was on the first question proposed, namely, "Shall there be any changes in the Phonotype alphabet?" By March 6, a clear majority had been reached, even though five members had not voted. Of the 46 members now remaining on the council, passage of any motion required at least 24 votes. By the date just mentioned, the following results had been obtained (IV:126): favoring a change of some sort in

---

145This topic is considered in greater detail in the Preface to this study.
the phonotype alphabet, 24; against a change, 17; not voting 5. Of the five not voting at this time, only one more had cast a vote by the time of the deadline, April 1, and this was in favor of a change. This made the final count 25 to 17 in favor of some sort of change.

At the same time of submitting the list of controversial words, Stone recognized that four rather than three vacancies existed on the Council, Taber being the other declining member. The completion of the list of members for the council was the next question to be settled; there was a definite majority of 24 or more votes for filling all vacancies. The following-named were elected: R. Gilbert, of Business Corners, Iowa; J.D. Pulsifer, Mechanics Falls, Maine; Elbridge Sibley, Wilmington, Delaware; and Dan S. Smalley, Jamaica Plains, Massachusetts (IV:154).

In spite of the suggestion to have the votes in by April 1, the voting was not completed by that time. On April 26, Stone wrote a letter mentioning that 14 members had not yet voted on all the proposals presented February 14. Of those who had voted, however, he pointed out that a clear majority was already obtained on certain questions (IV:162). These were: item No. 3, "Shall the President be authorized to submit to vote for adoption by the council any question he may see fit?" Carried by 31 affirmative, 4 negative; item No. 4, "Shall the President be authorized to lithograph and send to the members such improvements in the phonetic alphabet as may be sent to him by phonographers within one month after the passage of this vote?" Carried by 30 affirmative, 1 negative, 3 affirmative with qualifications.

At this time, also, the following changes in the alphabet were agreed upon by a majority of the council, according to the questions
raised February 14: a new vowel is needed for air, etc.; a new vowel is needed for her, our, etc.; a new vowel is needed in fast, era, among, probable, standard, partake; a new vowel is needed either for the vowel in obey, Ohio or for that in whole. Concerning these decisions Stone expressed the opinion that the most probable need in the fourth case is for a symbol for the short, or unstressed, a in obey, Ohio, advocate, and that the peculiar distinction made by some persons in the pronunciation of whole, bone, stone, etc., was likely to be only a provincialism. This opinion foreshadows the later findings of the Linguistic Atlas concerning the distribution of the phenomenon often referred to as the "New England short-o."

Of the various vowel scales proposed, the Council adopted at this time, by a bare majority, an eight-pair vowel scale (IV:162). The votes on the various scales were as follows: for a six-pair scale, 5; for a seven-pair scale, 6; for an eight-pair scale, 24 (the needed majority); a nine-pair scale, 1; either 6, 7, or 8 pair scale, 5 (this includes those who expressed different opinions at different times as well as those who stated they would be satisfied with any one of the three scales).

Some of the questions were decided in the negative, and since this had as much effect on the application of the alphabet as the affirmative decisions, we shall mention them. It was decided that two types of the letter r, one for the trilled r and the other for the "r in far," were not needed. It was also decided that a separate letter was not needed

---

for syllabic n and l. The use of accent marks to distinguish certain homophones such as two and to (or too) or thee and the, one and won, was rejected. The indicated vowel in eminent, divide, direct was decided to be properly represented by i (/I/). It was likewise decided that the proper representation of the vowel in nor and authentic (and words of that sort) was to be e (/æ/) rather than o (/o/).

Many other decisions were delayed for some time, and the Advocate reported no more discussions of the alphabet after May 8, 1852, until the next year. From this time on, discussions concerning the forms of the letters to be used in the eight-pair vowel scale were evidently carried on through other channels. According to the proposal adopted by the council, the president, Stone, was authorized to circulate lithographed copies of the various alphabets submitted to him, so that there was no further mention of the alphabet until February 5, 1843. Meanwhile, Longley did adopt in his printing the minor rulings of spelling adopted by the council.

On one item which had not been definitely settled, Longley adopted the practice for which he personally had voted. This was the distinction between the vowel in use or you from that in tune or due. Since the beginning of phonotypy there had been a general agreement of a difference between the long oo of noon and the long u of tune. The latter vowel was recognized to have a diphthongal quality lacking in the former. This diphthong was ordinarily represented by a single symbol, according to a point of view explained in Chapter I. The practice of representing this sound by a single symbol when it appeared initially was challenged, and the question had been officially asked concerning the need for some method of distinguishing the two sounds.
Longley had declared himself in favor of having some means of indicating this distinction, and even though the Council had voted to make a distinction, they had not ruled on how this distinction was to be applied. Longley's own recommendation was that the sound be written with a preceding $y$ when it occurred initially, and that it be indicated by the single symbol when it occurred medially. Since a majority of the Council had voted for some form of distinction, Longley adopted the practice which he had recommended.

Meanwhile, Pitman had changed his entire concept of the phonotype alphabet and had adopted what various writers of the time refer to as a "European basis" for his alphabet. By this term, they referred to his practice of assigning a continental value to certain vowels, particularly $i$, $e$ and $a$, so as to cause them to represent the sounds now shown by the I.P.A. symbols /i/, /e/ and /a/.

This condition caused a rift to develop among American phonographers, some of whom felt the American group should follow Pitman's lead and adopt a continental system. Numerous references are made in the Advocate to the large number of changes that were being constantly made in the British publication, each of them being claimed by Pitman as an improvement over all former arrangements. This course of action had caused Ellis to break away from Pitman, and ultimately brought about a three-way split in the phonetic ranks, with Pitman, Ellis, and Longley at the respective heads of the factions.  

---

16 This observation is based on a series of articles and letters in Pitman's Journal for 1859, Vol. XVIII, pp. 66, 99, 299, 434, and 503.
In August, 1852, a group of American phoneticians tried to crystalize the position of the American group regarding the alphabet and to establish formally the break with Pitman. Under the leadership of Stephen P. Andrews, a group of phoneticians met in New York on August 17, 1852, calling themselves the "National Phonetic Convention," and proposing certain recommendations concerning the alphabet. Though Longley was not present, (He explained that the pressure of his publishing business prevented his going) a discussion of the impending convention was given space in several issues of his periodical. This convention adopted the following recommendations:

1. The adoption of the "Anglo-American" basis for the alphabet. (This is interpreted as referring to a basis in the English language rather than in any of the continental languages.)

2. The approval of at least an eight-vowel scale.

3. Retention of single symbols for diphthongs (the four diphthongs already used in the phonotype alphabet) and the retention of single symbols for the English affricates. (This was in direct opposition to Pitman's new policy.)

4. The retention of g rather than k for the voiceless velar plosive. (This was also a rejection of Pitman's practice.)

5. Recognition of the fact that in English there are two qualities of sound represented by the short vowel letters as Pitman used them, one called the short-full and the other the stopped quality.

Though the action of this convention had no official standing as far as the American Phonetic Council was concerned, even though many

---

council members were present, it is likely that the publication of their decisions was influential in fixing opinion regarding the philosophy of the pending revisions in the alphabet.

Because of the vote of the Council which allowed the President to lithograph the various alphabet proposals and to circulate copies among the members of the Council, discussions concerning the forms of the letters are not available, since none of these lithographed sheets have at present been discovered. Though Longley did not print any discussion of the revision of the alphabet, as we have mentioned, until February, 1853, progress was still being made. Longley therefore assumed the responsibility of keeping the public at large informed on the progress of the revision.

Early after beginning the fifth volume of the Advocate, Longley summarized the status of the alphabet as it existed at that time, for the purpose of clarifying the exact issues which were under discussion. He said (V:5h):

The use of the following letters is agreed upon: --
\[\text{i, e, a (with a tail), a, o, u, y, u}, y, w, h, p, b, t, d, i, g, f, v, \&. t, s, z, r, l, m, n.}\]

The points to be discussed are: 1. the shape of the first long vowel; 2. the shape of the 2nd long long vowel; 3. the shape of the 3rd long vowel, namely that heard in (care); 4. what letter shall represent the 5th long vowel; 5. what letter shall represent the 6th long vowel; 6. what letter shall represent the vowel in (cut); 7. what letter shall represent the vowel in (full); 8. what letter shall represent the first diphthong; 9. shall we adopt c or k; 10. shall we improve by making it more like h.

The letters \[\text{\&} \] and \[\text{\&} \] were being printed at the time of Volume V with a new type, which, though not basically different from the old, gave a slightly neater appearance and was a little more distinguishable from \[\text{t} \] and \[\text{d} \] than the old. This was accomplished by making the letter
a little larger and a little further up on the stem of the letter.

Though Longley had earlier contended vigorously against making any changes in the alphabet, he democratically fell in with the majority when it was determined that certain changes were needed. Consequently, in most of the latter part of the fifth volume of the Advocate he used the various experimental alphabets proposed by the Council, for the purpose of subjecting them to the fire of public approval. The first of these experimental alphabets appeared in the issue of February 5, 1853 as an eight-pair scale of vowels, and made the following distinctions (V:105):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel No.</th>
<th>Full vowel</th>
<th>Stopped vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E e as in eel</td>
<td>I i as in ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A a as in ale</td>
<td>E e as in ell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A a as in air</td>
<td>A a as in an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A a as in arm</td>
<td>A a as in ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O o as in all</td>
<td>O o as in on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U u as in urn</td>
<td>U u as in up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O o as in ope</td>
<td>O o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W w as in ooz</td>
<td>W w as in full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "stopped" form of the 7th vowel, designated by (*), is indicated by a footnote to be the vowel in "The New England o in coat, whole." As long as this symbol was retained in the alphabet, the following notation appeared under the sample alphabet as it was printed in the Advocate:

The sound which this letter " " is designed to represent is that heard in "whole, coat," &c, as pronounced by New Englanders; but as it is not recognized by any lexicographer as an element of the English language proper, it will only be used when giving a specimen of Yankee dialect.
A new form was adopted for the first diphthong, or the sound of \( i \) in isle. (The old form was \( i \).) The new form was a lowered \( i \) with a cross bar and with the dot of \( i \) over it, approximately like this: \( \text{\textacute{i}} \). The form of both capital and lower case symbols for the voiceless \( \text{th} \) were changed from the old \( \text{\textacute{T}} \) and \( \text{\textacute{th}} \) to this: \( \text{\textacute{TH}} \) and \( \text{\textacute{Theta}} \) (Greek \( \Theta \)). However, the letter \( c \) for the voiceless velar plosive was still retained at the time of this revision, though it was still being discussed and challenged.

Longley was reasonably well satisfied with this revised alphabet, and said (V:1114),

The vowel sound in \( \text{air} \), the representation of which has always been a stumbling block, has now a distinct letter of its own. Heretofore we have been constrained to represent it by the same letter as we use in \( \text{ale} \) in accordance with Webster's notation; while nearly all our correspondents have been urging us to employ the same letter with which we represent the vowel in \( \text{at} \), protesting that it would more nearly represent the \( \text{true sound} \) . . . .

There is as much difference between the vowels in \( \text{urn} \) and \( \text{up} \) as there is between those in \( \text{air} \) and \( \text{ell} \) or \( \text{air} \) and \( \text{at} \) or between \( \text{far} \) and \( \text{fat} \) or \( \text{nor} \) and \( \text{not} \) . . . .

In regard to the sound heard in such words as \( \text{half} \), \( \text{laugh} \), \( \text{fast} \), \( \text{lath} \) etc., there has always been a conflict whether it should be represented by the long vowels in \( \text{arm} \) . . . . or by the short vowel in \( \text{at} \) . . . . We have adopted a letter to represent a sound midway between the two, which answers the purpose to a charm.

However, Longley felt there were a few flows in the alphabet which needed attention. Without changing the forms of the letters in relation to the value of the sound to which they were attached, he suggested that: The "\( \text{long} \)" vowel in \( \text{ale} \) (No. 2) be paired with "\( \text{stopped} \)" vowel in \( \text{at} \) rather than with the "\( \text{stopped} \)" vowel in \( \text{oll} \), at the same time the key word be changed to \( \text{ate} \); the "\( \text{long} \)" vowel in \( \text{air} \) (No. 3)
be paired with the "stopped" vowel in *ell* rather than with the "stopped" vowel in *am*, and the key words be changed to *fair* and *fat*, instead of *air* and *am*. He said of this arrangement, "To my ear, those [sounds] in *(fair)* and *(fell)* are exactly alike in quality." Another item which did not please Longley was the adoption of the Greek theta for the lower case form of the voiceless *th*, though he was well pleased with the form of the new capital letter, Θ, a form which he felt to have a closer visual relation to capital TH than the older one. Though he expressed an intention to return to the earlier lower case type for this sound, he did not do so until 1854. Another modified letter to which Longley objected was the lower case symbol for *sh*, which was modified to a form like this: §, a symbol which was thought to suggest both the conventional spellings *sh* and *si*.

As soon as the *Advocate* appeared with the new alphabet, some readers misunderstood the situation and concluded this revision to represent the final and official action concerning the alphabet. They objected on the grounds that the final decision should rest with the American Phonetic Society, an organization of friends of the reform which numbered nearly four thousand members by that time. As soon as it became known that this alphabet was experimental, suggestions began to come in from non-council members.

Of all the various proposals that were made regarding the alphabet, only one was basically different from all the others. This was made by a certain Mr. Stewart some time after Longley had begun printing with the eight-pair vowel scale. Though Stewart did not change any of the forms of the symbols, and used them for the same values as they were being used in the new eight-pair vowel scale, he did propose to change the
arrangement of the vowel scale, following the principles of pattern congruity, so as to have six groups with three vowels in each group rather than eight pairs. This arrangement would, of necessity, have certain blank spaces because of not having a distinctive English sound that could be used. His suggested arrangement would make the following groupings of representative key words:

---- eel ill
fair fail fell
palm pass pat
gall got ----
roll ---- run
---- fool full

The diphthongs he proposed were the sounds contained in mine, thou, you, oil, and aye. Evidently Stewart felt it necessary to make a distinction between the wide diphthong in aye from the narrow diphthong in mine. He suggested that for those who preferred a six-pair vowel scale this arrangement made six divisions, and the symbols for the sounds in fair, and pass could be optionally eliminated. However, since it made no provision for the sound of the vowel in cur, this alphabet could not have been expected to become popular with the many who felt this distinction necessary.

This first experimental eight-pair vowel scale alphabet was used by Longley from February 5, 1853, to June 4, 1853, and though there was considerable discussion of its merit and some dissatisfaction over it, it served him satisfactorily for a while. However, Longley's personal preference caused him to print in the second issue of May (V:162) an alphabet which he labeled, "A Working Alphabet." This was basically the
same as the 1847 alphabet as far as the needed vowel distinctions were concerned. The main difference lay in the form of some of the letters. He proposed that the only necessary distinctions in English were in the words eel-ill, ale-eil, arm-am, all-on, ope-up, and fool-full. For the vowel in ale he suggested a new form similar to that recommended by Andrews to the New York Convention, viz., a. This left the letter which in the revised experimental alphabet was used for this sound, a, to be used for the sound of the vowel in arm. He reassigned the symbol c, which had been used for the sound of the diphthong in oil ever since the early days of Pitman's experiments—since April, 1846, to be exact—and gave it the value of the vowel in all, giving the reason that he felt this symbol a better one for the vowel than the former symbol, a. For the diphthong in oil, then, he adopted a digraph composed of the vowel in on plus the vowel in ill, viz., oi. He also returned to the symbol j for the diphthong in mine which had been used in the 1847 alphabet for several years, rejecting the elongated symbol which extended below the line, i. In the consonants he made the first radical change that had been made since the 1846 revision. This was the adoption of k as a symbol for the velar voiceless plosive rather than c. The justification for such a radical departure is a complete reversal of his former position. He claimed that in the old romanic orthography the letter k was a stable sound, while the letter c was variable. He further justified the change on the ground of distinctness of form, claiming the letter c resembled the letter e too closely. He proposed to have a new form instead of the Greek theta, which was being used for the voiceless th, but that he had not yet the type cast. Another proposed innovation which he hoped to adopt at a later time in the "working
alphabet" was the creation of a new symbol for the sound of the long oo as in fool, so as to make it bear a closer resemblance to this double-o than did the former symbol, uu. After proposing this "working alphabet," designed, he claimed, for teachers and others concerned with the practical problem of applied phonotypy rather than for the more acute ear of the trained phonetician, he printed his first sample with the alphabet on May 29, 1853 (V:170). After this, evidently for the propaganda purpose of promoting his own alphabet, Longley printed his editorials in the "working alphabet."

After what was evidently felt to be a sufficient period of time to try out the alphabet which had been recommended in the early part of 1853, a second alphabet was experimentally tried which began in June of the same year and which continued through the remainder of the year. This alphabet was based on seven pairs of distinct sounds, omitting the symbol for the vowel in cur and for the New England short-o. This placed ope and up as the sixth pair of vowels. It is interesting to note that in this alphabet the form which Longley had designed for the vowel in ale, a was used, a form which it was hoped would satisfy both sides of the "American versus continental" controversy, since it resembled both a and e. The newer symbol for the diphthong in mine was also rejected on the ground that it was unsightly, and the older symbol, i, of the 1847 alphabet was reinstated. However, Longley's lead in adopting k for c was not followed by the Council until two months later, and was not printed in the Advocate until near the end of Volume V.

At this same time certain other changes were made in the assignment of values to the vowel symbols. The capital letter, A, which had
been assigned to the vowel in <i>arm</i> since 1846, was reassigned to the vowel in <i>air</i>, and a new symbol created for the vowel in <i>arm</i>. This new symbol looked approximately like this: $\mathbb{A}$. The lower case symbol which had been assigned to the vowel in <i>arm</i> was retained in the same form as in the first revision. The change of the capital was justified on the ground that the former capital, $\mathbb{A}$, for the vowel in <i>air</i>, was unsightly. The earlier lower case symbols for the vowels in <i>air</i> and <i>ale</i> were exchanged, which brought the official usage to correspond with that of Longley's "working alphabet." This gave the symbol $\mathbb{a}$ to the vowel in <i>ale</i> in order to satisfy both the "continental" and the "American" schools of thought. The next issue, however, brought a slight modification in this alphabet (V:205), and the symbols for the vowels in <i>air</i> and <i>arm</i>, both capital and lower case, were exchanged. The reason given for this action was that the vowel in <i>arm</i> was, by established romanic usage, more entitled to a symbol based on the Roman <i>a</i> than was the vowel in <i>air</i>, since the letter vowel had never been represented by the letter <i>a</i> alone in common orthography except when modified by <i>a</i> following <i>r</i>, as in <i>care</i>. This action assigned the symbols $\mathbb{A}$, $\mathfrak{a}$ to the vowel in <i>arm</i> and the symbols $\mathbb{a}$, $\mathfrak{a}$ to the vowel in <i>air</i> (and in <i>care</i> etc.)

Meanwhile, Longley was carrying out his promise to devise a new form for the vowel in <i>ooze</i> for his "working alphabet." His first type form was almost like the symbol for the long-<i>o</i> in <i>home</i>, (∞), with the center line carried completely through the circle, thus: ∞. On the first occasion in which he employed this symbol instead of the old <i>u</i> (V:198), Longley apologized for its form, and said he felt it could be improved. The next issue he adopted a form for this symbol something like this: ∞.
Another alphabet also making a bid for acceptance at this time was Pitman's revised alphabet of 1853. As we have mentioned, Pitman began to experiment extensively in 1851 and 1852, and had claimed to have developed an alphabet which was in all respects superior to any of his previous alphabets. However, since his alphabet was based on continental values for many of the Roman letters rather than English values, Ellis had broken with him. However, Pitman's publications had considerable circulation in this country, and there were some who felt his alphabet should be adopted in the United States for no other reason than that the two countries should have a uniform method of phonetic spelling. Pitman's vowel scale was based on a six-pair division, the values being the same as those in the original 1847 alphabet. The forms however, were changed, so that members of each pair were related in form as well as sound, a condition Pitman considered philosophically more perfect than assigning a form based on the English values of Roman letters. Thus, the first pair of high front vowels was based on the letter i, in this manner: i-i (I.P.A. /i/ and /ɪ/); the mid-front pair was based on the letter e in this manner: e-e (/ɛ/, /э/); the higher low front vowel in at and the low central vowel in father were based on the letter a in this manner: a-a (/a/, /æ/); the low back pair of vowels were based on the letter o, in this manner: o-o (/o/, /ə/); the mid-back vowel and the mid-central vowel were paired together, and though one of them was based on the letter ɔ, the other was not, a condition which violated Pitman's philosophic principle, giving these forms to this pair of symbols: ɔ-ɔ (/ɔ/, /ə/); the high back pair of vowels were based on the letter u, giving these symbols: u-u (/u/, /ю/). The small popularity that this alphabet
achieved in America is reflected, however, in the fact that when
the selection of an alphabet was submitted to the public, Pitman's
alphabet was rejected by a majority of 400 to 12.

During this period, competition with the Longley publication was
lessening, since the nearest competitor, the New York Propagandist
of Andrews and Trow, which had succeeded the former Anglo-Saxon
of earlier days, stopped publication during the year 1853. Webster's
publications in lithographed shorthand were having little or no effect
on Longley's phonotype activities, and none of the other periodicals
were sufficiently strong to offer any competition.

Toward the middle of 1853, Stone, President of the Council,
called for a final vote on the various alphabets that had been tried,
and though the call was made by circular and was not printed by the
Advocate, the mailing list of the Advocate was used as a guide for
sending the call to all interested phoneticians. According to a state­
ment of the number of ballots sent out and the number received, this
list of interested persons was approximately 1,500. Of this number, 618
replied by mailing in a ballot on some of, if not all, the questions
(VI:6). Though there were 42 questions submitted on this ballot, most
of them dealt with the manner of spelling certain specific words or
classes of words rather than with phonetic principles. For this reason
the entire slate of questions will not be considered in detail here.

However, since some of the items, including the tabulation of the voting
on the various alphabets proposed, are of sufficient interest or signi-
ficance to warrant discussion, they will be briefly mentioned.
The voting for the various alphabets was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer a six vowel scale?</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer 6 long and 7 short vowels?</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer 7 long and 7 short vowels?</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer an eight vowel scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(so as to distinguish cur and heard</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from cut, and stone from oak?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer to go back to the six vowel scale of</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-50?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer Mr. Pitman's present vowel scale?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer Longley and Brother's present</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six vowel scale? See the &quot;working alphabet&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarizing, we find a total of 396 in favor of a six vowel scale against a combined total of 293 for the seven and eight vowel scales, a majority of 103 of the votes cast. Other interesting items include a decision for k over c for the voiceless velar plosive by a majority of 130 votes. Further, this group showed a distinct preference for representing the vowel in laugh, fast, half, etc, with the same symbol as the vowel in at rather than with the vowel in arm. The use of a single symbol for the affricates in such words as cheer or jeer was preferred, by this group, to Pitman's system of representing them by a digraph. The same preference for the symbols of the old 1847 alphabet was expressed in the rejection of Greek theta as the symbol for the th in thin, with a majority of 222 to 120 favoring the old symbol, _, and was also reflected in the rejection of the symbol ɹ for /ɹ/, in favor of the older 1847 symbol ɹ, which was employed by Longley in his "working alphabet."

The following week the fact is reported that only 25 members of the Council had sent in their votes. Of these, 6 had voted for the six-pair vowel scale, 6 for a scale of six long and seven short vowels, 4
voted for seven long and seven short, and 9 voted for an eight-pair scale. On the c versus k controversy, the votes were: favoring c, 10; favoring k, 11; favoring both, 1; favoring either, 1. Longley then states (VI:6),

By an examination of about 150 votes from the most intelligent phoneticians, and from nearly every state in the union, we have found that full two thirds of them are in favor of increasing the vowel scale to seven or more. A very large majority are in favor of single signs for the diphthongs. About two thirds of the number are in favor of k, .

We have not yet made our decision; we shall wait a few weeks to see what our correspondents say of the results published; and after an impartial, though very interested consideration of the matter, we shall announce our course for the next five years, and as much longer as possible.

A short time later, a decision was announced which consigned Longley, from that time forward, to follow an independent course. This course ultimately led to Longley's becoming the leader in a second schism over the alphabet. He announced his decision in these words (VI:26),

We have just received a last vote of the Phonetic Council on certain questions, which we feel as much inclined to repudiate as the vote on the 5 vowel scale. From the present appearances, it seems to us that the whole of the disputed points must be settled by individual enterprise and influence. Such being our conviction, we shall from this time on act accordingly. . . .

But because we use a seven vowel scale, it does not follow that every one must use the same number. No trouble will come from writing or printing with six vowels used in the same sense as they are in the larger scale.

In the same issue in which he expressed these sentiments, Longley acknowledged receipt of an assortment of new type forms from Stone, and expressed the intention to incorporate them into the alphabet with the next edition. These new forms were: a new capital for the letter a (the sound of the vowel in ale) having the same form as the lower case letter, a, which was to replace the former rounded top Roman capital
letter, A; a new capital and lower case letter for the vowel in fool based on oo rather than on u, and having a form similar to that which Longley had expressed a desire for in his "working alphabet" earlier in the year, O, and a new symbol for voiceless th to take the place of the Greek theta then in use, a symbol based on the Roman t, and similar to the old 1847 symbol, thus: Æ. The new vowel capitals were adopted in printing the Advocate in following issue, September 24, 1853 (VI:29), and the new consonant symbol was adopted the next issue, October 1 (VI:33). This change allowed the elimination of the former capital A for the vowel in arm, which was felt to be unsightly, and the substitution for it of the rounded Roman capital, A, which had formerly been assigned to the sound of the a in ale. Longley considered these changes final, and pledged himself not to make any further alterations in the printed alphabet for ten years. A facsimile of the alphabet adopted at this time is given in Plate III.

Though he did not make any changes in the alphabet adopted at this time, Longley did yield to the pressure for having a distinct symbol for the sound of the vowel in earth. Several forms had been tried, and in the earlier experimental alphabet of 1853 a form based on u (u) had been tried with reasonable satisfaction. However, there was considerable objection to the philosophical principle of basing this symbol on u, and a strong inclination toward some symbol based on e. Benn Pitman, younger brother of Isaac Pitman who had, with Ellis, originated the phonotypic alphabet, who was residing in Cincinnati at this time, contended for the Roman e with two dots over it to represent this sound. Adams Jewett and Edwin Leigh both presented a symbol for this sound which used a single dot beneath the Roman e, thus: e.
### The Spelling Reform

#### Phonetic Alphabet

Each letter has the sound of the italicized letter of letters in the illustrative words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Vowels</td>
<td>Explicents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E e . cel . e</td>
<td>P p . pole . p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E e . earth . e</td>
<td>B b . bowl . b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H a . ale . a</td>
<td>T t . toe . t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A a . air . a</td>
<td>D d . doe . d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A a . arms . a</td>
<td>C g . cheer . c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O o . all . o</td>
<td>J j . jear . j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O o . oak . o</td>
<td>K k . king . k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O o . ooze . o</td>
<td>G g . game . g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i . ill . i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E e . ell . e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A a . am . a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O o . on . o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U u . up . u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W w . woood . w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E e . ice . i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O o . oil . o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y y . owl . w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U u . dupe . u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coalescents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y y . yea . ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W w . way . wa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breathing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H h . hay . h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W w . wood . w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R r . rare . r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nusals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M m . main . m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marks of punctuation are the same as in the old orthography, excepting the following changes and additions: The mark of interrogation is placed before the first word in a sentence indicates a query, ? at the end of a sentence indicates doubt; ! laughter; ! surprise; ! sorrow; the inverted * signifies the omission of a letter.

Plate III

Phonotypic Alphabet of 1853 (Facsimile from the Phonetic Advocate)
This latter symbol proved to be more generally acceptable, and was incorporated into Longley's alphabet May 20, 1854 (VII:165), and was continued without change until the middle of 1860. At this time, without giving warning to his readers or receiving authority from the still existing Council, Longley undertook to change the form of the last adopted symbol, viz., the symbol for the vowel in earth. About midway in his new periodical, The Journal of Progress, Longley changed the form of the symbol for this sound to: the lower case form of which suggests the form of present day schwa. Though there was some dissatisfaction with the new symbol, he continued to use it for the rest of the year, but returned to the dotted symbol in January, 1861.

To summarize, then, the modifications which took place in the alphabet from the time of the beginning of the American Phonetic Council until the final settlement of the alphabet (1852-1854) involved: first, the adoption in February, 1853 of a vowel scale based on eight pairs of vowels, with an equal number of long and short vowels; second, Longley's adopting in May of the same year an experimental "working alphabet," which incorporated several features which were later accepted by the Council; third, the rejection in June, 1853, of two of the symbols, those for the vowel in cur and for the New England un-rounded o, thus reducing the alphabet to seven pairs of vowels; meanwhile, during the year various letter forms were experimentally tried, modified, or shifted to represent different values; in July, 1853, the

---

letter c was rejected permanently in favor of k for the sound of the voiceless velar plosive; new type forms were designed in the latter part of 1853 for several of the vowels, and for the sound of th in thin, and were adopted in September and October of that year; and finally, a new symbol was created for the sound of the vowel in earth, which was added to the alphabet in May, 1854, giving a vowel scale with eight long and seven short vowels. Except for the one occasion six years later of changing the form of the symbol for the vowel in earth, no further changes were made in the phonotypic alphabet, following a pledge by Longley, and an agreement by the council, that they would undertake no further changes in the alphabet for ten years. In Figure 6 there is a comparative breakdown of the various changes which were made during this period. The chart shows the vowels and only those consonants which were not based on familiar Roman consonants in their usual significance.

Whether the new alphabet of 1854 was superior to that designed in 1847 by Pitman and Ellis is a matter of judgment. However, it was a distinctively American creation, and departed radically from the course pursued by Pitman in England and different somewhat from the course pursued by Ellis. It can, therefore, be properly called the American Phonotypic Alphabet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>I.P.A</th>
<th>1847 Alphabet</th>
<th>First 1853</th>
<th>&quot;Working Alphabet&quot;</th>
<th>2nd 1853</th>
<th>Final American Alphabet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cel</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>E E E E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>I i I i</td>
<td>I i I i</td>
<td>I i I i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nle</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>A a</td>
<td>A a</td>
<td>A a A a</td>
<td>A a A a</td>
<td>A a A a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eel</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>E e E e</td>
<td>E e E e</td>
<td>E e E e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ess</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eel</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
<td>A æ A æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>O O</td>
<td>O O O O</td>
<td>O O O O</td>
<td>O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nes</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>U u</td>
<td>U u</td>
<td>U u U u</td>
<td>U u U u</td>
<td>U u U u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>U u</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cool</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>W w</td>
<td>W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>W w</td>
<td>W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
<td>W w W w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rne</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mine</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shot</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thot</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wish</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thin</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6

Chart Showing The American Alphabet Experiments
CHAPTER IV

THE PHONETIC PUBLISHING FIRM OF THE LONGLEYS

Hope springs eternal in the human breast,
Man never is, but always to be, blest.
Pope

At the heart of every enterprise, whether great or small, stands a man, a single individual, a dominant personality, to whom others yield as spokesman for the rest. In viewing any group or enterprise, we often direct our attention to such an individual and assume that as he is, so is the group, and as he speaks, so speaks the group. That such a person should dominate the group of Longley brothers in their phonetic printing business is, therefore, not unusual. This person was the eldest brother, Elias, usually referred to in the Longley periodical as the "senior editor." Consequently, a study of the activities of the firm of the Longley brothers is largely a consideration of the activities and opinions of the senior editor, who admitted responsibility for all editorial matters, and who largely charted the policies of the firm in publishing matters.

In order to study the Longley firm, we should first study the Longley family. Let us, therefore, devote a few moments to a consideration of the family background. The father of the Longley brothers, A. H. Longley, was, as we noted in Chapter I, a Universalist minister, and a disciple of the Fourier system of socialism. In 1832, when Elias was only nine years old, the Longley family moved from Oxford, Ohio, seeking a new home farther west. After arriving at Indianapolis, Indiana, the father was told of the newly laid out Boone County to the northwest of that city. Two more days of travel brought them to the
county seat, Lebanon, which proved to exist only on the surveyor's map. Here they camped for about two weeks while they cleared timber from the land and built a log shelter. Later they built a larger house, the first in the town. Soon other inhabitants began to arrive. Elias and his younger brothers, then, grew up in a condition of enforced frugality, hard work, and self-reliance. Such education as they obtained must have come from their parents, since no school existed in Lebanon during these days.

The relative ages of the brothers is not known, nor is it known whether all of them had been born at the time the Longley family moved to Lebanon, or whether there were other children than the five brothers who later engaged in the printing business together. Of the five we know about, Elias, Servetius, Septimius, Cyrenius, and Alcander, only the older two, Elias and Servetius, were sufficiently mature to seek their fortune in the world at the time the Longleys moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1810. These two attached themselves to a printer in Indianapolis, where they learned the printing trade. Later they returned to Cincinnati and eventually set up a phonetic printing office in the late spring of 1818. Evidently the business was the sole property of Elias at first (XII:237), but by January of the next year the second brother, Servetius, joined him as a partner. The name of the firm, Longley and Brother, indicates something of the nature of the partnership. Evidently, from the fact that he dictated editorial policy and charted the course of the company in their various publications, Elias was the "Longley" of the firm and Servetius was the "Brother." Gradually they expanded the business into an ordinary printing firm. (Ibid.)
It is impossible to give a physical description of Elias Longley, for the simple reason that no factual information has been found. We can assume that he was a man of fairly robust health, for at the age of 68 he was still writing, though he had given up the publishing business many years earlier.¹

In temperament, Elias was something of an enthusiast in whatever he attached himself to. As we have mentioned in Chapter I, he was interested in a number of different reform movements, an attitude which is reflected in the title of the seventh volume of his phonetic periodical, when he changed the name to Type of the Times. This periodical was said to be "Devoted to all the True Interests of the Human Race." This enthusiasm is reflected constantly in his discussions, editorially, of the cause of the phonetic spelling reform. However, as an enthusiast, he was not overbearing or uncompromisingly zealous. He evidently had a rather well developed sense of humor, which allowed him to write without rancor in reply to his critics (or to critics of his espoused cause, the spelling reform). On one particular occasion when a certain Dr. Mudd, member of the school committee in Cincinnati, undertook to fight uncompromisingly against the introduction of an experimental phonetic school in that city, and engaged in certain tactics of questionable ethics in order to win his point, Longley exhibited what, in this writer's opinion, was a remarkable degree of good humor and self-restraint in replying several times to the attacks Mudd made against the reform

¹The last known work of Elias Longley, so far as we can determine, was: The National Typewriter Instructor, by the Eight Finger Method, New York: Typewriter Headquarters, 1891. The method was adapted to the Yost and Barlock machine.
and against those who were promoting it. Longley commented that he was sure Mudd was a man of good intention who, if ever he could be persuaded to accept and promote the phonetic cause, would be a valuable asset. Mudd replied, in a letter which Longley published (IV:7h), stated his appreciation of Longley's personal compliments, and said,

> Now I certainly can cheerfully and cordially reciprocate the compliment, for really I have never met with one whose mildness and amiableness of character I more admire, than I do your own, Mr. Editor.

Evidently Elias Longley tempered his enthusiasm with good judgment and tact, and instead of trying to force the reform, he faithfully held it before the people in his periodical with a continuous suggestion that the responsibility for promoting the work lay among the friends of the movement rather than in a single leader. He printed impartially letters praising the movement and letters opposing it, letters agreeing with his policies and letters contrary to them. He praised suggestions of evident merit and good judgment, even though they might be contrary to his own past policy, and in some instances he incorporated in his paper the suggestions made. This fair-mindedness was doubtless a contributing factor to his being able to continue in the phonetic publishing business as long as he did, rather than falling by the wayside, after one or two years of publishing, as some other publishers of phonetic periodicals had done.

When the Pitman system of phonography moved westward to Cincinnati, Longley and his brother became interested in it. They were at that time renting a portion of floor space in Gurlie's book store in the old Melodeon building on Fourth Street, just west of Walnut Street, in Cincinnati. What arrangement they had in this location is unknown, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that they had taken over the book
store from its former owner or else had taken over the premises in which Gurlie had formerly run a bookstore. Either of these arrangements placed them in position to go into the book selling business and an opportunity later to go into the printing business. It is reasonable to suppose that two recently apprenticed young printers did not come to Cincinnati with a large amount of cash for establishing themselves in business, and to suppose that during their earlier days they struggled to win their place in the competitive printing and publishing business of Cincinnati.

Regardless of the details of these early days of their firm, we know they seized the opportunity to become agents for Pitman's phonetic books in the area served by Cincinnati, and in 1847 established a depot for Pitman's phonetic books and materials published in England. They had maintained this relation with Pitman for nearly a year when it became evident to them that a phonetic periodical might be profitable, and they decided to undertake the publication of one. They ordered a reasonably large font of phonetic type, of a single size only, from Pitman, and undertook to learn to become phonetic compositors. This first font of type was not as neat or clean cut as some of their later type was, having an appearance almost like present day typewriter type. But it was phonotype, like that of Pitman, and with it the Longleys began publication of their first issue of a phonetic periodical in July, 1848.

Since this periodical was their principal phonetic publication during the next twelve years, it is proper that we spend some time examining it in detail. The first volume was a 12mo size sheet of 24 pages bearing the title The Phonetic Magazine, A Cheap Monthly Periodical,
Devoted to the Interests of Education By Means of the Spelling Reform; To Literature, Science and Art. Elias Longley was listed as editor, with Longley and Brother listed as publishers and printers. The magazine opened with a lead article in ordinary orthography entitled "The Printing and Writing Reform," purporting to show the follies of ordinary orthography and the desirability of a phonetic system. The phonotypic alphabet was then introduced on page 4, followed by this note, printed in ordinary spelling:

A few words of explanation may be necessary, to enable a person to comprehend the above Alphabet. It is composed of 40 letters, intended to represent the 40 elements of our language. These are arranged under appropriate heads, according to the position of the organs of speech by which they are made. They are divided, more or less accurately, into pairs; those on the left of the single rule, of the vowels, being long, and on the right, short; of the consonants, the first are heavy and the second light. To the right of each character is placed a word containing an example of its sound, which sound is now represented by the italic letter, or letters, in the word.

By a careful observance of the alphabet for a few moments, any one will be enabled to read the matter of the opposite page very readily. If it looks a little odd at first, never mind; it improves with acquaintance. The beauty and simplicity of the system will soon occupy your mind instead of the forms of the letters.

The remainder of the magazine was printed entirely in phonotype, and contained a variety of miscellaneous matter apparently gleaned from several sources and re-written in phonotype. The work, probably, of the editor, who admitted, editorially, on page 19,

We have often remarked the fact, that the first number of a new paper or periodical is almost certain to be the poorest of the volume. . . .

Of the reading matter we have nothing to say. It will doubtless please some, while others will think it trash; . . . We have the promise of various original articles, from good writers, for future numbers, which we are confident will give interest to our columns. . . .

In several other particulars the appearance of our paper may be much improved,—all of which will be attended to in due time.
A feature of the magazine which was regularly retained for many years was a section devoted to "Correspondence." In the first number of the first volume there were several letters, from Martin Kellogg, of Norwalk, Ohio, E. Webster of Cincinnati, Ohio, and M.N. Byington, of Columbus, Ohio, each of whom commended Longley for embarking on the course of phonetic publishing, and wished success to the magazine. This fact indicates that Longley had been in correspondence with a number of his friends, and had, probably, through them and through the medium of the Cincinnati Phonographic Society, obtained an initial mailing list. In addition to a prepublication list of subscribers, Longley also mailed the first copy to a large number of prospective subscribers, asking them for their patronage and editorially requesting anyone into whose hands the paper might fall to pass it along, and to assure themselves of future issues by sending in a dollar for a year's subscription.

Except for the lead article in the first issue, the remainder of the first volume is printed entirely in phonotype. Volume II continued the same size as Volume I, but changed the title to: *The Phonetic Advocate. Devoted to Education by means of the Spelling Reform: To Literature, Science and Art.* This second volume lists Elias and Servetus Longley as editors, with the same firm name of Longley and Brother, printers and publishers. With the beginning of the second volume it was decided to print the magazine semi-monthly rather than monthly. They gave the subscriber the same amount for his money by reducing the size of each issue from twenty-four to twelve pages, so that each subscriber received the same number of pages of reading matter as he had formerly. With this volume they printed a "wrapper" or cover page,
having a standard appearance and printed in ordinary type. The front page of this cover carried an article giving a brief history of the spelling and writing reform movement, an explanation of the need for reforming the atrocious orthography of English, and a series of testimonials from various persons (unknown to this writer) concerning the value of phonotypy. The reverse of the front cover carried the phonetic alphabet, which for the first half of the volume, thirteen numbers, gives not only the capital and lower case printed form of each symbol but also the capital and lower case longhand, or script, form and forms for a number of sounds not used in English. These last were evidently taken from Ellis's *An Alphabet of Nature,* which was designed for international use. For the first half of Volume II Longley sent a number of free copies to prospects who were not subscribers, but discontinued this practice after the thirteenth issue. In addition he carried on this inside cover a running advertisement for agents to represent him by taking subscriptions on a commission basis. He optimistically predicts,

The uniqueness of its character, if nothing else, will find a subscriber in every community where it may be presented. And when the nature and object of the work are portrayed in a proper manner, every intelligent and scientific person will give his influence and support.

Evidently this method of promotion was successful, for the firm prospered considerably that year. At the end of the third month the following statement is made (II:71), by way of assuring prospective patrons of the stability of the cause and of their periodical:

---

We are happy to give them assurances that their exertions have sustained us well thus far— that is, our receipts are paying current expenses; we have not been embarrassed in the least, and if there is no decrease of interest in the reform takes place, [sic] we shall get along without any trouble.

As a data [sic] by which to judge of the business being done, we may state, that during the past three months we have done more than in the whole twelve months previous; . . . We do not give these statements as a hint that our friends may relax their efforts in the good cause; . . . there is much work still to be done, and it must be done before any great results can be accomplished.

The statement that "during the past three months we have done more than in the whole twelve months previous" is one which could lead to erroneous conclusions. It was pointed out at the end of Volume I (I:233) that the firm was beginning their second year with "less than fifty subscribers," so that the trebled business did not mean a great amount.

In addition to the standing front cover, the second volume devoted both sides of a back cover to advertising, which, though occasionally varied, was largely the same. A few firms in Cincinnati contributed standing advertisements, but the major portion of the advertising space was devoted to plugging the various items the Longleys had for sale, including the Pitman books.

A new feature which had not appeared in the first volume, appeared with the beginning of Volume II. This was the use of a lead article in ordinary spelling dealing with or explaining some feature of the proposed spelling reform. This was done, according to the editors, in order that persons picking up the magazine for the first time might be introduced to its purpose in an article printed in the old style, lest the strange appearance of the new phonetic type should discourage them before they had time to get acquainted with the movement and with the paper. Thus they hoped to proselyte converts to the cause rather than
drive them away with an unfamiliar orthography. They admitted that
the idea was adopted from Pitman's practice in his English publication,
and at the same time they also pointed out that Pitman was enabled to
send numerous free copies of his publications to clergymen, members of
parliament, and other persons of influence, through the voluntary
contributions of friends of the reform. He hinted that the American
friends of the reform should do no less.

The educational character of Longley's magazine became increas­
ingly evident in Volume II, though there was some hint of it in the
first volume. In the issue of November 15, 1849 (II:96) the following
editorial appears:

What have become of all the school and educational
papers in the west? We have scarcely received one for six
months; there must be a suspension or discontinuance on
the part of some that once came to us regularly. From
present appearances we will soon claim for the Phonetic
Advocate the character of the educational paper of the west.
We think it can already boast of more educational reading
matter, and a greater sympathy from school teachers than
any professed school paper in the western states; and from
present indications we hope its circulation among school
trustees and teachers will be larger than any other. And
who will say that it does not deserve this favor? Intelligent
instructors testify to us almost every day that they find
in the Advocate and our books, knowledge of great interest
and service to them that they can not find elsewhere.

Reader, does the school teacher in your district know
of the existence of our paper? Have you called the attention
of the school directors of trustees to the subject of phonetic
spelling, and asked them to read the Advocate? If not, we
hope you will not put it off another week. Time is rolling
on, and we ought to keep the ball of reform moving. Let it
be known that the Phonetic Advocate is the only thorough
educational paper in the west.

Sometime earlier Longley had pointed out to a reader, who had sug­
gested the introduction of a column of shorthand in the Advocate (for
the benefit of persons learning phonography), that to print both short­
hand and ordinary print on the same page would necessitate engraving
plates for the shorthand (which when printed alone could be printed by lithography), and that this would create an expense they did not feel able to bear. It is noteworthy, then, that in January, 1850 they carried the announcement that they intended to carry a course in phonography beginning with the issue of February 1. This was to be done that a person might instruct himself without the need for a teacher, and it was carefully pointed out that for the mere price of a subscription to the Advocate a person could benefit from a course that would cost him five or six dollars if taken under a teacher. Though this was obviously undertaken to increase the circulation of the paper, their business must have been continually prospering during the latter part of 1849 for them to have been willing to go to this considerable additional expense. Longley had meanwhile prevailed upon members of the American Phonetic Society, (the expanded organization which had formerly been composed of such small local organizations as the Cincinnati Phonetic Society had been) to correspond with any students who wrote them, and also to correct any exercises sent them by the students—provided the student paid postage two ways. The course was given as promised, so that from February 1, through July 1, 1850 at least one page, and sometimes more, was devoted to phonography. This brought about a change in the manner of presenting the phonetic alphabet. Instead of presenting the printed and the manuscript alphabets in parallel columns as had been done earlier, the alphabet was now printed with the phonographic, or shorthand, strokes for the sounds in one column, with the phonotype equivalents and the key words in parallel columns. The non-English sounds which had been formerly printed were discontinued.
However, near the end of the course in phonography Longley decided to re-institute the manuscript alphabet, and made an announcement of his intent as follows (II:218):

The script alphabet that we kept in our paper for a while was not creditable to the reform. We have had a new one engraved, with the hope of a better piece of workmanship, and slight improvements in form. It will appear in our next.

An examination of this new script alphabet shows only that the letters have more flourish, though a few of the capitals had undergone a rather radical change in order to make them more nearly correspond to the lower case forms.

March, 1850, brought a new member to the firm, A. H. Longley, father to the brothers, who was presented as an "associate editor." In this capacity he contributed a short article for each issue, usually on some social problem. March also brought an announcement that beginning with the April 1 issue a column slanted toward the needs of medical students would be carried. This was to be a "Glossary of Medical Terms," written by Prof. H. P. Gatchel of the Ecclectic Medical College of Cincinnati. The glossary was to contain not only the definitions of the words which often gave students trouble, but also a phonetic representation following the ordinary spelling, so that the student need have no doubt as to the proper pronunciation. The editor suggested that the column might be of interest to the general reader by increasing his vocabulary as well as by giving him a knowledge of medical terminology.

During the second volume a great many reform fires were fanned, probably in an attempt to spread the appeal of the magazine over a wider area. This policy was criticized by Haldeman, who wrote that the
Advocate should spend more time and space in writing about the spelling reform itself, and not waste space with other matters. In cautioning the Longleys not to jeopardize the cause of the spelling reform, he said (II:228):

The Advocate will have a wide field and plenty of variety in sticking to its title; and it will have quite enough to do in allaying the prejudices against phonetic spelling, without hurting its position by unnatural alliances.

I am glad to see phonetic articles in the Advocate, even if I have had them already in the English periodicals. But I would like to see original articles from some of your correspondents upon subjects they have studied...

Longley did not receive this criticism of his policy without making a reply. In an editorial preface to Haldeman's article he said,

...but in intimating that we should exclude every thing from our paper but what relates to the spelling reform, the writer shows that he has had no experience in the publishing business. We might just as well discontinue the Advocate, as to fill it with essays on phonetic science and the discussion of the measures for its establishment; for there are not a thousand persons in the United States that would take a paper of such a character. Reformers are not all scientific men; and not more than half of them can afford to take two papers, hence we are compelled to change even the present character of our paper, and give it the more popular form of a weekly newspaper.

About two months before the close of the second volume, then, Longley anticipated the radical change in the format of his publication. He announced that beginning with Volume III he would put out a weekly newspaper rather than a semi-monthly magazine. Though there were some who wrote that he was taking too great a chance in making this change, and that a weekly paper would not receive the support that the magazine had received, the editors confidently went ahead, They raised their subscription price from $1.00 per year to $1.50 per year, believing that persons interested in the reform had sooner
pay the larger amount for a weekly paper than the smaller amount for a semi-monthly magazine. They anticipated the need for promotional activity, though, and for a few issues before the end of Volume II kept this advertisement running:

Ministers of the Gospel will be promoting the interests of Morality and Religion in several respects by acting as Agents for this paper; by placing in the hands of community [sic] unobjectionable reading matter, and accelerating the change in our orthography, which will tend to make education universal.

School Teachers also, by using their influence to obtain subscribers, will hasten the day when their monotonous drudgery will be abolished, and their services be required in the higher and more interesting branches of education.

Post Masters, and all influential men in society, by lending their aid to bring the subject of phonetic spelling before the whole community, will be doing the work of true patriotism and genuine philanthropy.

He then offered to those who would undertake to act as agents a commission of 50 cents on each subscription they obtained. This prospectus of the third volume appeared June 1, 1850, on the front cover:

The Third Volume of the FONETIC ADVOCAT commences, August 1, 1850, under the most favorable auspices, as a Weekly Journal of News, Science, Literature, and Reform

It will be printed on an Imperial Sheet, and with New Type

LONGLEY AND BROTHER, PUBLISHERS & EDITORS

The proprietors of this now well established periodical, take pleasure in announcing the forthcoming volume as a weekly newspaper. Heretofore it has, aside from its phonetic character, been too indefinite, and too much withdrawn from the busy [sic] scenes of the world, to make it of general interest. The greater number of persons can afford to take but one paper, and wish that to compass the entire field of News, Science, Miscellany, &c. Hence, as we wish the whole world to become phonetic readers, we have resolved to issue a paper that will meet all the wants of the family circle. We shall enter the great arena of life, and make such observations on Men and Things--on Institutions and Theories, as shall seem best fitted, in our judgement, to promote the welfare and enjoyment of our readers. We shall give as varied a selection of News Items, Scientific Extracts,
and Miscellaneous Articles as it is possible to obtain from the great sea of papers and books afloat in the world. In short, in as far as the diversified tastes of a great company can be satisfied at any one table, so shall the Phonetic Advocate be acceptable to all who become the recipients of its counties.

Friend, we have a desire that you should share with our ten thousand other readers the excellencies of the paper we print; consider a moment, then, while we make special reference to a particular feature of our journal, namely,—

its phonetic character

The Advocate was originated to aid in bring about a reform in our written and printed language, by means of which the tedious process of learning to read is rendered speedy and pleasant. This work it has now so firmly established in various parts of the country, that a final triumph of the system is no longer doubted. Its merits have been so well tested, in schools and in the every-day business of life, that the people now demand their daily reading to conform to the same principles of truth and brevity. They claim the following advantages of a phonetic newspaper, which, with one who can read the common spelling, can, after a few minutes study, be easily read, and after a few weeks experience will be preferred to any other style;—

1. To begin with the least, one-eighth more reading matter is put on the same sized sheet with the same size of type;—thus showing that the reformed mode will economize twelve-and-a-half per cent, which, so far as it goes, is more valuable than ten per cent interest on money.

2. From the simplicity of the spelling, blundering readers and children just learning will very rapidly become correct and fluent in reading;—a very desirable object certainly, with all those who value the acquisition of knowledge.

3. Every word being spelled just as it is pronounced, the readers of a phonetic newspaper will be relieved from the jaw-breaking process of stumbling unintelligibly over the hard words of our own language, and the foreign names and phrases that are now constantly recurring in the news of the day. After reading one or two numbers of this paper, no one will hesitate as to the proper pronunciation of every word he finds on its pages. In this particular, on its merits as a newspaper alone, the Advocate will be more valuable than any periodical in the United States.

4. This journal will be invaluable to such persons as have acquired a bad pronunciation and wish to correct it. It is far better than any pronouncing dictionary yet printed, being more explicit and precise. It will be very instrumental in doing away with the vulgarisms so common in some sections of country, and establishing a uniform pronunciation in all the land.
5. Not to enter further into detail, the patronizing of a phonetic newspaper will be giving your support and influence towards the thorough establishment of scientific truth where it has long been demanded; it will be assisting in the great and philanthropic work of making the universal education of the poor possible; and in thus aiding to simplify the representation of the English language, you will become patriots of the noblest stamp—for in phoneticizing our language, making it easy of acquisition and free from corrupting influences, we will do more towards extending our free institutions and causing the English [sic] to become the classic language of the world, than might ever be done by the display of American swords and bayonets over subjugated territories and vanquished nations.

A limited space in the Advocate will be devoted to the exposition and illustration of phonetic principles, and also to a brief record of its progress in this country and Europe, in which are found many anecdotes and incidents illustrative of "human nature" the world over. But none of this will divert the attention of the Editors from their grand aim of supplying those who patronize their enterprise with the very best collection of the news of the world. Cincinnati, being near "The center of the world," affords facilities not possessed by any western city, nor excelled by any in the east, for collecting the latest news from every section of country. All that is important in the daily telegraphic dispatches will be sifted out and presented to our readers in a more satisfactory form than in those weeklies made up with the type hastily thrown together for the dailies. Ours will be an original newspaper. The European news and correspondence will be condensed so as to present only facts of real interest and narratives the most instructive. Reports of speeches, lectures, &c taken by phonographic writing, will constitute an instructive and interesting department of the Advocate, a feature that is not possessed by any Cincinnati paper. A weekly review of the market (a very important matter to our country friends, and to business men generally), will be carefully made out from the best authorities, and presented in a comprehensible form.

We will promise no more, but simply say that we hope to give reasonable satisfaction to all who may favor us with their patronage.
It can be readily seen from this prospectus that the Longleys were intending to expand the scope of their periodical considerably. For the new enterprise they moved to new quarters—probably more spacious than the former quarters—around the corner from their former location, on Walnut Street rather than on Fourth Street, and described as "between Fourth and Fifth Streets." Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of Volume III is the promise to print verbatim reports of speeches and lectures which were to be given in various places, which had been transcribed in phonography either by one of the editors or by some member of the American Phonetic Society. However, this held more promise than fulfillment, and most of the verbatim reporting published was of such items as the proceedings of the School Board, proceedings of the Woman's Rights Convention (and other conventions), report of the First Phonetic Festival, actions of the Indiana Constitutional Convention, and things of that sort. This gives little to the student of rhetoric who might be interested in verbatim reports of speeches. However, a few speeches were recorded such as: a speech by Hon. John P. Hale, given before the New England Society at the celebration of the 230th anniversary of the landing of the pilgrims (III:86), transcribed in shorthand by John B. Burns; A Lecture on Religion by O.S. Fowler, transcribed by F.A.B. Simpkins; Dr. Buchanan's Lectures on Psychometry, evidently transcribed by the editor of the Advocate, since it is not credited to any one else (III:114); a lecture on The Necessity and Advantage of Labor by Samuel F. Carey, esq., and transcribed by F.A.B. Simpkins (III:130); a speech by a certain Mr. Owen "on receiving from Prof. Larabee the silver pitcher presented by the women of Indiana in commendation of his efforts to secure to them legal rights in property"
Volume III undertook for the first time to include fictional material in the paper. It began with a serialized story entitled "Curry Cummings," by L.A. Hine. A second serial was entitled "The Jew's Prophecy," by T.J. Vator, a story which ran almost to the end of the volume. A series of short stories bearing such titles as "The Virgin Wife," anonymously written, "The Dangers of Dining Out" (in two parts), by Mrs. Ellis (initials unknown), "The Sea Captain's Return," anonymously written, and "Christmas on the Prairie," by Mary Irving, filled in the issues not carrying a serial. An interesting extra feature was the appearance, serially, of Pope's Essay on Man in phonotype.

Toward the end of Volume III Longley asked for volunteers among his readers to write a series of articles "advocating the theory and practicability of the writing and spelling reform," which were to be printed as tracts during the summer (III:134). The purpose for the tracts is not mentioned, but it was probably for propaganda purposes in promoting the reform. The editors proposed that all articles not used for tracts (which he was not intending to print in unlimited variety) would be used ultimately as lead articles in the Advocate in the column headed "The Reform." In exchange for these articles the Advocate was to be sent free for a year, not, as Longley pointed out, as payment, but as a token of appreciation and acknowledgement.

Evidently by the middle of Volume III the Longley periodical was rather firmly established, as is attested by a remark by Jewett, commenting on the desirability of having Longley as secretary to the American Phonetic Council, and of having his paper as the official organ
of that body. Jewett says (III:126):

You are the publisher of the only phonetic paper which really circulates among the masses; and it will be, of course, the interest and desire of the Council to reach, as far as possible, the phonetic mind of the country. . . . Friend Webster truly deserves highly of the phoneticians of the country; . . . but he is not at present in a position to do that service to the cause which you can render.

The format of Volumes III and IV was identical, though there were a few minor changes made internally in Volume IV. One of the changes was the discontinuance of the phonetic longhand alphabet, which had been printed regularly through Volume III, and the reduction of the block containing the phonetic alphabet to about one fourth the size it had formerly occupied. At this time, also, the phonetic alphabet was divided into groups of sounds and labeled. There were nine divisions of the alphabet, though one, breathing, contained only one symbol. These divisions were: long vowels, short vowels, diphthongs, coalescents, breathing, explodents, continuants, liquids, and nasals. These divisions had previously been understood, but until the appearance of this volume of the Advocate the designations for the various types of sounds had not been printed with any of the alphabets.

The use of a lead article on page 1 was discontinued after the first few issues of Volume IV, so that the first page was devoted entirely to general reading (sometimes fictional) printed in phonotype. Occasionally a short article on the reform in ordinary orthography was printed on page two—evidently some of the left-over tract articles previously mentioned—but the appearance of such articles was by no means regular.

In Volume III, a good deal of space had been given, unofficially, to the discussion of the election of the American Phonetic Council. In
Volume IV, when Longley was elected Secretary to that organization he agreed to devote a portion of his paper to "Opinions of the Council," a column in which the various problems confronting the council could be thrashed out. In spite of his fears that the paper would suffer from the open discussion of changing the alphabet, Longley's publishing business evidently prospered satisfactorily during the time of the discussion, for he mentions in the issue of March 13, 1852 (IV:130), that the *Advocate* had 1700 subscribers at that time. This, when contrasted with the fewer than 50 at the time of beginning Volume II, indicates considerable growth. As a result, probably, of this increase in circulation, we note considerable increase in the amount and variety of advertising carried, which, as all newspapermen know, is more conducive to financial prosperity than are subscription receipts.

Volumes V and VI are generally very much like Volumes III and IV. The discussion of the alphabet begun in the fourth volume is continued through the fifth, though more and more attention is devoted to the forms of the letters. This phase of the work has been discussed in detail in the third chapter of this study; consequently, it does not need further consideration here. Aside from the adoption at various times of the newly accepted type forms, there is little to note as far as the content of these two volumes is concerned. However, we do note that Volume VI is actually only a half-volume, running from August to January. The editors explained that they did this in order to bring the beginning of each volume to correspond with the calendar year, and that subscriptions bought at the beginning of the volume will be continued for their full twelve months, regardless of the ending of the volume.
Volume VII, then, begins Saturday, January 1, 1854, bearing the new title *Type of the Times*, a title which the paper retained throughout the remainder of its life. It continued as a weekly, but was printed on eight pages half the size of the former newspaper. Though the readers were getting approximately as much reading material, the subscription price was raised once more, this time to $2.00 per year, with club rates for two or more copies to the same address of $1.50. The content is of about the same sort as that of the previous volumes. The first two pages were devoted to miscellaneous reading, frequently in ordinary type; the third page was a mixture of phonotype and regular type of a miscellaneous character; page four was the editorial page, sometimes written by Elias Longley, sometimes by Servetius, and sometimes by other writers, and usually of a philosophic nature; page five began with the phonetic alphabet, as revised in 1853, and was devoted to the spelling reform; page six and part of page seven was given to "News of the Week" and to late telegraph dispatches; the remainder of page seven and the last column (sometimes the last two columns) of page eight was given over entirely to advertising, while the first three columns of page eight was devoted, usually, to a fictional item of some sort, either complete in itself or part of a serial.

The beginning of 1854 saw also some changes in the firm itself, for at this time the three younger brothers, Cyrenius, Sepimius, and Alcander, were taken into the firm on a five year partnership agreement. There is a suggestion that these younger brothers had served an apprenticeship in phonetic type setting under their older brothers for some time before being accepted into the firm. At any rate, 1854 saw the first publication of the firm known for five years as "Longley Brothers."
One of the interesting events of the year 1854 was the beginning of Smalley's *Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language* mentioned earlier. On October 28th of that year (VII:339) an impression of the first two pages of this publication was given in the paper. That this dictionary was to have an influence on Longley's printing practices is indicated by the following remark, made in a short editorial calling attention to the fact that the stereotyping of the dictionary was rapidly being done:

In reading the proofs thus far we have had a hundred minor points of pronunciation to settle, many of which have never been thought of before; and in so doing have found not a few errors which we have practiced for years without having them called in question. From this time on we shall conform our spellings, in the paper and other publications, to the standard, as fast as it progresses.

During the year 1854, the first competition in phonetic publishing which the Longleys had ever faced, as far as their geographical area was concerned, developed. This was the result of the arrival of Benn Pitman (brother to Isaac Pitman, previously mentioned). Pitman formed a partnership with a certain R.P. Prosser, of Cincinnati, and opened another phonetic printing establishment, which, though not in direct competition with Longley's phonotypic business, did cut into his shorthand business considerably. Since the sale of phonographic material had always been the most lucrative part of the business, often supporting the less remunerative phonotypic business, the competition was financially damaging. This fact, coupled with the general slackening of interest in the spelling reform that had developed during the days of

---

3See footnote, p.69, Chapter III.
the discussion of changes in the alphabet, caused Longley to contemplate a slightly different course for the next volume. When in November of 1854, Prosser broke with Benn Pitman and established a third phonetic printing house in Cincinnati, Longley determined to expand the circulation of his periodical by designing it to appeal to a wider clientele. Rationalizing that his proposed course would, in the long run, win friends for the reform he explained his proposed program for the coming volume, in a prospectus printed in the last two issues of Volume VII:

We expect to displease a few of our readers in the announcement we are about to make, but we can not help it; we have in view only the good of the cause, . . .

In the enlargement of our paper we aim at securing a large list of Romanic readers who care nothing about Phonetics; and hence we shall fill its columns to a considerable extent with Romanic spelling, giving this class of patrons as much and as great a variety of reading matter as they would get in ordinary papers, and leave it optional with them to read the Phonetic spelling or let it alone. A large portion of this class will become interested, and finally engage in the promotion of the Reform as earnestly as the best of us. And through their reception of the paper the friends of hundreds of them will have their attention drawn to the subject that otherwise would not be reached, and Phonetic disciples will be increased indefinitely. . . .

While, to those who wish the Type of the Times merely as a Phonetic paper, it will not be rendered less serviceable or interesting. We will give full as much phonetic reading as now, and we hope a vast deal more of Phonetic intelligence.

Volume VIII was probably the most radically different volume of their periodical that the Longleys published during their entire career. At the same time that they changed the format of their periodical to appeal to a large mass of readers, they launched upon a program of general printing, in common orthography, which may have had the effect of dividing their efforts to the neglect of the phonetic reform.

However we view it, Volume VIII is probably the most interesting, as far as content is concerned, since Volume II. In the first place,
it is the largest volume of the entire series, since each issue, published weekly, consisted of sixteen pages rather than the former eight. This gave a total of 816 pages for the bound volume, and there would have been 832 but for the fact that only 51 numbers were published (Subscribers were sent an extra issue of the next volume to make up the deficiency). The first eight pages were in ordinary type, and contained stories, news items, essays, and general reading matter of the sort you would expect to find in any regular weekly paper of the time. The last four pages were also in ordinary type, though at least half, sometimes more, of each of the last four pages was given over to advertising matter, which had expanded considerably both in variety and in quantity. This left only four pages of the paper to be used for the Phonetic Reform. The phonetic alphabet was given on the ninth page, and the four pages devoted to the reform were printed in phonotype. Probably the only feature (except the phonetic section) distinguishing the Type from any other newspaper was an inclination to focus considerable attention, by the use of selected news items as well as by editorials and essays, on various reform movements throughout the country.

In the section devoted to the spelling reform in the third number, appeared an account of the meeting of the Ohio Phonetic Association's convention at which was given: "REPORT, On the Influence which the practical study of Phonetics will have on improving the Elocution of public speakers, and performers of Vocal Music." (VIII:43) The entire report is too long for transcribing here in its entirety, though certain excerpts from it will, doubtless, prove of interest to those who deal with the historical aspects of speech education. After a lengthy
exposition of the relation of phonetic analysis to proper pronunciation, the report stated:

The conclusions, then, to which we must arrive, are, first, that the complete analysis of spoken language which Phonetic science teaches, must ever be the basis of all real improvement in the art of elocution.

Corroborative of this, the report cited Prof. William Russell, who, after remarking on the necessity of careful analysis of the sounds to be spoken as the "indispensable condition of accuracy both in teaching and learning," concluded his remarks with the statement,

Phonetic analysis must therefore be the only sure foundation of spoken language as a department of education.

Further corroborative testimony was given from Dr. Andrew Comstock, who was quoted as saying, "A true and philosophical system of elocution must necessarily be founded on Phonetics."

The next paragraph expressed the second conclusion of the report, and is, we believe, sufficiently interesting for inclusion in this study in its entirety.

Our second conclusion legitimately results from the first, and is this: In proportion as teachers, school readers, and charts of elementary sounds have approached the phonetic basis,—ceteris paribus—have they been successful in improving elocution? Since Dr. Rush's more complete vocal analysis, down through the works of Dr. Barber, Prof. Russell, and the legions of new reading books that yearly inundate the land, a constant tendency in this direction is discernable. No school book can now compete for public favor with the slightest chance of success, that does not give the elements of speech with appropriate exercises in combination. Indeed, so far as this become necessary that series of reading books have been revised to admit the phonetic analysis and thus preserve a justly earned popularity. Any person, too, who has observed the charts of elementary sounds as they have successively appeared, must have seen a gradual advancement. The imperfect analysis of the early charts; the want of arrangement of the tonics, and the non-exhibition of the cognate consonants, are to a considerable extent supplied in those of a later date. Elocutionists have in the most improved phonetic charts an instrument as superior to
the first rude attempts as the present glittering and finely mounted share is to the iron pointed bough the ancient Romans called a plough. New charts are being published, old ones resuscitated, and new editions ordered to supply the demand which is rapidly increasing for the phonetic evangel. Teachers who have passed, as most of the present generation have, through the dreary wilderness of learning and teaching elocution by the purely imitative process, and who now stand in the bright light that is radiated by phonetic science, will bear witness that nothing has ever accomplished half so much in training effective and polished elocutionists, as a system of vocal gymnastics based upon its principles.

The report then took up the application of phonetics to the need of persons in the singing field, an aspect which it is not necessary to deal with here.

The expanded and enlarged paper was evidently successful, for, eight weeks after the beginning of this volume, the editor admitted to having more business than the five of them could keep up with and still do justice to editorial writing. Consequently, they engaged two writers "of ability," to do a large part of the editorial writing, leaving the Longley brothers free to manage the expanding business. However, the senior editor assured the readers that he would speak his own thoughts whenever he felt the need to do so, and said, "We intend to exercise due oversight on everything that enters our columns." The two writers engaged were L.A. Hine, author of several articles in earlier issues of the paper, and William Henry Smith, who, though recommended by the editor, had not been as conspicuous in the past, as far as contributions to the paper is concerned, as had Hine.

The evident success, as far as circulation was concerned, may have been due to a vigorous promotional campaign, in which Longley offered $10,000 worth of books as prizes to the persons who produced the largest subscription lists. The only catch in the proposition, however, was
that these awards were to be made "when the circulation reached
10,000." Whether the circulation ever reached that amount is doubtful,
since no list of recipients of these prizes is ever given. Though
editorial claims are not always completely reliable, there was a claim
to expanded business activity during this time, which attests to the
success of the new alphabet. This is indicated by the following
editorial (VIII:346):

More books have been sold... during the past six months, than
ever before in double the length of time; and more phonetic
reading matter has been put into the enduring form of stereo­
type plates since September last, than ever existed previously.
The fact, therefore, that there now exists in
matrices, stereotype plates, books etc., property to the
amount of many thousands of dollars is sufficient guarantee
to the public that phonetic publishers are in earnest, that
they have finally settled on a permanent alphabet; and it
ought, ... to be a stumbling block in the way of ambitious
geniuses who can not sacrifice their pet notions and schemes
for the sake of uniformity, harmony, and the good of the reform.

A standing notice appears in this volume, of phonetic depots established
in several places. This is another indication of the expansion of the
sale of phonetic books. Though it is to be admitted that some of the
books handled, and for which there was considerable demand, were books
on phonography, there is evidence that phonotype books also had consid­
erable circulation. In New York and in Philadelphia the firm of Fowler
and Wells (publishers of Life Illustrated) acted as agents for Longley's
phonetic books on a reciprocal agreement whereby the Longleys handled
the books published by Fowler and Wells; in Boston, Otis Clapp, an
established bookseller, was agent for Longley, especially for school
books, of which there is a report of his having sold 1000 in less than
six months in the vicinity of Boston. Other phonetic depots were in
Bangor, Maine, the firm of William Bartlett; in Providence, R.I., the
firm of J.C. Thompson; in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, the firm of S. L.
Wilkinson; in Hiram, Ohio, L. W. Trask; in Freeport, Ill., A. B. Pickard; in St. Louis, Mo., E. W. Spaulding; in Lansing, Mich., S.D. Newbro; and in Yellow Springs, Ohio, Julius Cone.

During the year 1855 the Phonetic Dictionary, which had been started the latter part of the previous year, was completed. The dictionary contained 816 pages, and sold for $3.75. However, a unique use was made of the dictionary in that before its completion the Longleys had made the offer that a copy of the dictionary would be given free to any of their readers who would send in as many as ten regular subscriptions. The offer did not include their regular agents, who were on commission. So far as has been determined, there were only 12 persons who obtained the dictionary under this proposition, though after the dictionary was completed, a similar offer was instituted which gave the dictionary for sixteen subscriptions. Evidently ten subscriptions did not give adequate margin to pay for the dictionary.

The Longleys were prepared to do general printing during this year, and a good many of their publications were not in phonetic type. This standing advertisement appeared throughout Volume VIII:

Longley Brothers, Book and Job Printers, . . . [address] are well prepared to do every description of work in their line, in a very superior style, and at short notice, from the smallest primer to the largest book; or the most delicate card to the largest poster. Satisfaction guaranteed to all.

In spite of the evidence of financial prosperity for the firm, Elias Longley did not seem to be satisfied with spending his time in the regular printing business. As the end of the eighth volume approached he laid out his course in a different direction. His explanation of his program for the coming year was as follows:

We have for a long time felt, that in editing and publishing a weekly newspaper we were spending our time for naught;
especially, that in publishing a romanic newspaper we were
doing that which any body else can do as well, . . . We have
felt that our time and energies were not put to such use
as would most benefit the cause of Phonetics. . . . It is our
business to make phonetic books, and then to make customers
for them, by lecturing and teaching up and down the country.
A good variety of books is now ready, and we must go out
and scatter them where they will do good; we must get them
introduced into the common schools and into every family in
the land.

He then went on to comment on the fact that three possibilities lay
open to him. First, he could make satisfactory arrangements for someone
else to take over the management of Type and continue to operate it as
a general reform periodical while he undertook to publish a second
periodical devoted to the spelling reform exclusively; the second was
to leave Type as it then was, with a new managing editor, while he
undertook to travel as a "phonetic missionary" promoting the cause of
phonetics through schools, and otherwise, as he could; the third was to
change the character of the periodical so that it would become more
nearly an organ of the reform. He professed being unable to obtain a
managing editor to whom he would be willing to turn over the manage­
ment of Type, and so he determined to embark on the third course, namely,
to change the character of the paper in such a way as to make it more
nearly the organ of the reform that he felt he should publish. But hear
his own words concerning this decision:

The value of a newspaper, either partly or wholly phonetic,
as an instrument for the furtherance of the Reform, has
always been over-rated; the labor that is necessary to spend
on it, in order to make it at all useful, would be far more
serviceable if applied in other ways, as we hope to show
before this time next year.

He then pointed out that in the previous volume they had allowed them­selves to be carried away by every wind of reform, had subscribed
themselves to too many isms and ologies, and that this course had
alienated some of the staunchest friends of the reform.

His proposed sheet for the next year was to be a "neat sixteen page pamphlet, to be devoted entirely to the phonetic cause, educational matters, and choice reading in phonetic spelling." In short, he intended to return to a journal of the spelling and writing reform rather than continue a generalized newspaper, designed for popular appeal.

Volume IX began just as predicted. Except for a lead article, and an occasional short paragraph in ordinary orthography, the entire paper was in phonotype. In size, this volume returned to the 12mo form of Volumes I and II. In content, it was filled with essays, news items (digested into a single column) reports on the spelling reform in various parts of the country, reports of educational conventions and of phonetic societies in various states, a serialized story, and a section entitled "First Lessons in Geometry," in which a rather comprehensive coverage of plane geometry was given, entirely in phonotypy—as a prelude to a Phonetic geometry text.

During the fall of 1855, Elias Longley had been called to New Orleans as a witness in the federal trial of a postmaster of that city. Several letters from him are printed in the latter part of Volume VIII. The trial was not completed at that time and he returned to Cincinnati. In the spring of 1856, he had to return to New Orleans, and since there are several items of interest to persons from Louisiana recorded in this volume, we feel it not inappropriate to mention them.

During his stay in New Orleans, Longley associated with a certain Mr. Kerr (who is alleged to have told his friends his name would be spelled Colo if he were a military man, to accord with the spelling of
colonel), and with a certain Dr. N.B. Benedict, with whom he resided. They both were interested in the subject of the phonetic reform, and Longley established a depot of phonetic books with Kerr, who was associated with the University in New Orleans. On his second trip to Louisiana Longley evidently spent considerable time there. He mentioned stopping in Baton Rouge with his "good friend M.N. Byington," who was engaged in teaching phonetics in that city. A report of Byington's activity appeared in a letter (IX:126) which said of him,

Gradually he has won over near the whole city of Baton Rouge to an entire approval of the system as a means of obtaining a correct knowledge and use of the English language. For several months he has had classes of his pupils in the public schools, in both phonography and phonotypy. . . . A few weeks since, the other public schools here adopted the same course of training; and while we were there Mr. L.H. Mathews, teacher of a Catholic school, signified his intention of adopting phonetic reading with a portion of his pupils.

Byington was able to attract some attention of the press with his system, the most noteworthy of which was, probably, the Minerva, of Thibodeaux, Louisiana, since it carried several articles on the movement. Among other things, the Minerva carried a report of the preliminary meeting of the Louisiana Teacher's Association in Thibodeaux, Louisiana in December, 1855, at which a committee was appointed to investigate the claims of phonetics and report to the regular session in March, 1856. Byington was present at that meeting, and presented the claims of the phonetic system to the men present. His presentation of the matter was probably responsible for the appointment of the committee above mentioned. Oddly enough, all the members of the committee were editors of newspapers, representing the following named publications,
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4Thibodeaux Minerva, January 5, 1856.
all from New Orleans: True Delta, Delta, Bee (or L'Abeille), and the Louisiana Courier. Longley heard of this committee, and after expressing the belief they might not give the subject proper consideration, mentioned that he was sending all of them the *Type* for three months as well as a packet of pamphlets and explanatory material.

On March 7 and 8 the first meeting of the Louisiana Teacher's Association was held in New Orleans, and J. Bryson Burrows was elected president. The committee appointed at the preliminary meeting to investigate phonetics gave a favorable report, which will be mentioned in greater detail in the next chapter, and a standing committee was appointed having the title Committee on Phonetic Instruction. Shortly after his election as president of the association, Burrows was made editor of a section of the *Minerva* devoted to education, and in his first editorial considered the subject of phonotyph. After describing the phonotypical system and explaining the merits of phonetics, he said, "This system must and will succeed. It is founded upon principles that conservatism... cannot stop...

A second article appearing in the *Minerva* was an account of a lecture Elias Longley gave in the town of Thibodeaux on the subject of the phonetic reform. After commenting on the fact of the lecture, the editor evaluated it thus:

The gentleman handled the subject in a masterly manner, and proved to everyone present, by analysis, the necessity of adopting an alphabet containing a letter for each sound.
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These gentlemen have devoted their lives to this noble work of reform, and the world owes them a debt of gratitude for the triumphs they have achieved and the blessings they have scattered broadcast over the land. A few years since, this important change in our language was known to but few. . . . Now it is daily gaining favor--finding its way into the country house, the bar, and the schoolroom; . . .

Burrows was sympathetic toward the subject of phonetics, and shortly after the Longley lecture asked Byington to write a series of articles on the movement for inclusion in the *Minerva*. These articles, however, turned out to deal primarily with phonography, and are, therefore, not pertinent to this study.

In Volume IX, however, Longley did make a certain modification in the arrangement of the alphabet, though he did not make any changes in the forms of the symbols. This was the arrangement of the vowels into three groups rather than two as formerly. The first and second groups contained the original six pairs of vowels of the old alphabet, labeled "long" and "short." The third group was composed of those three new vowels that had been added in the 1853 revision, *viz.*, the vowels in *earth*, *air*, and *ask*. These were labeled "shade vowels," a term designed to show their indefinite or intermediate nature.

Volume X, which began January 1, 1857, continued the same format as Volume IX, and except for the difference in date it would be difficult to tell one from the other by an examination of the contents. The geometry lessons were continued (though by April they focused on *solid* rather than *plane* geometry), the same stories continued, and new stories of the same type were begun, the same sort of feature articles and essays appeared, and the various departments appeared on the same pages as before. However, a few events took place that year in the personal life of the senior editor that are worth mentioning. During
the early part of the year, from January 10 to February 15, Elias made a trip to Madison and Hanover, Indiana, where he spent his time, as he had long wanted to do, visiting the various schools and demonstrating to the teachers that phonotypy could be of considerable value to them in teaching reading. On this trip he made the discovery that both his Primer and Pitman's, which had some circulation in this country, were not well adapted to the use of the school room. Of them, he said they were "so inappropriate in fact that we set to work, and with our own pen printed a new one, testing it by use as we progressed with it." On returning to Cincinnati he immediately undertook the revision of his Primer in the light of this practical experience.

One other item of interest affecting Longley was the formation, in the latter part of 1857, of a new phonetic publishing company organized for the specific purpose of printing phonetic text books above the level of the Primer and elementary Readers. This idea had originated with James Adair, a teacher of Mendota, Illinois, and for two years had been agitated by him. Longley had been sympathetic to the idea, but had explained that financial reasons prevented his undertaking such a project alone. Adair then undertook to raise enough money by subscription, in advance of publication, to insure the financial success of the undertaking, but for two years had been unable to raise adequate amount. On a visit to Dubuque, Iowa, he mentioned the project to a certain Dr. Asa Horr, who, as will be recalled, was a member of the first American Phonetic Council, and had been quite active in support of the reform movement during its early years. Dr. Horr and his brother, Isaac, each agreed to put $5,000 into a fund for publishing the books Adair was projecting. They enlisted the aid of a
young lawyer of the city, James McKinley, who agreed to add an additional $5,000. Meanwhile, Adair had raised approximately $5,000 in subscriptions which he added to the fund, and the group approached Longley, as the prospective printer of the books, who promised still another $5,000 to the fund. This gave a fairly substantial working capital to the new company, and plans were undertaken at once to get the books prepared for publication. The initial intention was to publish the following: Atlas, Geography, Gazetteer, Arithmetic, Grammar, and History of the United States, all in phonetic type. McKinley and Isaac Horr were not satisfied in their own minds at first that the phonotypic alphabet then employed (the revised alphabet of 1853) was the best, or the most desirable, and hence the proposition of the alphabet was submitted to the judgment of "twenty of the best phoneticians in the country." Since none of the twenty favored any alphabet but that being used in Type, as accepted by the American Phonetic Council in 1853, this alphabet was then accepted by McKinley and Horr.

Unfortunately, this project, beginning under such favorable circumstances, was not to be consummated. In the next volume appears a letter from Dr. Asa Horr telling of the death of his brother Isaac. Evidently Isaac was the financial power in the Horr family, for this remark was made in the letter,

While mourning his departure as a very dear brother and associate in business, I weep at the loss phonetics will feel in his death. He was our main dependence in aiding you, . . . but now I can not see how it can be done.

The letter went on to mention that he died of "Typhoid-Pneumonia with brain complications," and that he had not executed a will. Longley, after proper condolences and eulogizing, remarked, "Our ardent friend
Dr. Adair, will be overwhelmed with grief on hearing of the death of the mainstay of our publishing company."

In addition to this circumstance, there was a financial "panic" in 1857 which caused both Dr. Horr and McKinley to suffer financially. Subsequent letters from Horr and from McKinley (XI:129) mention that their resources had been virtually wiped out in the financial crisis of the time. This forced the discontinuance of the project. In May, 1858, Longley made a new proposal for getting the phonetic school books printed. He mentioned that he was not in a financial position to undertake the expense of the project alone—having already twice indicated that the firm was barely paying expenses in publishing the *Type*, with a plea to all friends of the reform to rally around them in getting more subscriptions for the paper—but that if those who had subscribed to purchase the books when they were published would advance the money as a loan, he would be able to go ahead with the printing. He proposed to pay the loan back to each of the subscribers at 10 per cent interest, half in one year, the remainder in two years. (Evidently he had faith that the books would sell.) However, the proposal was never subscribed to, and so far as has been determined, these books were never published.

The evidence that the paper was running a deficit is positively established by an editorial note (XI:337). Longley stated that the *Type* had not only failed to make a profit during the past two years when he had operated it as a strictly phonetic journal, but that it had actually cost the firm money gained from other sources. He made the statement that since so much of his time was taken up in other matters, causing him to neglect the paper, only one of two courses was open.
One was to hire an editor to look after the paper, which could expand
its interests to other fields than the spelling reform; the other was
to discontinue the Type and devote his entire time to phonetic books
and book selling. He preferred the former course, but predicted:

If with good attention, and an able editor it can not
be made to pay its expense in 1859, it will at the
close of that year cease to exist. . . . During the years
the Type has been neutral and mum on everything except
phonetics, it has gradually lost its hold on the affections
of its patrons, and they have been dropping off one
after another until now our list is not half what it
was two years ago.

Meanwhile, L.A. Hine, formerly a contributor to the Longley
periodical, had undertaken the publication of a paper devoted to the
"Land Reform" which bore the title The People's Paper. This paper,
after an existence of less than two years, folded, and in order that
his subscribers might not be cheated, Hine arranged with Longley for
"three or four" pages of the Type. He would then have Longley send the
Type to the subscribers who were still due issues of The People's
Paper. This resulted in Volume XII being a hybrid sort of sheet,
partly devoted to Hine's land reform projects and partly to the spelling
reform. The portion of the Type that was turned over to Hine was
labeled "People's Paper Department" and was printed in ordinary type.

The new paper was to be composed of "sixteen large Double Column
Pages, twice a month." However, for the first time Longley adopted an
almost apologetic tone regarding the spelling reform, as he explained
in his prospectus, obviously designed to reach a large group of
ordinary readers:

In order to be a true "Type of the Times" of course
a portion of its pages must be printed with phonetic
type. . . . which any reader can understand after a few
minutes observation.
Half or more of the twelfth volume was printed in ordinary type, a great deal of it devoted to Hine's project. This caused a certain amount of bad feeling to develop on the part of Benn Pitman and Prosser, both of whom castigated Longley severely for selling out the spelling reform to another movement. They even accused Longley of deserting the cause, and of being more concerned with profits than with the promotion of the spelling reform. Longley vigorously denied this, and after considerable wrangling the three again established amicable relations. Longley admitted, however, that he had not yet "recovered from the prostration and expense that followed those three years of changes," and on several occasions hinted that things were not going well with the firm.

About the middle of the year 1859, the five-year term of partnership of the brothers having expired, the firm of Longley Brothers was dissolved. Each of the brothers was of the opinion he could do better financially elsewhere. The general printing business was sold, though Servetius was retained by the new owner, L.A. Warden, as foreman for the print shop. Elias Longley's name appeared alone, for the first time since the beginning of Volume I, as the Publisher of *Type of the Times*, which he had decided to continue. The stock of phonetic books was moved out and relocated in the establishment of A. Hutchinson at 160 Vine (a few doors away from their old location) and a notice appeared that business concerning books or concerning the paper was to be conducted at that address in the future. What arrangements were made for printing the *Type* is not known, though it is probable that the actual printing was contracted to the new owner of their former print shop.
In the issue of November 1, Longley apologized for the fact that Volume XII would consist of only twenty issues instead of the usual twenty-four, and explained that extended sickness in his family had prevented his getting out the last four issues. However, he promised his patrons they would not receive less than they had paid for, as he would send the first four issues of his new paper, The Journal of Progress, which was to begin the first of January, 1860.

There was no radical difference between The Journal of Progress and the last volume of Type of the Times, though the stated purpose of the magazine was expanded to include the areas of "Education, Social Economy, and the Useful Arts." The prospectus stated:

"The Journal of Progress," . . . is designed to present its readers with a faithful record of the Educational, Social, and Political conditions of the American People; and to keep them posted in regard to the various discoveries and improvements in the Arts and Sciences. . . .

After commenting on the importance of the spelling reform to education, he explained his expanded outlook on educational reform, which included developing a well rounded individual, establishing self-supporting high schools and colleges so that all students could work their way through school, and finally the free discussion of all matters relating to the written or spoken language. He further proposed to abandon the practice of promoting only one reform in order to be able to "stand on more than one leg." The other reforms to which he intended to give some space and attention were: the socialization of labor on the basis that, "Since labor produces all things, the laborer should be the noblest and wealthiest of men"; free and open homestead rights to public lands; and the elimination of all inequalities of law based on differences of class or sex.
Since nearly half his paper was to be devoted to educational reform, he engaged a certain John Hancock, President of the Ohio Teacher's Association, and Principal of the first intermediate school of Cincinnati, to be the "educational editor." Hancock used his space to present material which formerly had appeared in the Ohio Journal of Education. This journal was reported to have been forced to discontinue publication. The remaining part of the periodical was devoted to various causes, usually appearing in the phonetic department, and printed in phonotype. This department also included occasional letters regarding the continued progress of the spelling reform. The use of the phonetic system of teaching was still evidenced throughout the periodical, and the promotion of the spelling reform was no less enthusiastically promoted through this portion of The Journal of Progress than it had been in the former publications of the Longley firm. Longley believed that by making his paper a more general educational paper he would have a wider circulation among teachers, and said:

Our friends know that the Spelling Reform—by which we mean, primarily, the adoption of the phonetic alphabet in teaching to read—must receive its promotion from the school teachers.

The Journal of Progress existed as a semi-monthly for only a year, the second volume coming out as a monthly. This volume went through only eight issues, and its discontinuance ended the publishing activities of Elias Longley, though not his writing activities. At the end of the eighth month of the second volume, Longley decided to turn The Journal of Progress over completely to the Ohio Educational Journal, copies of which can not at present be located. However, since we are concerned only with the Longley publishing firm, we shall leave the further pursuit of the spelling reform movement to future research.
Of the phonetic publishing business of the Longley firm, there remains to be considered his book publishing business. Since this aspect of the study can be considered separately from the rest of the Longley story, it is so presented here. We shall give a chronological list of the various other Longley publications, most of which are no longer extant. We have already mentioned that Longley acted as agent for the publications of Pitman and Ellis in England. He also acted as a general book dealer for several American publishers, advertising that any book published in the United States could be purchased through his office. For the purpose of this study it is not felt necessary to mention any books advertised in the Longley periodical other than the ones published or printed by the Longley firm.

In addition to the major phonotypic periodical which he printed, which we have just discussed, the firm undertook in April, 1851, to publish a penny paper for young people by the name of The Youth's Friend (III:142). This was the continuance of another periodical which had been "under the management of a clergyman of this city." There was a small subscription list of about 500, mostly from various Sunday schools. The paper intended to provide non-sectarian religious and moral instruction, coupled with wholesome stories for young people. Evidently the original publisher was unable to continue it, and the magazine was turned over to Longley. The editorship was taken over by Mrs. Margaret Longley, wife of Elias. During the first year the magazine relied heavily on another periodical, Star in the West, for its material, but later with the beginning of its second year under Mrs. Longley's management, it contained a preponderance of original material. It is significant to this study since the Longleys, when they took over
the magazine, inaugurated the printing of at least a page in phonotype, with the alphabet and a brief explanation of the spelling reform movement. This was done so that young people coming in contact with the magazine would become acquainted with the reform movement, and possibly, thereby, support the other aspects of phonetic printing. The periodical was well received, since the subscription price was only 50 cents a year for single copies, or 26 cents a year in groups to schools and Sunday Schools. In 1860, The Youth's Friend was still being published, though it was discontinued a few months before the final dissolution of the Longley firm, and was the first of the longstanding publications of the firm to fall.

In addition to these two periodicals, Longley published a shorthand supplement to the Advocate which was in considerable demand, though he discontinued this publication after Benn Pitman established his printing house in Cincinnati. The discussion of this and other shorthand materials published by the firm is irrelevant to this study.

The first item Longley published other than his magazine was a pamphlet for use in a "phonetic Sunday School" which he opened the first Sunday of February, 1849. This was printed on a sheet the size of a page in the Magazine, with each page half the size of the sheet and so arranged that when it was folded once it formed a four-page tract. The first two pages were devoted to elementary sound-symbol exercises with short, simple phrases and sentences. The third page had a short talk, on the juvenile level, using the text "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The last page involved a talk about the values of learning to read and mentioned certain phonotypic stories, notably "Charley's House," an English booklet which he had obtained from Pitman, and which
the pupil should use for continuing his reading experience. The fourth page then closed with the "Lord's Prayer."

In July, 1849, just before the end of their first year of phonetic publishing business, Longley printed his first school book, entitled The Phonetic Primer, or Child's First Reading Book, and advertised it as the "first American edition, from the third English edition." This book was adapted by Elias Longley from Ellis' Primer, and contained much of the same material. The American Primer went through two printings of 1000 each during 1849 and 1850. In December, 1849, Longley came out with his first non-school publication, a book designed to entertain children with light reading material which had been written by Mrs. Eliza V. Burnz, and entitled Childhood Hours. This was reported to have been very popular and to have sold rapidly over a period of several years.

The next book from the Longley presses was a reprint of Ellis' little book First Ideas of Religion, a series of dialogs between a child and its mother on matters of religion. The book was advertised as especially adapted to Sunday Schools as well as to family use. The absence of international copyright at that time made the practice of reprinting foreign publications without asking permission fairly common, and so it is doubtful that either Longley or Ellis thought much about the matter.

Two books appeared in September, 1850. One was a Key to the Pronunciation of Geographical Names, by F.G. Adams, a former teacher in the Cincinnati Schools; the other was The First Phonetic Reader, excelsior series, written by G.B. Bradley of the same city. A facsimile of a portion in this book appears in Plate IV, containing a story which
was taken from one of McGuffey's readers. The *First Reader* (as we shall hereafter designate this book) was a volume of 72 pages and contained all the material of the *Primer* plus a deal more reading matter. The first thousand copies of the First Reader sold within three months, and a second printing was sold out in two months and a half. The book continued to be popular in elementary schools for some time and went through several printings. However, it was abandoned after the alphabet change of 1853, when a new series of school books was printed.

About this time Longley conceived the idea that children did not need to wait until they went to school to learn to read, but that, with phonotypy, their mothers could teach them at home and send them to school already able to read. To serve this end, he published a series of charts, or sheet lessons, for the use of parents in preschool instruction of their children. These were sold in a packet with a booklet entitled *Guide to Phonetic Reading*, by G.B. Bradley. Though these did not appear on the market until February, 1851, orders for them were being taken as early as the first part of December, 1850. The *Guide to Phonetic Reading* contained 52 pages which described and explained the phonetic alphabet and gave the reasons for the adoption of the various forms of the new letters.

In May, 1851, a *Second Phonetic Reader* was published, also written by G.B. Bradley, containing 96 pages of text. It was recommended that pupils who had finished the *First Reader* should read through the *Second Reader* before undertaking to go on into ordinary Romanic reading. We note that by the middle of December, 1851, orders for these school books from Boston and vicinity were so numerous that Longley authorized Otis Clapp, a book dealer and publisher of Boston, to reprint the *First*
de lam dog a luc, az muç az
tu sa, "U mad mi' leg wel, 
ny pra du de sam for dis
puur dog hu haz cum wid me."

He Sep and de Lam.

Wun da an old Sep, wid hur
yu êj lam woz in a feld, wid de
rest ov de floc. De sun woz
worm, and de lam woz cwjit ga
and ful ov pla. It ran her
and dar, up and down, round
and round; but it ran most bi
de hej, az it woz a worm spot,
and de hi' hej cept ef de wind.
At last de lam, in its gle, ran
cwjit intu a bus, ful ov tornz,
and de tornz tuc hold ov its
cot, and held it fast, so dat it
cud not get fre, do it trjd veri

hard. De old Sep, hu woz not
for ef, hurd it blet and ran
tu it tuu help it; but in van
did de old Sep pul de bus,
and tri' evuri wa se cud tigh
ov; se cud not set hur lam fre.

At last de Sep left de bus,
and ran az fast az se cud tu
for end ov de feld, hwar woz
a ram wid hernz. Se told de
ram, dat iz, se told him in hur
wa, de sad cas ov hur lam.
De ram ran wid hur tu de bus,
and wid de help ov hiz hernz,
he and de old Sep set de puur
lam fre, wid de los ov sum ov
its wul. De lam woz veri glad
tu be fre wuns mor, and j dar
sa it did not go ner dat bus
for a loy tim.
Reader for the local trade, since they were being ordered faster than Longley could supply them. Stereotype plates of the First Reader were shipped to Clapp in Boston for that purpose, and at the same time 500 Second Readers were shipped to him for stock.

To bridge the gap between the Readers and the ordinary print, a book entitled The Transition Reader was contemplated. The need for such a book had earlier been felt by Ellis in compiling the English school books, and he had prepared a book entitled Romanic Exercises for Phonetic Pupils. Longley's Transition Reader was prepared by Caleb Simmons, of Jonesboro, Georgia, and was to have parallel texts on facing pages, one in ordinary print, the other in phonotype. The principle was that as the pupil reading the ordinary orthography encountered a difficult word, or a word whose illogical spelling puzzled him, he could simply glance across at the word in phonotype, pronounce it, and thereby recognize it.

However, since Longley did not get his Transition Reader completed until October, 1851, another publication of the same type came out earlier. The schools in Boston and vicinity had adopted the phonetic system extensively by this time, and large numbers of Longley's Readers had been in use for some time. The pupils were ready for going on into ordinary print before Longley's book was in press. Consequently J.W. Stone of Boston arranged with Clapp to publish a book for the purpose, for which Stone prepared the material. This book, entitled The Child's Transition Book, came out in August, 1851, while Longley's book was not ready until late October. Evidently no thought of professional jealousy entered Longley's mind, for he carried an announcement of the Boston book (IV:18) and ordered a supply for his own stock until
his book was ready. Though he mentioned that the style of phonetic spelling was not exactly like his own and, consequently, the book was not the best one to follow up his Readers, he conceded that this factor was not really important after all.

Shortly after the publication of the last of the series of three Readers, the discussion of alphabet changes, recounted in Chapter III of this study, began to occupy the attention not only of the Longleys but of other supporters of the spelling reform. As a result of the uncertainty, Longley announced his intention not to undertake publication of any more books until the alphabet question was settled. He did promise, however, to keep a supply of the Readers on hand for use of the schools, since the plates for them were already stereotyped. A few other items which had appeared serially in the Advocate were put out in book form, but none of them had evidence of serious promotion. For example, Pope's Essay on Man had been printed serially in the Advocate, in phonotype, during the latter part of 1850. When printed in book form early in 1851 it comprised 72 pages and sold for 20 cents. In December, 1851, Longley published an American Phonetic Almanac, which in addition to the usual almanac material, contained such items as the phonetic alphabet; a history of the writing and printing reform (in common orthography); an account of the present movement, from Pitman's first experiments to 1850; names of the American Phonetic Council; and statistics on the advance of the reform in the United States. A couple of amusing items were included, the first of which was, "A Puzzle for Spellers of the Old School"; the second, "The Schoolboy's Song of the Year 1900," a song, we presume, in praise of being delivered from the horrors of common English spelling
into the bright day of phonetic spelling.

In 1852 a story by L.A. Hine was carried serially in the Advocate and later was printed in booklet form. It had the curious title The Unbalanced, and was a story of a zealous reformer and his trials and final triumphs, establishing without doubt that there was really "method in his madness." After it was published in book form it was advertised as "the first novel to be published in phonotype." Another interesting publication of the same year was The Phonetic Singer, compiled by C.L. Filmore of Fulton, Ohio, and published in December, 1852. The book involved an unusual system of numerical notation, and had lyrics in phonotype. The system of musical notation may be worth a moment's notice, since it was a radical departure from conventional musical notation. It was said of it (V:128) that it was a system which anyone could read who was familiar with any system of music. Two lines were drawn between which the numerals one through seven were placed, to represent the seven notes of the scale, the second octave represented by the same numbers placed above the top line, thus:

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

Time was indicated by a system of dots and commas, thus:

;1 equaled a whole note; ,1 equaled a half note; unmarked equaled a quarter note; ;1 equaled an eighth note; ,1 equaled a sixteenth; and ,1, equaled a thirty-second. The key was indicated by a numeral above the parallel lines, the number 1 indicating the key of C; 2, the key of D; 3, the key of E; etc., while the letter G affixed after this number indicated the "grand," or major, scale, and the letter P in the same
position indicated the "plaintive," or minor scale. The type of measure was indicated by a number below the parallel lines, 2 indicating two beats to the measure, 3 indicating three beats to the measure, etc. There is no indication of a method whereby any note other than a quarter note should receive one beat, though in this system I suppose such was not necessary. Sharps and flats were indicated by prefixing the letters S and F to the numeral of the note, while a return to the natural was indicated by prefixing the letter N.

Two small booklets published during 1852 were: The Phonetic Longhand Writer, in which the several prevailing styles of manuscript phonetics were shown, and L.A. Hine's Lectures on the Spelling Reform, a tract which sold for three cents. But probably the most profitable phonotypic book Longley published was his Manual of Phonography, which, first published in 1852, was still in demand in 1860, though in the revised edition using the new alphabet.

During the period of uncertainty concerning the alphabet, the list of phonotypic publications remained fairly constant, and consisted of the publications we have mentioned up to now. Immediately following the acceptance of the revision, however, Longley began printing more items for the phonetic market. One of the first was an illustrated book entitled Biographies of the Presidents. Little is known of this except that it was recommended to children, and was offered as a premium to young people sending subscription lists to the Youth's Friend. It regularly retailed for 40 cents, a fact which indicates it must have been rather nicely printed. At the same time, the school books were also re-worked and were issued in the new alphabet. The former First Reader was issued as two volumes, a Primer and a First Reader. With the
announcement of these first two school texts, Longley said, "With this book teachers and parents can commence a course of phonetic instruction, in all confidence that other books will follow as fast as they may be wanted." The first forty pages of the Reader were said to have been occupied with the original tales of A.J. Ellis, of whom this was said:

To those unacquainted with Mr. Ellis' writing for children, it is enough to say that he has one of those happily gifted minds, . . . equally at home in nursery tales or rhymes for children, as in abstruse questions of science for the savant.

Meanwhile, another book was published in the new alphabet. It was designed to be a practical course in elementary economics, with the title Money Getting and Money Spending, and was written by L.A. Hine. The book had appeared serially during the latter part of 1853 as a "prize essay" of twenty-four chapters. This essay evidently did not sell well, as several years later it is still being advertised for sale, with no evidence of there having been a second printing.

Two projects were undertaken in 1854 which were significant, though Longley did not extensively expand his book publishing business, until 1855. In October, 1854, he began the actual printing of Smalley's Phonetic Dictionary, which has been previously discussed. The other item of significance has a considerable background of anticipation. This was the proposed printing of the New Testament in the American Phonetic Alphabet, a name given to the revised alphabet of 1853. The proposal to print the New Testament in the United States had been made as early as May, 1849, and a committee had been appointed to attend to the undertaking. However, since Longley carried in stock a phonetic Testament published by Pitman, the proposal did not receive much support.

Finally, after noting that only $314 of the needed $600 had been subscribed
to the fund for publishing the Testament, which Longley did not propose to undertake on his own initiative, he declared that unless at least half the amount, or $300, were received within four weeks he would abandon the project. The money was not forthcoming, and the project was abandoned. The revision of the alphabet, however, threw a different light on the matter, and the English edition was no longer satisfactory. Consequently, the New Testament project was re-opened, and, toward the close of 1854, Longley announced, "The Stereotype plates of the New Testament are all cast, and will be ready for printing this week." (VII:348)

The year 1855, however, saw the biggest expansion in Longley's publishing business. At this time, with the decision to make his periodical partly in phonotype and partly in ordinary type, the Longley firm announced their intention to undertake any type of printing, and published several books which were not in phonetic type and had nothing to do with the reform movement. Such books were: Memoir of Frances Wright ("Fanny Wright," well known reformer of the early 19th century), written and privately paid for by Amos Gilbert; Philosophy of Odd Fellowship, published by I.D. Williamson and printed by the Longleys; and The Practical Cook Book, by Sylvia Campbell. In school books, Elias Longley wrote a new Transition Reader which was published early in the year, and an unknown author compiled a series of Dialogues for Children, designed for school exhibitions. The completion of Smalley's Phonetic Dictionary during this year was probably the most ambitious accomplishment, since it was by far the largest book—816 pages—ever to come from the Longley presses. Another publication that must have involved considerable time, since it was a volume of over 300 pages, was
A New Pronouncing Medical Lexicon by C.H. Cleaveland, M.D. Unlike Smalley's dictionary, though, this book printed only the pronunciation of the medical terms in phonetic type, and printed the definitions in ordinary orthography. Elias Longley re-worked his text on phonography and published during this year what was probably one of the best selling books of his entire career. This book carried the title New American Manual of Phonography, a title designed to show that it had been reprinted in the new American phonetic alphabet. David Parsons, Principal of the Southwest Normal School of Ohio, published a book Practical Orthography of the English Language which the Longleys printed, but it is not known whether this book was in phonotype or in the ordinary orthography. Another novel, first printed serially and then as a book, was printed during this year with the title Money-Getting in Low Life, Both Sides, by Dr. E.L. Crane. This story was printed in ordinary orthography, not phonotypy. One more item completes the recital of Longley's publishing activities during the year 1855. This was the printing of a chart of the Elementary Sounds of the English Language; according to their organic formation, accompanied by Explanatory Remarks, by Sina Stratton. The chart was designed especially for drill in articulation, and was planned for the use of elocution teachers.

In 1856, Longley's book publishing business dropped off, as far as we can determine from the advertising in the Type of the Times. Elias Longley had undertaken to make his periodical a strictly phonetic publication, and there is evidence that the firm began curtailing operations after the active days of 1855. However, toward the end of the year he announced a series of three little books in verse for children, written by a certain "Aunt Libby" and illustrated by H.C. Grosvenor, with the suggestion that they would make good Christmas gifts. The books
were entitled: The Little Big Man, My Hobby Horse, and Harry O’Hum and his Big Round Drum. The first two were printed in phonotype as well as in ordinary type, and all were printed both in color and in black and white. A fourth book, designed for youthful readers, was entitled The Young Hero; or Money Never Makes the Man, by "Mabel," which was printed in ordinary orthography. The only book of significance was compiled by Elias Longley himself—it is possible that his work in preparing this prevented his publishing other things. The book was a Pronouncing Vocabulary of Geographical and Personal Names, to which was added a complete list of scriptural names, and a good deal of other miscellaneous, but valuable, information. Evidently this publication met with considerable favor, for within a month there is the statement that the book was selling fast and "many teachers are ordering them by the dozen." It is highly probable that this was an expansion of Adams' Key to the Pronunciation of Geographical Names which had been published in 1850, now reprinted in the new American phonetic type.

In 1857 there is no evidence that any new publications were undertaken, but that considerable promotional effort was made to get the school books adopted in the common schools. The Primer was revised during that year in the light of Elias Longley's personal experience in introducing it into the classroom, as related earlier in this chapter. During this year he incorporated in Type a series of First Lessons in Geometry, by Thomas Hill of Waltham, Massachusetts, which were written in phonotype. At the end of the series he printed these as a phonetic geometry text. In 1858, he undertook the printing of a non-phonetic periodical for a certain Miss Carrie D. Filkins bearing the title The Western Olive Branch. He acted as printer for a book entitled The Normal,
or Guide to Phonetic Teaching, which was edited and published by A. Holbrook of the Southwestern Normal School of Lebanon, Ohio, and designed as a text for his school in teaching the phonetic method of teaching orthoepy and orthography. Though this book was not printed in phonotypy, it contained in Part II a discussion of the use of the phonetic method in teaching orthoepy and orthography. It also contained a chart showing the physiological classification of English sounds and giving in parallel form the phonotypic, the Websterian and the Worcesterian system of notation. A second chart showed "Cognates" in sound, which were indicated with the phonotype symbols. A third chart broke down the various species of sounds into their most common spelling and indicated the value of the sound with the phonotypic symbol. A method of teaching both reading and spelling is discussed which is predicated upon the use of the phonotypic charts and cards.

A little later in 1858 Longley published a book by John King, M.D., with the title The American Family Physician, but there is no indication that it was printed in phonotype. In February, 1859, he printed A Comprehensive System of Grammatical and Rhetorical Punctuation, by Consul W. Butterfield. Two other publications appear to terminate Longley's publishing activity except for the periodical. This was the publication of the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly and the Lord's Prayer. The last-mentioned was in the form of a decorative wall card. The Catechism, the Lord's Prayer, and a group of selected religious items were sold together as a packet.

Whether the fact of having the books on hand when the Longley firm dissolved and when Elias moved into the book store of A. Hutchinson indicated that the books were not being sold, or whether it indicates
that there was still a demand for these items is not known. It is
evident, however, on the basis of his advertising, that the following
books and supplies of a phonotypic nature were still being handled at
the end of Longley's general printing and publishing career:

Phonetic Sheet Lessons, 12 charts, 18" by 24", containing
21 first lessons in reading, in large beautiful type; for
home or school use. 50 cents.

Phonetic Tablets. The alphabet on cards, the letters 3 inches
high. 25 cents.

American Primer, in large type, each letter illustrated with
a picture suggestive of its sound. 5 cents; per doz., 35 cents.

First American Reader, large type, illustrated. 10 cents.

Second Phonetic Reader, advanced in style. 20 cents.

The Transition Reader, a course of inductive Romanic Reading
Lessons for the use of Phonetic Readers in learning to read
Romanically. 20 cents.

Phonetic Alphabet, of both the small and capital letters.
18 x 24 in. 10 cents.

Alphabetic Chart, 28 x 42 inches, with bold letters, a brief
Explanation at the bottom, and a Specimen of Phonetic Printing.
25 cts. postpaid; $1.25 on canvas and roller.

Phonetic Longhand Writer, exhibiting various styles of penman-
ship. 10 cts.

New Testament, 12mo. Cloth, 75; Sheep, 85; Morocco, gilt, $1.50.

Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language. A complete work of
800 Octavo pages, embracing also lists of Classical, Geographical,
and Scriptural Names. $3.50.

Pronouncing Medical Lexicon, the pronunciation only in Phonetic
spelling. . . . In cloth, 75; black sheep, 85.

Pronouncing Vocabulary of Geographical and Personal Names, Cloth,
60; boards, 50.
First Lessons in Geometry, "Facts before reasoning." by Thomas Hill. 25.

Childhood Hours; or Entertainment for Children. Illustrated. Extra Cloth, 30; full gilt, 50.

My Hobby Horse. The song of a happy boy about his hobby horse; each verse illustrated with a beautiful and appropriate picture. In black printing, 5 cts., per doz., 25 cts.; in gay colors, 6 cts., per doz., 30 cts.

The Little Big Man, Story of a discontented little boy who, trying to improve his condition, made the matter worse, and learned a useful lesson. Illus, as above. In black, 10 cts., per doz., 50 cts.; in gay colors, 12 cts., per doz., 75 cts.

Dialogues for Children; suitable for presents to children. 6 cts., per doz., 40.

Shorter Chatecism, of the Westminster Assembly, Lord's Prayer, and various selections. 6 cts., per doz., 40.

Biographies of the Presidents, with their portraits. In paper, 30; Cloth, gilt letters, 40.


In addition to publishing books and periodicals, Longley occasionally engaged in printing a number of other phonotypic items. In boosting their "Book and Job Printing" during 1849, when the firm was young he pointed out (standing advertisement):

The advantages of printing CARDS, CIRCULARS, SHOW BILLS, ETC. in phonotypy, is greater than most persons would imagine; yet we know from experience, that they would be read oftener, ten to one, than if printed in the common spelling,—the uniqueness of the type will attract attention.

As to circulars and handbills, there is evidence that Longley printed such items often for travelling lecturers on phonetics. On one occasion (II:110) he received an order from a district school in the community of Mount Healthy, Ohio, for making up a batch of school tickets, or, as we call them today, report cards, for sending home the weekly reports on the progress of his pupils. He hoped in this way to stimulate an
interest in phonotypy among his patrons. A similar request came from the Eclectic Medical College of Cincinnati. One of the professors had worked out a set of rules for pronouncing difficult medical terms, which he had had printed in phonotypy, after explaining to the students the values of phonetic printing and obtaining their approval to the idea. Following Longley's printing of these rules, the college regularly had concert tickets, programs, school tickets, and such items printed in phonotype.

Longley regularly kept a stock of phonetic longhand paper as well as his regular phonographic paper. This longhand paper had the phonetic longhand alphabet printed at the top of the page, so that when a letter was sent to a person not familiar with the phonetic system he would not be utterly confused by it, and, by this introduction, might be prevailed upon to adhere to the practice of phonetic writing himself.

In the middle of 1851, Longley decided to improve on that idea by printing a phonetic envelope. In a narrow panel at the top, leaving only room enough on the right for a stamp, was a brief explanation of phonography written in ordinary print. In a box on the extreme left was an explanation of phonotypy, printed in phonotype to illustrate the principle. This left just about enough space in the lower right hand part of the envelope for an address. A facsimile of the envelope was printed in the first advertising notice concerning it (III:187). The reaction of postal authorities to this envelope is not known, but Longley advertised it for several years as being in stock.

Once a horticulturist from Anapolis [sic], Indiana (III:10), was reported to have ordered a catalog of his fruit trees and ornamental shrubs printed with the names of the plants in phonotype, believing that
this would enable persons to call their names correctly with greater ease. On another occasion Longley received an order from E.H. Spaulding, an ardent supporter of the reform in St. Louis, Missouri, for 1000 business cards to be printed in phonotypy.

Though these next items do not reflect any activity on the part of any of the Longleys, they were of interest to them, and were related to the subject of phonotypy. A certain John R. Forest (location unknown) wrote that he was having a sign twelve feet long and two feet wide printed in phonotype characters. He suggested that other persons interested in the reform should have all their personal advertising and sign work done in this manner. He claimed any good sign painter could do the work properly if the principle were explained, and a careful copy given him. Another phonetic sign painting is mentioned by Dr. John McLean, of Jackson, Michigan, who persuaded a merchant to have a phonetic sign made. McLean suggested that friends of the reform might indulge in a bit of friendly contest to see which city or town might have within one year the largest number of phonetic signs in proportion to its size. There is no mention of any follow-up to this idea, and it is supposed that the idea died after this initial appearance.

Unfortunately, most of the material published and printed by the Longley firm is not extant, so far as available records show. A few items, such as his periodicals, the second edition of the First Reader, The Phonographic Manual, Smalley's Phonetic Dictionary, the Pronouncing Medical Lexicon, and the Normal are all, according to present information, that remain as testimonials to what was, for a period of slightly over a decade, an extensive business of phonetic printing.
CHAPTER V

PHONOTYPY AND COMMON-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Whetstones are not themselves able to cut, but make iron sharp and capable of cutting. *Isocrates*

One of the primary considerations in obtaining an education has always been the acquisition of an ability to read the mother tongue. A second consideration of almost equal significance has been the acquisition of the ability to reproduce the language orthographically with a minimum of error. It is a self-evident fact that in the early years of a child's education his oral and aural vocabularies vastly surpass his visual vocabulary. Consequently, a great many years of the child's educational career must be devoted to acquiring a reading vocabulary commensurate with his understanding vocabulary. According to this writer's personal observation, probably verifiable by anyone who has taught in secondary schools, much time is lost to the student by his inability to read with understanding the materials with which he has to deal. At the same time, it has been noted that the same students will understand perfectly well the identical material when it is presented to them orally by another whose reading vocabulary is adequate. These conditions are, and always have been, the bane of the teacher's life and a millstone about the neck of the pupil, and, probably they existed to an even greater degree during the middle of the nineteenth century than they do today. It is with this problem, and the attempts which were made to solve it, that this chapter is concerned. The solution involved the application of phonetic science to the teaching of reading and spelling, and ultimately of speaking.
An examination of the problem raises these questions: (1) By what method (or methods) was the principle of phonetics introduced into the school system? (2) What were the practices of the teachers in applying the phonetic system? (3) What were the results of the use of phonetic teaching, as affirmed by the teachers themselves? (4) What were the opinions of educational administrators, educational organizations, legislative groups and other official bodies? (5) How extensive was the spread of the phonetic system of teaching? (6) What was the place of the Longley publishing firm in relation to the educational application of phonetics?

During the first year of the Longley phonetic publishing business there is little evidence of the promotion of the reform as an educational program. Most of the supporters of the movement were interested in phonography, and phonographic corresponding societies were formed in various parts of the country for the purpose of practicing the art of shorthand writing and reading. There was an institution of great popularity at the time called the "ever circulating letter." A group of from eight to ten men in various parts of the country would agree to carry on a correspondence. The first man would write a letter (in phonography) and mail it to number two; after reading it, the second man would append a letter of his own and mail both of them to number three; the third would add a letter and repeat the process until when the letter finally reached the last man it would include missives from all the rest of the group. The last man on the list would add his letter and mail it to number one, who would remove his first letter and write a second letter in its place, mailing the entire packet to number two; he would in turn remove his first letter and write a second, then
nail the entire packet to number three, and so on. After the first round, each recipient would get a letter each time from each of the other members. This process went on until the chain was broken by mutual consent.

The novelty of phonetic shorthand had such an appeal that it was nearly a year after Longley began publishing his periodical before it began to become evident to anyone that the use of phonetic type was a potentially powerful educational instrument. Perhaps the accounts of what was being done in England by the use of phonotypy, both as they appeared in Pitman's magazines and as Longley reprinted Pitman's accounts, may have exerted some influence in the direction of education. For example, Longley gave an account of an experiment which Pitman had undertaken in the Swinton school, which was established by the city for pauper children, in Manchester, England. He had proposed to demonstrate the values of teaching children to read by the use of phonotype. (Possibly the city fathers were not agreeable to his using any of their own children for the experiment, but felt nothing would matter if the experiment failed and the pauper children did not, therefore, learn to read). Pitman is alleged to have taken 60 of the dullest pupils for the experiment, which he invited other teachers of the school to observe. The proposition was that if he were successful in teaching these to read without too great difficulty, the system of phonetic teaching would be adopted by all the other teachers in that school. A second letter from Pitman followed up the account with an enthusiastic report of success: "It is now being used by all the teachers and monitors in teaching reading to entering pupils who can not read, and to all others whose reading is imperfect."
Though Ellis had written a series of phonotypic school books for the purpose of teaching reading, which Longley stocked along with the phonographic materials of Pitman, there was very little response to them on the part of teachers and educators (III:138). The traveling phonetics teachers preferred the more lucrative (and more popular because of its novelty) business of phonography. Though it may be prejudicial to other reformers to suppose that Longley himself was the prime mover in directing the attention of spelling reformers to the untouched field of primary education, we do note that in the second volume of his periodical he took a militant stand in this particular.

What factors lay behind the decision to mount the stump for the application of phonotypy to the cause of educational reform is not known, though such letters as the following from school teachers may have started his thinking in this direction. This letter is the first one to be printed in his magazine from a teacher of a common school who was not already a phonographer, and appears near the end of Longley's first year of publication (I:283):

I have often come near arriving at the conclusion that education is not worth obtaining, seeing that so much of life passes while laying the mere foundation; but have concealed myself with the idea of having use for it in another state of existence. And this is the principal motive that I was ever able to present to the minds of pupils to reconcile them to spend the prime of life in memorizing the numerous words of our language. I have instructed the last pupil that I ever intend, by the old method of spelling.

Henceforth I go for the spelling reform. If you will send me the helps--books, copy slips, etc. I will devote much of my attention to the interests of the reform.

Whatever may have caused Longley to adopt the course he did, at the beginning of the second year of his phonetic publishing business he determined to advance the cause of the spelling reform as an
educational program rather than as a universal reform in orthography. He suggested in the first issue of Volume II his interest in phonotypy for educational purposes, though there was still an undertone of the hope for a universal reform in English orthography on a phonetic basis. He gave the basic arguments in favor of a changed orthography and against the common spelling in this manner: (1) "No one can tell the sound of an English word from its spelling." As proof of this point he presented the same combination of letters in a series of words which have widely different pronunciations. He then pointed out a group of words spelled with different combinations of letters which are pronounced alike. Then he cited the fact that there are some words in English upon which even orthoepists can not agree. And finally, he cited some unusually illogical combinations that no one could possibly guess unless he had been told by another (certain British proper nouns, for instance, and the ough words. (2) "No one can tell the spelling of an English word from its sound." His first argument for this proposition was similar to an argument used for the first point, namely, that certain words are pronounced alike, but their spelling is different. He then pointed out that authors do not always agree on the proper spelling of some words. Etymology was rejected as being of little value in determining the modern spelling of any English word. He then mentioned that no sound in the language is uniformly and consistently represented by the same spelling, and that at one time or another every letter in the alphabet except J is mute. Finally he argued that no one letter of the present alphabet has a single phonetic value.

(3) "By means of this old alphabet, it requires constant study for two or three years to be able to read with any proficiency; and from five to
ten years of close observation are requisite to make a tolerably
good speller." The proof advanced for this proposition was the testi-
mony of teachers of youth as well as the experiences of youth itself,
pointing out that the spelling book or dictionary must be the constant
companion of every student both while he is in school and when he is
out, and that for the balance of his writing life the dictionary must
be constantly referred to because memory is treacherous, and a person
can never be absolutely certain of the spelling of some words. (4)
As a result of these conditions, he then pointed out that "one person
out of every twenty-five in the United States, is unable to read and
write his native language." He cited official census figures in
support of this argument and pointed out, "This portion of the com-
munity is most addicted to vice and crime."

As proposed advantages to be gained by the adoption of a phone-
tic system of spelling, he cited these:

1. No one will hesitate as to the proper pronunciation of any
word spelled phonetically, . . .
2. Every person, acquainted with the phonetic alphabet, can
spell correctly and with certainty any word they may hear
spoken. . . .
3. By means of the new alphabet, children six or eight years
old, or uneducated adults, may learn to read with a mechanical
correctness seldom attained by the best scholars, in a very
short time, varying, according to the aptness and intelligence
of the learner, from one day to three months.
4. . . . there will be no excuse for a grown person being unable
to read; . . . and among the succeeding generation there shall
not be found an individual unable to read the language he speaks.

As a means of attaining the benefits described, he suggested (with an
eye on his own business, I imagine) that the promotion and support of
phonetic periodicals would help greatly in spreading a knowledge of
the phonetic system. Naturally, he recommends the Advocate as the
best organ for this purpose, and in order to increase the circulation of
the periodical, he arranged for agents to represent him on a commission basis. He also offered to send a free copy of Ellis' *Plea for Phonetic Spelling* to any reader who would send in as many as three subscriptions to the *Advocate*. As another method of reaching the goal of a reformed orthography, he suggested that friends undertake to demonstrate to teachers and educators the advantages of the use of the phonetic system for teaching reading. At this point he gives the first hint of his later zealous promotion of phonotypy as an aid to education.

In the second issue (II:2h), however, Longley makes his first overt move toward directing the attention of friends of the spelling reform away from their fascination for phonography and toward the needs of the school child in learning to read common print.

Now that the subject of the spelling reform is beginning to be agitated in school conventions and other literary associations, we take the privilege of and responsibility of suggesting the prominent measure to be advocated,—indeed the only one upon which any definite and decided action should be taken. And that is this: We propose that the phonetic alphabet and phonetic spelling be used in all our primary schools, as an aid, an easy method, of learning to read the common orthography; because that thereby both pupil and teacher, to use the language of an experienced instructor given in our last number, "will be gainers by two-thirds of their time."

The position taken by spelling reformers, that a child can first learn to read phonotypy, and then by analogy, the common printing, in less than half the time it takes to learn to read the latter, strikes the stranger to the system as being impossible. Hence it will be necessary, not only to state the nature of the circumstances which makes this a fact, but we must also be able to refer to experiments, where this result has been demonstrated. Where the discussion comes up before teachers and school trustees, the advocate of phonetic spelling should say, in addition to the above: Gentlemen, we do not ask you to receive our suppositions or statements, unless you are perfectly satisfied of their truth; but we ask you to test the matter by practical experiments in our schools; as men desiring to promote the best interests of your pupils, and of community generally, [sic] you should not neglect to test the merits of any educational measure that comes to you so well recommended as this. It
can be done at a trifling expense, and with little trouble; the tablets and primers are prepared to your hands, and if you will but make the trial we will abide the result.

It should be seen to, however, that the instructor who undertakes the matter, fully understands the system. He should at least have carefully read the Teacher's Guide to the primer, and scrupulously follow its directions. We have never yet heard of the school teacher who, after fully comprehending this little work, could doubt for a moment of the great advantage the phonetic system of teaching would be in learning children to read.

Let no one suppose, from what we have said, that we dispair of the triumph of phonetic spelling over the time-honored system of our fathers. Not at all; we have not the least doubt but the present mode of spelling will in the course of a few years begin to be laid aside, to moulder with the musty tomes of the sixteenth century; and that our children's children will look upon it with the same feelings that we now experience in reading the old works of Chaucer, Spencer, and Wycliff. But this result must be brought about by means, and the one we propose seems to be the most feasible. Many persons would listen to such a measure that could not bear the idea of a change in our standard (1) orthography, and the destruction of our literature. Let us approach them in this way, and gain the ground proposed, and we have no fear of the ultimate result.

Evidently Longley's promotional propaganda began to have some effect, for a few weeks later we find this attitude expressed by John S. Dickson of Ashtabula, Ohio (II:50),

I am now thinking of returning to Howell, Mich., to take charge of a large Union School. I hope I shall then be able to introduce phonotypy, as the readiest means of teaching heteric reading. I shall at least try hard to do it.

The editor replied to this letter,

If teachers will collect all the facts and experiments in reference to teaching phonotypy, that we have published and lay them before their employers, we don't see how they can refuse such permission.

In February of the following year, 1850, the idea began to take rather firm root in the minds of others in the movement. At a meeting of the Cincinnati Phonetic Society (of which M.N. Byington, professionally a teacher of phonography, was president), a resolution was
adopted offering to send the Advocate for three months at the expense of the society to all those teachers of the city school system who would indicate their desire for and willingness to accept the offer. The offer was to be made to all the teachers of the city, since it was felt a number of the teachers were not aware of the aims and purposes of the spelling reform movement with its alleged value as an educational aid, and were, consequently, not preparing themselves properly for the adoption of the phonetic method in their schools. The resolution further proposed that the February 1 issue of the Advocate be sent to each teacher at the same time the offer of the three months' subscription was made. A few weeks later there was a report on this action which indicated that considerable interest in phonetic spelling had been aroused among the teachers of the city. As a further result, approximately two hours' time was allotted to an exposition of phonetics on the program of a city-wide institute of teachers which was held about two weeks later.

Further spread of the idea of indoctrinating teachers with the principles of phonetic teaching is expressed in a letter from S.C. Mendenhall, who wrote from Richmond, Iowa (II:185):

I have succeeded in accomplishing one of the grand objects of my ambition in the good cause, namely, the introduction of phonography and phonotypy into the Friend's Indiana Boarding School. This I look upon as being the most important movement towards giving the reform permanency, that has been made in the state, for here young men are preparing themselves for teachers, and it is to teachers that we must look for the permanent establishment of the phonetic principle.

The practice of promoting the spelling reform through schools devoted to the training of teachers continued to be a technique for propagating the movement as an educational device. Toward the end of
1851 (III:202) we find an account of the introduction of phonography and phonotypy into the curriculum of a Ladies' Seminary in Charleston, Massachusetts, for the purpose of preparing teachers to teach these subjects. The initial class numbered only 20, but there is no evidence that succeeding years did not increase the enrollment, especially as we later note the tremendous interest the phonetic movement had aroused in the state of Massachusetts. For example, a year later we have this report from Thomas Ranney, writing from Stirling, Massachusetts (IV:134):

I cannot do more than to prepare the way for the introduction of phonotypy in the summer schools, and I am glad to say that the teachers and school committees where ever I go, are among my most enthusiastic pupils, and all my instructions are with a view of making them perfectly familiar with the routine of phonetic teaching.

According to the report, Ranney's class he had just closed numbered 103, and he was at that time beginning three more classes of over 100 in each—these were expressly stated to be in phonotypy, not in shorthand.

During the early days of the movement other influences were responsible for the introduction of phonetics into the local schools. One of these was the personal intervention on the part of some friend of the reform. For instance, E.T. Bussel, of Milroy, Indiana, wrote (II:177),

The cause of language reform is steadily gaining a firm and sure footing in this vicinity—something that will last and tell well in days to come. I commenced sending my oldest boy to school last week—a little fellow five years old—and here I "showed my faith by my works"—I sent him with a phonetic alphabet (and I am fully determined that he shall not learn the old one). Tonight I have been drilling his teacher some, so that he may be able to teach him correctly. The teacher is a clever man, but knows nothing about phonetics; he is willing to learn, and I now have him reading the "Teacher's Guide" and the "Plea for Phonetic Spelling." . . . Our good friend Bishop is teaching a common school in Saint Omer, nine miles from this place. He is trying an experiment in phonetics—teaching a small
class in it. I would be glad if you could send us a
teacher of phonography out this way. I am of the
opinion he would be well patronized.

Another friend of the movement voluntarily undertook to teach reading
after having taught himself the phonetic system from a borrowed Primer.
John M. Bremer, of Perkinsville, Indiana, a man 65 years of age, wrote
for twelve Primers (II:215) for the purpose of getting a class of
children started with reading in the phonetic manner. After learning
the phonetic method, he said:

I spent twelve of the best years of my life in attempting
to instruct children to spell and read, with an alphabet
altogether inadequate to the purpose. I view the spelling
and writing reform as offering a greater amount of good
to those speaking the English language than has been
since the discovery of the art of printing. . . .

J. M. Kyes, a traveling teacher of phonography and phonotypy was such
a zealot that he taught classes in phonotypy free, paying his way with
his shorthand lessons (II:215). He also gave private lessons to
teachers in the technique of teaching by the phonetic method, and vol-
untarily gave no less than five subscriptions to the Advocate to
teachers whom he was trying to interest in the cause. Evidently the
school was also used as a meeting place for church services, for Kyes
related the following incident from Crittenden, Kentucky:

An appointment had been made for preaching on 28th [sic] of
March--the congregation met at the school house, but no
preacher came. My phonetic charts were hanging on the wall;
several of my students were there, and they passed away the
time by lecturing on the new system. At the close, a vote
was taken as to the propriety of adopting the system, when
a unanimous yea was given in its favor. . . .

Even after the movement was becoming fairly well established, the
personal influence of friends was felt. In 1851 (IV:90) Lloyd Balder-
ston, a farmer from Port Deposit, Maryland, wrote that he had been
teaching his own children "and some uneducated Irishmen" with the
phonetic method, and had attracted so much attention that he thought a phonetic school could be promoted in that area by the next session.

During 1849 and 1850, when the propagandistic efforts of the Longley press were being exerted vigorously, a great many traveling teachers of phonography decided to teach both phonography and phonotypy. They would frequently have classes in shorthand at night and run a private school for children, using phonotypy, during the day. Many of them, however, were not as altruistic as Kyes, and used the phonotypic schools as a means of supplementing their income. Some even went in man-and-wife teams, as did the Burnzes (probably originally named Burns, until they adopted a phonetic spelling of their name). The husband would teach phonography while the wife would open a class for children in phonotypy. One of these, John Burnz, who had been teaching phonography for many years while his wife taught classes of children in phonotypy, finally came to this conclusion (IV:38):

I would advise those who hereafter go to lecturing and teaching to give all their attention to phonotypy and Longhand writing. These must precede phonography. . . . Phonetic shorthand requires more study than is usually given it, by those who take but a dozen lessons, to make it of any use to them. And from the fact that phonetic short hand is not so perfect an embodiment of the phonetic principle, the pupil often gets an erroneous comprehension of phonetic spelling. I shall never teach another class in short hand before making them somewhat familiar with phonotypy.

As time passed other teachers of phonography began to see the values of phonotypy and began to promote its interests more and more. Jacob Housaly, from Lagro, Indiana, wrote concerning the two aspects of phonetics (III:10):

I own they are closely connected, and must and ought to go together, but permit me to say that I believe phonotypy to be of the most importance. . . But if we can
have but one, let it be phonotypy. For if children are learned to read phonetically they must and will have a phonographic alphabet, and if it is not the short hand, it must be the long.

Meanwhile, Longley was promoting the cause of phonetics among teachers by making a standing offer to them that for every five subscriptions to the Advocate that a teacher sent in he would give him either a personal subscription for a year or a dollar's worth of phonetic books. For a list of twenty subscribers, a teacher could order five dollars' worth of phonetic books. This was done, he explained, in order that teachers might supply themselves with school materials without cost to themselves.

One of the most ambitious projects, however, was promoted in Boston. A group of interested men, members of a local phonetic association, determined to sponsor a phonetic school and demonstrate to the public the superiority of the phonetic method. They engaged a young woman, a Miss Lothrup, to teach in a place known as the "Warren Street Chapel." Some time later a group of three of them was invited to examine the children, and gave this report (III:58):

The undersigned were requested to examine a school of about forty children aged from 2 to 6 years each, who have been taught phonotypy for various periods of from one week to six months, in the Warren Street Chapel by Miss Lothrup. Our attention was particularly directed to a class of 12 children who had been studying but four weeks, and, who previously could neither read nor spell. The teacher's attention had been chiefly occupied by the other portions of the school, but yet these twelve children had mastered the phonotypic alphabet of 40 letters, and in the remaining week, had become so well acquainted with the principle of uniting sounds, that they were enabled to read the primer without spelling, with a considerable degree of rapidity and several of them without hesitation...

One remarkable feature of the examination was the introduction of French words which they had never before seen. These little infants, some of them hardly able to find a language to make known their wants, pronounced with accuracy the inquiry, "Parlez-vous Français?" as well as other French
sentences without having heard the words spoken, but merely from seeing them represented in the new characters.

Having satisfied themselves with the success of the experiments, the promoters of the school began to hold regular public demonstrations, inviting representatives of the various newspapers from Boston and vicinity and even from as far away as New York, to witness the demonstrations. The favorable press notices aroused a public interest which is expressed in this editorial from the Chelsea (Mass.) Union (III:161): "We are glad that this labor-saving, drudgery-dissipating system of instruction is receiving the approval of teachers and friends of education where ever introduced."

A letter from C.W. Slack, of Boston, gives this account of the 14th exhibition of the phonetic school (III:182):

The whole town and neighborhood have been awakened to the importance of the topic, everybody interested in education has been talking about the wonderful success of "those little phonetic children," and the result of the "outside pressure" has been such as to secure the adoption of the science into the primary schools of Somerville, Charlestown, and Chelsea, and a fair prospect of several more. In Chelsea (where I have a summer residence), the school committee were so much pleased with the facts presented, they not only voted to allow the best teacher in the town to put it into our school, but appropriated a sufficient sum of money to provide each scholar, 70 in number, with the elementary book. . . .

In Boston, . . . a special committee was appointed to investigate the subject. . . . The committee appointed is one favorable to the plan, and we confidently expect to have Phonetics . . . in Boston before many weeks pass.

The success of the experiment is further attested by the report, made nearly a year later, that phonotypy had been introduced into all the primary schools of Somerville; twelve of the schools of Fitchburg; into all the schools, primary, grammar and high, of the center of Dedham; into all the primary schools of Plymouth; and one school each in the towns of Chelsea, Westboro, Grafton, West Boylston, Oak Dale,
Sterling, Leominster, Westminster, Abington, West Newton, South Boston, Lynn; and into two schools in Boston. The Boston Traveller is quoted as stating (IV:186), "This new system [the phonetic method] has been introduced into 53 of the schools of this state." Thus, in a little over two years, the movement to promote phonotypy as an educational reform began to develop fully.

The introduction of phonotypy into high schools was done, according to a letter from Thomas Ranney (IV:182) for the purpose of improving enunciation. Ranney said:

During the month of April, I made the important discovery that the phonotypic chart was the only one which has ever been produced that was well adapted for training the vocal organs so as to produce clear and distinct articulation. I presented this fact to the school committee of Leominster, and they agreed to introduce it into their high school as an experiment. After using it one week, it was found that the pupils had made much greater improvement in their enunciation than they had previously in a month, and the committee resolved that the Phonetic system must go into all other schools as fast as they could bring it about.

The forward movement of phonetic teaching was not a constant thing, however. From the time that it became definitely established that a change in the alphabet was pending, until nearly a year after the adoption of the new alphabet, there is little mention of the use of phonotypy in the schools. Longley took the position that until the alphabet question was settled there was no value to be obtained from publishing additional school books in the old alphabet. He contented himself with keeping only enough books of the sort he had previously published to meet the needs of schools in which the system was already established. With the settlement of the alphabet, however, he settled down again into the business of promoting the spread of phonotypy, under the vaunted "American Phonetic Alphabet." It might be
unfair to say that he desired to recapture his vanishing book business, and that he adopted the spread of the educational reform to accomplish this end, but it would be unrealistic to ignore such a possibility.

The Ohio Phonetic Association took a positive action after the alphabet was settled. At their second annual meeting, in December, 1853, they decided to support a full time agent, who would travel throughout the state, lecturing on the subject of phonetics and spending as much time as necessary in introducing phonetic teaching into the public schools. Charles S. Royce was chosen for the job. A year after his appointment, the following report on his activities was made to the next meeting of the association (VIII:43):

He has travelled through the state attending Teacher's Institutes, visiting schools and school officers, and urging upon them the claims of phonotypy and phonography, and where practicable, introducing phonotypy into the schools as a means of teaching the Romanic method of reading.

By his labors...a large number have been made acquainted with the details of teaching phonotypy, . . . who have gone abroad to use their widespread influence in favor of the Reform. . . .

The settlement of the alphabet has given new life to the cause. So general is the satisfaction which it has given, that we meet with none who do not rejoice that it has been done, and find that it is reviving our former likewarm friends by scores.

The activities of the state agent during the next five years would be a major report in itself, since he sent to the Type a regular account of his travels and lectures. There are accounts of his having traveled and lectured in other states than Ohio, notably Indiana and Illinois, and that he was also successful in these areas in arousing interest in the educational aspects of phonotypy. A typical example of the response to agent Royce's activities is given in this report of the proceedings of the Preble County Normal Institute in July and August, 1855 (VIII:473). Royce had addressed the assembled teachers on the subject of
phonetics and the need for introducing the phonetic method into the elementary schools, it was moved and carried that a committee of five be appointed to consider the propriety of introducing phonetic instruction into all the schools of the county, and if they approved of its introduction, to submit a plan for making an efficient beginning for that purpose. Later during the institute the committee gave the following report (VIII:538):

We are united in recommending that phonetic instruction be introduced into all the schools of our county, and adapted to the different classes of pupils according to their advancement.

Then, regarding the method by which this was to be accomplished, the committee recommended:

1. That the teachers of the county qualify themselves for teaching phonotypy and phonography.
2. That measures be taken . . . to present the claims of phonetic instruction to the township Boards of Education, to the Village Boards of Education, and to the local school directors. . . .
3. That the subject be kept before the people generally and school officials in particular, until the object shall be accomplished.

Royce resigned his job as traveling agent for the Association in 1859, after a little more than five years, on the ground that the friends of the reform were losing interest, and that they were not paying his salary, and for a considerable time had not paid more than half of what he had agreed to work for.

Longley had his own ideas about promoting the cause. In February, 1854 (VII:61), he announced:

Now that the Spelling Reform is again in the ascendant and we have to go to work in earnest in the publishing of phonetic books, we wish to make arrangements for having every state in the Union canvassed by competent lecturers and book agents. . . . We have already engaged a few, and are corresponding with others; some of them will commence operation immediately for our periodicals, etc. . . .
The men who, between this time and next fall, prove themselves effective agents, will be employed at good salaries.

In March he hired five men to travel for the Longley company, and in the latter part of April hired a sixth. They were to lecture and to try to introduce the phonetic system into the school systems, thus providing a sale for Longley's phonetic school books.

In the latter days of the Longley publishing firm there did not seem to be any concerted effort to promote the reform as an educational aid. After the dissolution of the company in 1859, no more agents went out, and the former promoters of the movement gradually drifted away from Longley and his school books, turning their attention once again to phonography. There is some slight evidence that the phonotypic movement did not die instantly with the cessation of Longley's phonetic publishing. But the gradual shift of this movement into the organization known as the Spelling Reform Association in America, which was organized in 1876, and which ultimately became the base upon which the Simplified Spelling Board was organized in 1905, is not within the scope of this study. It is possible, judging from such slight evidence as has been seen, that the pursuit of the spelling reform movement from the time at which this study ends until the time of the organization of the Spelling Reform Association in America might be a fruitful research area.

Having examined the methods by which phonotypy was promoted as an educational reform, let us now turn our attention to the methods employed in the classroom in using the phonetic method of instruction. It is unfortunate that the quantity of information in this particular is not as copious as it is in some other areas of the study, but there are
occasional letters revealing individual teachers' techniques.

One of the earliest techniques—also one of the most obvious, in the absence of any other devices—is mentioned by David Parsons in August, 1819. At this time Longley did not have his phonetic printing business set up for publishing school materials, and so Parsons was forced to use his ingenuity. He did the obvious thing—used the blackboard. Instead of introducing his beginner class to the convention alphabet, he wrote the phonetic alphabet on the board. From this beginning he introduced them to the phonetic Primer and Reader.

Shortly after he began to advocate the promotion of phonotypy as an educational reform, Longley printed a series of alphabet cards. These cards were three inches high, and printed with symbols large enough to be seen from the back of the room. The teacher was advised to procure an easel with a strip of lath at least three feet long, placed at a height that could be easily seen, the lath having a ledge at the bottom on which the cards could be placed. This device could be designed either to stand on the floor or to rest on a table, though the floor type was recommended as more usable. The technique of using the easel and the cards was described in the Teacher's Guide. The teacher was cautioned emphatically to avoid giving the names of the letters (the names have been discussed in another chapter of this study). Instead, in the case of the vowel, the teacher was to show the symbol and then make the sound of the vowel. The pupil was told, then, that whenever this symbol appeared he was to make the appropriate sound.

1A. J. Ellis, The Teacher's Guide to Phonetic Reading, Bath, 1848, Quoted in the Advocate, II:5 ff.
The symbol was to be examined in detail as to its form, and in the case of symbols having a not too dissimilar form the teacher was advised to put them both out together and point out the distinguishing features of each. The teacher was cautioned to check each pupil to see that he had the proper sound, and that he was forming the sound in his mouth in an acceptable manner. This introduction was followed by intensive drilling so that a sight-sound relationship was firmly fixed in the pupil's mind. The consonants were to be introduced one at a time, not necessarily in the order in which they appeared in the phonetic alphabet. In fact, it was advised to introduce first those consonants which would combine singly with a vowel to form a word. Again the teacher was cautioned against using the names of the letters in designating the consonants. This explanation was made:

In the long vowels and diphthongs the name and power are one, but in all other cases they are different. Thus, es is not the power of s, it is only a word in which that power occurs; but which also contains the power of another letter, e (/ɛ/), and this word might have been selected as the name of the letter e with equal propriety. . . .

"But," the teacher will naturally inquire, "How am I to teach children to spell without teaching them the names of the letters?"

By teaching them the powers of the letters without their names.

The power of the letter s is a hiss produced by blowing or breathing sharply when the mouth and tongue are arranged in the position required for s. Show your children the letter s, and then tell them that when they say this letter they are to make this sound s---, but not so long as you are now making it for them to hear it distinctly.---When they have learned this, they have acquired a knowledge of the primary power of this letter.2

There follows a discussion of the "secondary power" of the letter, which

2Ibid.
is nothing but its assimilative features. This is described as being the initial effect any letter has on the immediately following sound. It is suggested that the children learn this feature of the sound by imitation, and not have the theory presented to them.

After learning the "power" of a consonant, the children were to be introduced to the symbol in combination with a vowel. At this point the easel was to be used. The consonant, for example, $s$, would be placed at the extreme left of the lath (the pupils' left) and a vowel, for example $e$ (/i/), placed at the extreme right. The teacher would point to the $s$ and the children would make the proper sound, then the teacher would immediately point to the $e$ and the pupils would make the proper sound. Then the teacher would place the cards increasingly close together and point to the letters with decreasingly less interval between until as the cards were placed side by side the pupils would say see. The same technique would then be used for saw, say, Sue, so, sigh, ice, use (n), etc. As soon as a second consonant was introduced in this manner, the number of possible combinations was increased, so that in a short while the pupils were reading most of the common monosyllable words. The teacher was advised to call attention to the difference in the way the isolated sound felt and the way it felt when joined to another sound,—that is, the teacher was instructed to demonstrate the junctural features of combined sounds kinesthetically.

This method of introducing the phonetic alphabet was evidently standard procedure, for as late as 1860 Alfred Holbrook was still describing this method in his pedagogical textbook. Its general

---

acceptance can also be deduced from the fact that the Teacher's Guide (later called Guide to Phonetic Reading) was regularly used, or recommended to be used, by teachers in learning the phonetic system of instruction, and that this book explained the method of teaching as we have given it. It is to be assumed, however, that each teacher modified the general principle to suit the needs of a particular class and adapted the details to his own personality and methods.

We have one account given of the introduction of the phonetic method into a class which had already begun in the old method. The occasion was the visit of the traveling agent of the Ohio Phonetic Association, Mr. Royce, to a school for the purpose of introducing both the teacher and the pupils to the advantages of phonetic teaching in learning to read and to spell. The general procedure Royce used was to visit a school not using the phonetic method and to convince the teacher (or the school officials) that they could afford a demonstration of the new technique. He would then go into the classroom and take charge of the class (the regular teacher becoming an observer). In this particular instance related below, he was in one of the public schools of Cincinnati, and the editor of the Advocate was present and made a verbatim phonographic transcript and commentary of the lesson as Royce gave it. It is not inappropriate that we include the complete account of this occasion as it was printed in Type (XI:247).

On Tuesday, 24th August, [1856] Mr. C.S. Royce, the Agent of the Ohio Phonetic Association, entered two of the district schools of this city, according to previous arrangement with the Trustees and Principals, for the purpose of starting classes in their primary departments in the Phonetic method of teaching reading. Those schools are in the Third and Eighth Districts, the Principals, Messrs. Forbes and Rice. The female teachers who have charge of the a-b-c pupils, having no acquaintance with the phonetic system, become, for the few weeks Mr. Royce will remain with them, learners of the
new process of teaching; after which they will conduct the classes themselves.

Thinking many of our readers, those who are teaching especially, would like to know something of the details of conducting a large class of little fellows by the Phonetic method, we will, with our phonographic pen, endeavor to bring him and his class of twenty or more boys, within their hearing.—

The class having been called out by the teacher, Mr. Royce addresses them as follows:

"Well boys, do you like to go to school?"
Some answer Yes, and some say No.
"Do those of you who love to go to school wish to learn how to read?"
Quite a number say No to this question.
"Well, do any of you love to play?"
"Yes," from most of the voices.
"Very well, do you want to play with me?"
The children seem to doubt whether they may answer this question as they would like to. Seeing this, Mr. Royce proceeds to perform some gymnastic evolutions with his arms, and encourages them to join him in the exercises. Some of them readily enough follow his motions, and soon the rest of them find themselves sufficiently free from the restraint of their new position for his purpose, which is to interest them so as to secure their confidence. This he called play, and continued it until they really seemed to think that they were at play. Then taking the position, and going through the motions of a wood-sawyer, he asks, "What kind of play is this?"

"Sawing wood," is the general reply.
"What do we saw wood with?"
"With a saw," all reply.
"Let me hear you say saw again."
He then got them to speak that word several times as distinctly as he could, they still feeling that they were at play.

Going through the motions of a seamstress, Mr. Royce asks them, "What kind of play is this?"
"Sewing," is the answer of the children.
"Who do you ever see sewing?"
"Let me hear you say saw."
All repeat the word. Again and again this word is called for by the teacher and pronounced by the class.

"Now watch me and see how many sounds I make: s, aw!"
A faint and doubting response of "two," leads him to repeat the sounds again asking how many he makes. A more full response of "two" comes from the class.

"Now see if you can tell me what word I am trying to say when I make the sounds s e, (aw) s e, s e, s e."
None of them seeming to perceive what word the sounds should make, the same process is repeated once or twice more, when some of the boys exclaim,

"Saw!" "Saw!"
The sounds of which the word is composed are again
eumciated separately and slowly, and repeated with less pause
between them, until nearly all seem to comprehend that the
blending of these sounds is the pronunciation of the word saw.

The children are now called upon to pronounce the word
saw; and after they do so a few times, Mr. Royce enunciates
the elements of the word as in the case of the word saw,
asking them how many sounds they hear.

They readily answer, "Two."

"Now watch and see if you can tell what word these sounds
would make, if I should speak them closely enough together."

Enunciating the elements of the word saw, s—s|, s—s, and
brining them more and more closely together, as in the word
saw, several of the class soon answer,

"Saw," "Saw."

Then without mentioning the words say and see, he
enunciates their elements, s i, s e, demanding of them,
first, how many sounds he gives, and afterwards what words
they would make if spoken close together. In each case he
manages the exercises in such a way that they readily dis­
cover what words are in his mind.

Pointing to a drawing upon the blackboard, Mr. Royce
asks, "What is this?"

"A tin cup," is the answer from several.

"Well, one of you bring me some water in it."

"We can't," they reply with a smile.

"Why not?"

"It won't hold water."

"What is a tin cup good for, if it won't hold water?"

The children at this question stare, without replying.

"Is it really a tin-cup?"

Some say "Yes," and some "No."

Addressing those who said no, he asks, "Then what is it?"

By a little management he draws from them the fact that it is
but the picture of a cup.

After explaining the difference between a thing and its
picture, he asks them if they would like to see the picture of
the sound s, to which they reply,

"Yes."

Then drawing on the board the letter S, he tells them,
that although we cannot see a sound, men have agreed to use
this (the letter s) as the picture of that sound, and that
whenever they see that picture in reading they are to make
that hissing sound, which they have been making.

In order to fix its form in their minds, and to asso­
ciate its sound with its form, they are required one after
another to find in on a suspended Sheet Lesson and among the
 tablets; and when they find it, to enunciate its sound in reply
to the question, "What is that a picture of?"

Up to this time the children hardly seem to have observed
the transition from play to reading. In like manner, the
character e is introduced as the representative of the second
sound in the word see, and when this is accomplished the first
lesson is concluded with the remark—
Wall, children, I think we have had a fine little play spell; and while we have been playing we have been learning something, don't you think we have. (Yes, yes, is the response.) Now I think you will all like to learn to read, if you can have somebody to play a little with you at the same time.

Lessons two, three, four, &c, should be conducted much in the same manner, in order to keep the attention of the little fellows, and fix in their minds the shape and sounds of the letters.

After reading this account of Royce's technique, we can easily understand how he could be successful in introducing the phonetic method and how he was able to continue in this sort of work for over five years. He was a teacher, not a mere pedagogue; a showman, not a mere demonstrator.

The question now arises, what results were being obtained by the use of the phonetic method? To cite a complete list of testimonials from school teachers would read like a patent medicine advertisement, but it is not inappropriate that we should mention a few representative letters by way of describing the reception which was given to the phonetic method. During the time of Volume II of the Longley periodical, when the educational aspect of phonotypy was being initiated and promoted with great vigor, the Advocate carried a large number of letters from teachers telling of the results they were having with the phonetic method. Later on, the inclusion of letters of testimony was evidently not felt to be necessary, possibly because the word-of-mouth spreading of the benefits of the method had been greatly increased. As early as the first issue of Volume II, a letter (dated June 30, 1849) from David Parsons, of Jefferson, Ohio, gave this testimony (II:4):

The scholars which have learned phonotypy, and are still learning it, are a-b-c scholars. They learn to read easy sentences in from two to three weeks, and will read anything in three months. In our primary department, we don't pretend to teach a-b-c scholars the old ways of reading, except by the new way first. If I was compelled to teach...
the old way of spelling and reading, I would teach the new way first; by which means I should be, as well as my pupils, the gainer, by two thirds of my time.

Two letters bearing the testimony of two individual children's response to the phonetic method are interesting from the viewpoint of "the other end of the log." The first is from a school teacher in Milan, Ohio, and gives the experience of her own child as sufficient motivation to cause her to attempt to use the phonetic method in her school, if the board of education will allow it.

A little son of mine, who has always considered reading a task rather than a pleasure, notwithstanding much pains has been taken with him, has at last found, that phonetic reading affords him delight. He can hardly wait for the regular arrival of the Advocate. But a few days since, I asked him why he took such delight in reading phonotypy.—"Because," said he, "I don't have to guess what the words are, I know what they are." That is it, let orthoepy be studied, and orthography reduced to a mathematical certainty, and a child that does not love to read, will be as rare an object as one that does not love to hear talking. (II:37)

The second is from Cyrus Week, of Franklin, Indiana, who says (II:47):

I have one little boy in my school who is learning phonotypy. He could not read very well in heterotypy, but I have only been teaching him a little more than a week, and he can read in the Advocate. The little fellow says he likes to read in phonotypy better than in heterotypy, that the former is very easy; he is quite proud that he can read what the other scholars can not; he is about six years old. . . .

Another experience with teaching a single individual is printed in the early part of Volume II (II:82). Robert Patterson (alleged to be the "President of the U.S. Mint") of Philadelphia tells of his experience in teaching an illiterate Negro boy from Virginia by means of phonetics. The boy had already learned most of the Romanic alphabet, and memorized a few words by rote, but if the words were presented in any order other than the order in which they had been learned, he could not spell them. After about 40 hours of instruction Patterson reported that the boy was
able to read anything set before him. On one occasion he tested him by writing a series of long terms from a medical dictionary. The boy read them easily after they had been properly syllabicated. Patterson was of the opinion that the boy's reading ability was at least equal to that of a child who had studied over a year under ordinary methods.

Another letter during these early days concerned teaching a group of Indians at the Friends Mission among the Shawnee Indians, at Westport, Missouri. The writer, W.P. Harvey, said (II:58):

> Although I have not introduced the new system of spelling into my school here, yet some of my pupils can take up a Magazine and, injuns as they are, read nearly every thing they come to. Three years ago, not one had tried to read, but the evening before last, I had my papers, (the Magazine and Advocate) in the school room where the boys were, and some of them took the papers, and began to read. I was engaged in writing at the time, but my attention was soon drawn to the little fellows, in astonishment; one of them, aged about fifteen, in the course of half an hour, with a little assistance at first, could read as fluently as any white boy of that age, in the old style. What a pity that the old system had not been exploded long ago.

Other testimony could be added to that given, such as the statement by L. Bishop, of St. Cmar, Indiana, "...many children who have been to school for two years can not read as well as they," in reference to his phonetic students, or the statement from M.I.S. Raymond, New Haven, Illinois, "My scholars learn faster, and I am relieved from the never ending task of explaining the infinite modes of spelling in the 'good old way'. . . . " but we will not burden these pages with any more. It is sufficient to say that they were entirely pleased with the phonetic method of teaching reading, and generally agreed that the saving of time was considerable.

A point frequently mentioned was that pupils who had learned to read the phonetic way had better and clearer enunciation of their words
than pupils taught in the ordinary way. After the process of phonetic teaching had become firmly established as a desirable method of teaching, we find this aspect of phonotypy attracting favorable comment from school officials. Thomas Ranney wrote from Boston (III:202),

Since the introduction of Phonotypy into some of the public schools here, it has been admitted by such of the School Committee as have examined the schools, that the phonetic system is the only true system by which the correct enunciation can be taught to children.

Ranney mentioned that pupils who were already able to read were being put through the same basic course as the beginners in order that they should learn the proper values of the various English sounds, and thus correct their pronunciation and enunciation. As further testimony of the effectiveness of the phonetic method in teaching correct enunciation, we note this letter, dated June 22, 1857, from Cornelius S. Carter, Master of Harvard College of Charleston, Massachusetts, (an institution we have yet to identify, but evidently not connected with the university of the same name). The letter was addressed to D.S. Smalley, and read (XI:95):

In the experiment of your system of phonetics as conducted by yourself with my class, I have witnessed enough to convince me of its great practical utility. Your phonotypic alphabet...affords a sure and ready means for acquiring a habit of distinct enunciation, analyzing difficult words, correcting faults in pronunciation, eradicating impediments in the free use of the vocal organs, and disciplining the ear to a just appreciation of such sounds as are peculiar to a foreign language...

Its happiest results, however, must be looked for only where it is begun in the Primary Schools and continued throughout the term of pupilage.

Another letter dated June 30, 1857, appears in the same location. This was from D.B. Hagar, Principal of the Elliot High School of West Roxbury, Massachusetts, and President of the Massachusetts Teacher’s Association.
He said, in part:

In the course of a long experience in teaching elocution to young people, I have almost always found their articulation very imperfect. A want of thorough early training in the exact utterance of words has, in nearly every case, permitted the formation of bad habits of speech, which have been overcome with great difficulty. . . .

I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that if children were, from their first entrance into school, correctly taught to spell by sound, as well as by the common orthography, they would certainly acquire an easy clear, and exact enunciation; and consequently, that nearly all the time now spent in our High Schools in endeavoring to correct erroneous habits in reading and speaking might be devoted to the higher department of elocution.

So well convinced am I of the utility of phonetic training, that I should prefer to have my own children instructed in reading a single term with its aid, than two terms without it.

At one of the exhibitions of children taught by the phonetic method, mentioned earlier in this chapter, Horace Mann (often called the "Father of Modern Education") was present. Ranney reported that Mann "expressed himself very much gratified, and earnestly recommended its [the phonetic method] adoption in our public schools." Mann wrote a letter to Dr. Stone (whom we have earlier mentioned as the first president of the American Phonetic Council), which Stone forwarded to Longley. This letter was printed in the Advocate (III:198) as follows:

Dear Sir: Having witnessed the exercises of a class of nine children under your care, [they were under Miss Lothrup] in reading Phonography and Phonotypy, it gives me pleasure to assure you of the delight which their performances gave me. I think the Nine Muses were never listened to by a more gratified audience.

The English language is so anomalous and self contradictory, that some of the greatest and best minds have sought for a method of lessening the difficulties of acquiring it. We call it improperly the English language; as though there was but one. On opening a dictionary anybody will see that there are two English languages; one for speaking, the other for writing and printing; and I believe the mastery of these to be more difficult for children than that of two languages.
wholly distinct and separate from each other, or having any [sic] word in common. The child is taught to give a particular sound to a letter, and when he sees the same letter again he is taught to give it another sound; and still another and another many times over. Intellectually considered, this must present to the learner a considerable extent of chaos; and in morals, it is as near like lying as any thing can be and escape it. Phonography and Phoentoypuyo propose to obviate these very serious difficulties by using as many distinct signs as there are distinct sounds in the language so that no letter or character shall ever imitate the rogues device of changing his name. I have long believed that so desirable an achievement would be realized. My only doubt had been whether you have obtained the best system of characters. And here I do not deny, but only reserve judgement.

The children you exhibited had certainly made most wonderful proficiency, and were in several of the essentials of good enunciation and reading years in advance of most children who had been taught in the old way.

Stone mentioned to Longley that this letter from Horace Mann would probably have more weight with school committees than many expressions from lesser figures.

A bit of statistical support for the superiority of pupils taught by the phonetic method is given in a report of the outcome of an Educational Prize Demonstration, given in Boston. This was a regular affair and offered a prize of $250 to the best two readers and spellers from any Boston school as determined by a public exhibition. The rules of the competition provided that two children could be entered from any school providing the average combined age of the children did not exceed seven years (if one child was over seven, the other must be younger than seven by an equal amount). The competition had been originated by Dr. Stone, though whether he individually posted the prize money is not known. Its purpose was to demonstrate to the public the superiority of the phonetic pupils. On the occasion we are describing here which was the fourth such demonstration, the judges were Charles G. Loring, chairman, Rt. Rev. John B. Fitzpatrick, Charles Sumner, Thomas Sherwin, Rev. Hubbard Winslow, William H. Prescott,
George S. Boutwell, John G. Palfrey, and George B. Emerson. The classes were designated by letters so that none of the examiners might know from which school they had come. The reading was from the fifth and sixth chapters of Acts and from the sixteenth chapter of John in the Bible. The tabulated results of the reading were given as follows, based on a standard of 8 as perfect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total points</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Classes A and F were eliminated on the grounds of averaging over seven years of age.)

The classes were then examined in spelling. The examination consisted of two lists of words, the first list containing eleven words of reasonable difficulty, the second list of six very difficult words. The first list consisted of the words: could, sword, champions, there, enough, iron, excellent, dispaired, valley, weapons, rogues. The second list consisted of: dissatisfaction, passport, government, apprentice, mountaineer, intelligence. The words had been selected by the examining committee, and had not been previously communicated to the teachers of the students. The results of the spelling contests, tabulating the number of errors made in each class of words, were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st spelling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd spelling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total errors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be readily seen that class H was the winner in both contests. Only after the contest was over was it revealed that class H was from the experimental phonetic school. We can not ignore, however, the fact that class I, from an ordinary school, was a close runner-up in both contests. A very interesting aspect of this group of statistics is that in the phonetic school the pupils had been taught reading only one year and spelling only four and one half months. Where, we might ask, can we find a group of seven-year-old children today who would undertake reading material of the type used in this contest, or who would even know where to begin in spelling the words in the two lists used on that occasion?

In addition to these reports, a number of organizations of teachers took official action regarding phonotypy. For example, at the meeting of the Ohio Teacher's Association in Columbus, December 26 and 27, 1859, the following resolution was passed unanimously (II:124):

Resolved, That this convention recommend to school teachers and school trustees the propriety of testing for themselves by actual experiments in school, the value of the phonetic system.

Two years later, probably as a result of the experiments above mentioned being carried out, this same group made an even more positive statement. The Association, meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, July 2, 1851, passed this resolution (III:194):

Whereas, It is the unanimous testimony of friends of the Phonetic Reform, and in accordance with the observation of members of this association, that the Phonetic method of instruction as now extensively employed by teachers in various parts of this country, and in England, is of great service in teaching children to read the common printing, so that a course of instruction of a few weeks in the phonetic characters followed by similar instruction in the common printing, will enable the learner to acquire a knowledge of the latter, in nearly one-fourth the time
required by the usual method of instruction, therefore, Resolved, That this Association do recommend it to the teachers of the State of Ohio, so far as practicable, to make use of this method of instruction, so that the great advantages thus promised to the cause of Primary Education may be speedily secured.

Resolved, That a committee of three members of this Association be appointed to publish, at their earliest convenience, an address to the Teachers and Friends of Education of the State of Ohio, setting forth the principles of the Phonetic Reform, and communicating such information relating to its history, progress and success as shall be necessary to a proper understanding of its great importance to the cause of education.

Another report was given from Pennsylvania, reprinted from the Teacher's Magazine, published in Pittsburg (which may have been the journal of the Pennsylvania teacher's organization) which states (II:232):

Phonotypy, or printing in accordance with sound, is becoming, contrary to the predictions of many who esteemed themselves wise, very popular; and indeed a candid examination of the system, is all that is required to secure the approbation of every lover of truth and useful reformation—The extreme difficulty attending the acquirement of an accurate knowledge of the power of the letters of our language, as now written and printed, plainly proves that there is room for reformation; but whether the plan presented by Messrs. Pitman and Ellis is the best that could be adopted or not, may be subject to some debate. One thing there can be no question, it is the best before us, . . .

Perhaps many may say "it is all folly to talk of such things, for we would all have to go to school," but this is a mistake; for we feel assured that in one week, every person, able to read, could become familiar with the new style of printing, and read it as fluently as they can the old; . . . Phonotypy is one of the greatest improvements of the nineteenth century, and deserves to be classed with electro-magnetic telegraphing.

Still later, the teachers of Illinois took a stand regarding phonetics, and expressed the following position regarding phonotypy in a two-part

---

Pennsylvania Teacher's Magazine and Family Monitor, Pittsburg; 1849-1850 only.
resolution on phonography and phonotypy, which is quoted from the Princeton (Ill.) Post (V:106): 5

2. That we believe phonotypy should be introduced into our common schools without delay, and that... it will enable the pupil to read the common print in one half the time required by the usual method of instruction...

Teachers who met in an Institute in Ontario, Indiana, were introduced to the First Phonetic Reader following a lecture on the phonetic reform and the value of the phonetic principle to the classroom teacher. They were reported to have "agreed to attempt the introduction of the First Reader" into the schools at once experimentally, as an occasional exercise, without calling attention to phonetics as a branch of study (V:1146). It may be reasonably presumed they intended to incorporate the study formally after the merits had been established sufficiently to overcome any possible opposition.

The head of LaGrange College, a teacher's college in Indiana, stated he planned to introduce phonotypy into his school so that his graduates could begin using the phonetic method in their schools. He also expressed his intention to prepare a grammar and an arithmetic in phonotypy, but at present we have found no evidence of the completion of such works.

Following the leadership of Horace Mann, a number of states began promoting normal schools for teachers. In Ohio, the normal school was first a regional (often only county wide) normal institute held in the summer for periods of from five to six weeks. Later on, when a permanent normal school was established at Lebanon, the curriculum for

5 No available data.
junior, or common, school teachers included the teaching of elocution (which included reading and declamation), and orthography, with phonetic analysis, as well as the usual elementary school subjects.  

In June, 1857, the Teacher's Association of Iowa expressed a favorable attitude toward the phonetic reform, and an editorial in the **Voice of Iowa** said (X:125):

The action of the Association in regard to the important subject of Phonetics is highly indicative of the right spirit on the part of the teachers of Iowa. . . . The action of the State Phonetic Association was also prompt and decisive. Mr. Sanders has taken the field as the State Agent, and will do much to advance the interests of both Associations. . . .

The action of the Iowa Teacher's Association had been to pass this resolution:

*Whereas,* it is the unanimous testimony of the friends of Phonetic Reform and in accordance with our own convictions of its truthfulness, that the Phonetic mode of instruction is the most rational manner of teaching reading, and that after the pupil has been taught to read by this system, he will make the transition to the common print in much less time than is required in learning the common system alone, therefore,

Resolved, That this Association recommend to the teachers of Iowa to make use of this system of instruction as far as practicable, so that the great advantage thus promised to the cause of education may be speedily secured,

Resolved, That we receive with the pleasure the assurance that a series of school books in the Phonetic type will soon be published, and will enable teachers to test the system and prove to the public the utility and advantages of the Spelling Reform.

---

6This information appeared in an advertisement of the first winter session of the school which appeared in the *Advocate*, VIII:726.

7*Voice of Iowa*. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1857-1858 only.
The Wisconsin Fox Lake Journal is quoted as reporting that the Teacher's Institute, held in Marquette county, Wisconsin, adopted the following resolution (X:125):

"Resolved, that we regard the Phonetic System of teaching reading the best we now have, and that we recommend its introduction into our common schools as soon as practicable." The paper then editorially praises the action and speaks at length concerning the values of the phonetic system of orthography.

As was mentioned in an earlier chapter, on March 8, 1856 the newly organized Louisiana Teacher's Association heard a committee which had been appointed at a previous meeting report on phonetics. The report went into considerable detail on the inconsistencies of ordinary orthography, and concluded with the following resolution (IX:129):

Resolved: That we regard with favor all attempts to facilitate the acquisition of reading and writing, and to render them more efficient in the diffusion of knowledge.
Resolved: That we consider the phonetic instruction one of the improvements characteristic of the age.
Resolved: That we recommend the speedy introduction on phonetic instruction, in both branches, into the common schools of Louisiana.

As a result of this report and its favorable acceptance, a standing committee with the title "Committee on Phonetic Instruction" was appointed.

Reports from school officials were also generally favorable to the phonetic movement, as witness this letter from the Committee of School Examiners of Hamilton County, Ohio:

---

8Fox Lake Journal, also entitled Fox Lake Record, Fox Lake, Wisconsin, 1854-1865.
As undersigned members of the Board of Examiners of Common Schools of Hamilton county, Ohio, take pleasure in stating that from their acquaintance with the science of phonotypy, they regard it as worthy the attention of instructors. We are satisfied that by its use persons previously unacquainted with the common alphabet may in a very short time (one or two weeks) be led to read in the New Testament in phonotypic characters. This alone would recommend the subject to the notice and approbation of the intelligent and benevolent persons of the community.

Another committee, appointed by the Henry County Educational Society, reported to the assembly society at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, proceedings of which are allegedly reported in the Iowa True Democrat9 (II:89) as

The committee appointed at the last meeting of the Henry county Educational Society, to examine and report on the merits of Phonotypy and Phonography, at this meeting of the society, having examined the subject, as well as their time and ability would permit, and believing their merits will more fully appear by showing the advantages they possess over heterotypy (our other system of spelling and writing) report the following contrast:

Disadvantages of Hetericism
1. Heteric spelling renders reading very difficult.
2. It renders writing still more so.
3. It necessitates every student to learn the spelling and pronunciation of every word in the language individually.
4. It renders the task of learning to read hateful, unpleasant and slow.
5. It is, consequently, one of the great causes of ignorance among the masses of the people who speak the English language at the present day.
6. It occasions great difficulty to those who endeavor to reduce unwritten languages to writing, and obscures the names of persons and places.
7. It disables us from ascertaining the real condition of our spoken language, even a few hundred years back.
8. It is a great obstacle to the universality of our language, and its general use among foreigners.

Advantages of Phoneticism
1. Phonetic spelling will render reading easy.
2. It will render spelling very easy.
3. It enables the student, as soon as he has learned the phonetic alphabet thoroughly, to spell words with the same accuracy that he can pronounce them.

9Iowa True Democrat, Mount Pleasant, Iowa, 1849-1852.
4. It renders the task of learning to read delightful to teacher and learner, and rapid of performance.
5. It will, consequently, tend to remove the present ignorance of the people, by opening to them a ready means for acquiring knowledge.
6. It will render the business of reducing unwritten languages to a written form sure and easy.
7. It will be of essential service to the student of languages, in showing him the exact state of a language at a given time.
8. It will tend most effectually to the general diffusion of our language among foreigners, and may complete the numerous claims which our idiom can already advance, to be used as a universal medium of communication between nation and nation.

For the further consideration of the society, the committee report the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, the perpetuity of our republican institutions, and the happiness of the people, depend upon their education; whereas, knowledge can not be diffused among the people to any great extent, without they possess the ability to read; and whereas, learning to read by our present system of English orthography is of such difficult attainment, there are more than half a million of white adults in the United States who cannot read; whereas, there are multitudes of foreigners who do not speak English emigrating to the United States; and whereas, the inconsistency and absurdities of English spelling, which requires patient years to master, prevent foreigners from learning to read, or speak English; and whereas it is highly important that we have a national language of easy acquirement, spoken and understood by all; whereas, pupils cannot be taught a knowledge of other branches till they have learned to read; and learning Heterotypy requires so much time, that it is necessary to confine children in school at very early age, (sic) often to the great injury of their constitutions, when they should be exercising in the open air, and acquiring physical strength;

And whereas, the introduction of Phonotypy would obviate all these evils, therefore

Resolved, that it is the duty of all the friends of popular education of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian, to make themselves acquainted with the spelling reform, and use their efforts to secure its success.

Resolved, that we recommend to the friends of phonography and phonotypy, to call a national convention of the friends and advocates of the reform in the United States, in some central place, (say Cincinnati,) at a day early as possible, (say early next spring,) to discuss and adopt such measures as they may deem necessary to promote and secure the success of the reform.

Resolved, that it is the duty of the State Superintendent of public instruction to investigate the subject of phonotypy and phonography, and we hereby call his attention to an examination of "the spelling and writing reform," and should he find it worthy of public support, and calculated to advance the best
interests of popular education, we advise him to bring the subject before the state legislature, at as early a day as possible.

Resolved, that it is the duty of teachers, and all school officers to examine "the reform," and if they find it calculated to promote the happiness and welfare of the uneducated, it is their duty to use their efforts to secure its success, and the benefits thereof to the public, and especially to the rising generation.

Francis McRay (or MacCray)
D.M. Kelsy

(Since the names were given phonetically, it is impossible to determine their exact spelling.)

There is evidence that by the time of the end of Longley's publishing activities, which marks the limit set for this study, phonotypy had been introduced into a large number of schools in Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania; in several schools in Vermont, Maine, Missouri, Kentucky, and Mississippi; and in an occasional school in Virginia, Maryland, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Texas, and California. It is possible that the phonetic system of teaching had been introduced into other areas than those mentioned, but this has not, at present, been verified. Further evidence of the attitude of teachers, educators, and school administrators might be amassed, but an exhaustive report on all the letters and resolutions relating to the phonetic reform is felt to be superfluous. Numerous journals devoted to education, such as the Ohio Journal of Education, the Indiana School Journal, the Missouri Educator, the Pennsylvania School Journal, the New York Educational Herald, carried articles favorable to the phonetic system, and some of them went so far as to set up the phonotypic alphabet with a sample of phonetic printing as a means of encouraging the adoption of the phonetic method.
What effect did this mounting mass of evidence have upon legislative groups in their deliberations on the educational process? First we must recognize the fact that during the middle of the nineteenth century, the period with which we are concerned, the cause of education was awakening as a sleeping giant, and educational reform of all sorts was popular, politically, in a great portion of the United States. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the cause of the spelling reform a subject of discussion in legislative halls. Information is fragmentary on this phase of the study, but those legislative actions that are known are of interest and value in completing the picture of the spread of phonotypy as an educational reform.

One of the first accounts of legislative consideration of phonetics was given in May, 1852 (III:174), when a petition from a number of citizens of Boston was presented to the Massachusetts legislature. The petition was referred to the Joint Committee on Education, which called for a demonstration by phonetically taught pupils. This demonstration was duly made, and the report of the committee stated their satisfaction that these students, aged three to six years had demonstrated a superior ability to read after having been taught phonetically. The report briefly described phonotypy, and listed twelve advantages claimed for the phonetic teaching of reading in the public schools—advantages which they did not deny. The committee concluded the report thus:

The committee, therefore, deem the subject of sufficient importance to be worthy the attention of school committees and of those who have charge of common school instruction.

The report was signed by D.L. Keyes and William Hyde from the Senate, and James W. Ward, Francis Coggswell, and William Curtis, from the
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Approximately a year later (IV:1142), a similar petition was presented to the legislature of Wisconsin by "James Eadie and 55 others," asking that phonotypy and phonography be introduced into the public schools of that state. This, also, was referred to an appropriate committee. The disposition of this petition, however, was not as forcefully favorable to the reform as was the disposition of the Massachusetts petition. After being editorially introduced, the report is quoted as stating (IV:154):

The committee who have had under consideration the petition of James Eadie and others, praying for the introduction of phonography and phonotypy into the schools of the State, beg leave to report, That the Boards of School Districts are authorized by the present law to introduce said system whenever they think proper. Therefore, we deem no further action on that subject necessary.

Following the publication of the report, Longley asked, "How are they to get their books, friend Eadie? To insure the adoption of the system, had you not better get some merchant to order a supply of the necessary instruction books?"

In February, 1853, the matter of phonetic teaching came up in the Michigan legislature. The report of the legislative committee indicated that it had been favorably impressed by the information that phonetic teaching had been adopted in 160 schools of the state of Massachusetts, that it was taught in the Massachusetts State Normal College and in the Albany Female Academy, and that evidence had been presented that in the United States the phonetic method had been adopted in over 500 schools and colleges. The report then recommended a favorable acceptance of the phonetic system by the public schools of Michigan, though they made the actual adoption of the system optional with local school boards.
Following the favorable report of the Louisiana Teacher's Association in March, 1856, the legislature of Louisiana received a report from the State Superintendent of Education which, though not recommending the outright adoption of the phonetic system did suggest that the merits of the phonetic system be seriously considered and investigated. He further advised that in the event of the establishment of a state normal school for teachers, phonetic teaching be introduced into the school in order that it might be thoroughly studied and tested (X:63). At present no record of the action taken on this report has been found. Other legislative groups may have discussed the merits of phonetic teaching, though at present no record has been found of such action.

In addition to its being used in the common schools, phonotypy was also effectively used as a means of teaching foreigners to read and speak English. The first hint of this application of phonotypy appeared in 1848 (I:214) as Longley mentions editorially:

We believe Cincinnati has taken the lead in one particular, in putting into operation a project for promoting the spelling reform; namely, using phonotypy for instructing Germans to read English. . . .

He then went on to tell of the application of phonotypy by a German teacher in teaching his countrymen to read English. Longley told how they had started the project by calling a meeting of the Germans of Cincinnati, at which Longley passed out a number of tracts printed in German explaining the merits of phonetics in learning English. Mr. Clamroth, the teacher, then spoke on the subject, and afterward it was agreed to purchase the necessary books for applying phonotypy to learning English. Clamroth said that in the case of Germans already having a speaking knowledge of English, he could teach them to read in
from four to six weeks, where previously it had taken nearly two years.

Longley then commented editorially that persons residing in the neighborhood of large numbers of foreigners would do well to introduce them to phonotypy, pointing out that he had tracts explaining the system in French, German, and Welsh. However, an earlier occasion of using phonotypy for this purpose is suggested by a Mr. Kinney, editor of the West Liberty, Ohio, Banner. Prior to Longley's beginning his publishing business, Kinney had been in Cincinnati, studying phonography under Mr. Webster, and taught spoken English to a group of Germans (III:70):

When we were with Webster in Cincinnati we taught a class of Germans fresh from fatherland, to pronounce English intelligibly by the system, in two or three weeks, when with the old alphabet, it could not have been done so well in as many years.

The next mention of this aspect of phonotypy appeared about a year later, when Longley commented editorially (IV:6),

We have now another new step to record in the progress of the phonetic system. On Tuesday afternoon of this week we were visited by the Trustees and Teacher of a large German school, who wished to examine our books and method of teaching. One of them had become somewhat acquainted with the phonetic principle, and at once saw the advantage it would be to foreigners, in acquiring the correct pronunciation of the English Language. . . . A brief explanation of the books and the method of teaching was sufficient to satisfy them all, and the result was an order for 50 copies of the First Phonetic Reader, and half a dozen Longhand writers, to be sent to their school the next day.

About a month later this announcement appeared in the editorial column (IV:22),

We are happy to announce the fact, that the whole adult German population of Cincinnati, though they number by the thousands, will be afforded the opportunity of learning to read the English language in the short term of three months. We refer particularly to those who can speak our language to a greater or less extent, and who are familiar with the orthography of their own language. . . . It will be done by the Phonetic Method of teaching, which is now so rapidly displacing the old process of memorizing the
orthography and pronunciation of each separate word.

Mr. H. Shults, a German teacher in one of the Cincinnati District Schools, who has made the Phonetic system a special study for six months or more, has resolved to give the matter a start in the course of a few weeks. . . . Mr. Shults' plan is for Evening Schools, for the benefit of those who are engaged through the day.

The percentage of the German population which took advantage of this school is not known, but there are several subsequent references to the fact of the German school being in operation successfully.

In November, 1854, in a letter from E.H. Spaulding of St. Louis, Missouri (VII:361) a private school was mentioned at which "thirty or more of the applicants cannot read English, though some of them understand German. It is proposed by one of the teachers. . . to introduce these pupils to the English via phonetics."

Similarly, the problem of teaching foreigners arose in California among the heterogenous population of San Francisco. The first mention of this problem appeared in a letter from T.J. Nevins, an agent of the American Tract Society working in San Francisco and vicinity, stating the extreme need for introducing phonotypy there as an aid in teaching English to the assorted foreign element with which he had to work (III:118). He requested such books as might serve to that end, in order that he might introduce the spelling reform in his teaching and working with these people. Another letter, which had been sent from A. Jackman of San Francisco to a certain Rev. Blakesley of Geauga County, Ohio, was, in turn, forwarded to Longley. In essence it agreed with Nevin's idea that the gateway to teaching English to the foreign element there was through phonotypy. He closed the letter with this remark,

From this consideration and others which might be named, I am of the opinion that the science of
Phonology is the sure fulcrum over which the Christian lever must be placed in order to move the world.

Two weeks later Longley announced that he had sent a small lot of phonetic Readers to California by J.M. Thompson, who was going out with others following the gold rush.

Evidently Balkesley himself went as a missionary to California, for about two years later (V:135) there was a letter from him from San Francisco stating that he was using phonotypy to teach Chinese and other foreigners. A few weeks later Longley acknowledged receipt of a lithographed booklet which Blakesley had designed and was using in his classes. This booklet was described as containing about 1200 words in phonotypy, with the Chinese characters following them as a translation. Should a copy of this booklet ever be discovered, it would be a most valuable curio. At the same time, Blakesley wrote that a fire had destroyed his phonetic books, and ordered a new supply, saying, "I am fully convinced, that, to reach them effectually, I must introduce among them a possible means of acquiring our pronunciation. This, phonotypy, almost alone, gives them. . . ."

There are two references to phonotypy being used by missionaries in areas outside the United States. The first of these had a history somewhat as follows: A certain Rev. Officer, of Springfield, Ohio had gone to a certain Mr. McDonald of Woodstock for phonetic instruction for the purpose of using it in teaching English to the natives in a part of Africa to which he was going, according to a letter from McDonald's daughter. A little later Longley received a letter from Officer, who said (IV:142),

"Mr. Thompson, who has been there two years, tells me that phonotypy is almost indispensable in reducing their languages
to written languages...I expect to sail about
the last of August, but wish to know something of phonotypy before I leave. If I attempt to introduce it into
the school at the Mission, I will need some Bibles,
Testaments, etc.

In June, Officer wrote again, and, after thanking Longley for
his assistance in offering the books at half price and for editorially
requesting his readers to donate toward their purchase, Officer said
(IV:178):

I have consulted the Committee under whose auspices I go
out, and they advise me to procure a few of each of the
different kinds of elementary works you publish and try
them in the Mission. I have also seen Mr. Thompson who
has spent two years at the mission, and he still recommends
the use of Phonotypy.

Longley then repeated his request that friends of the spelling reform
would do well to support the purchase of phonotypic books for the
mission, pointing out that it was non-denominational, and that men
from several different faiths were on the staff there. Then, to
motivate them to action further, he quoted from "a work recently
published by Mr. Thompson" which he alleged would show the importance
of phonotypy in Africa.(an extract of this unidentified work was sent
to Longley by an unnamed friend). Thompson is reported to have said:

Brother Carter, being much interested in Phonography and
Phonotypy, was peculiarly anxious to introduce the latter,
and apply it to the African languages. He collected a
class of Akoos, and met them for this purpose. They were
much interested, and applied themselves so that in a
few evenings they could apply it to their own language,
and write to each other understandingly. I am fully per-
suaded that this or something similar must be introduced
and applied to the numerous languages of Africa, before
any great movement can be made toward the translation of
the Bible, of the general diffusion of knowledge...I
have, therefore, to request everyone who is expecting
to go to the Mendi Mission, to teach or to preach, to
acquaint themselves with the principles of phonotypy
before leaving America. I have tried the application of
our common alphabet in the translation of Mendi; and it
is impossible to effect the work with any completeness or
satisfaction. We must have something else, and we look to phonotypy as the thing desired.

The other instance of phonotype being used by a missionary outside the United States is briefly noted. It simply consists of the acknowledgement of an order for 25 phonotypic Readers and 25 copies of the Gospel of Matthew in phonotype, requested by a certain Rev. G.B. Nutting in Aintab, Turkey. However, the implication of the order is that Nutting was making about the same use of them as was Officer in Africa.

What was the relationship of the Longley publishing firm to this movement? Actually Longley was at the very heart of it. Except during the earliest days of the spelling reform in the United States, when such phonotypic books as were obtainable came from the Pitman presses in Bath, England, the bulk of the phonetic school books used in the United States (and Canada) were printed by Longley. We find such items as these which hint at the volume of phonetic text-book business carried on by the Longley firm: the first two printings (1000 and 1500 respectively) of the First Phonetic Reader, published in 1849, were sold out by the end of six months; by early 1852 Thomas Ranney had introduced phonotypy into 33 schools in Massachusetts, for whom he had ordered over 1300 of the First Reader; by fall of the same year it was reported that about 3000 First Readers had been sold in Boston alone; small orders of from a dozen or less to twenty or thirty copies were acknowledged in almost every issue of the Longley paper, these orders having come from teachers of small schools independently adopting the phonetic system. By 1850, a year after he began book-printing, the demand for phonotypic school books became so great that Longley found it difficult to keep up with the orders. In order to facilitate
distribution, he established depots for his books in Dayton, Ohio; Rushville, Indiana; and Kennabeck, Manitoba, Canada. By the end of that year and during the early part of 1851, he established additional depots at Lincoln, Ohio; Pleasant Valley, Ohio; Greencastle, Indiana; and Waukegan, Illinois.

After the revision of the alphabet in 1853, as Longley began once more to promote his school book business, additional depots were established. Probably one of Longley's largest outlets was in Boston, with the firm of Otis Clapp. Clapp was both a publisher and a book dealer, and he agreed to stock the phonetic texts for the Boston schools. The demand for these books became so great that in 1854 Longley authorized Clapp to print the First Reader (which was in greatest demand) and sent him a set of stereotyped plates for that purpose (V:45). The American Phrenological Journal is quoted as having noticed the phonetic activity and having commented thus on Longley's First Phonetic Reader, Second Phonetic Reader, and Transition Reader: "This series of Primary school readers have been before the public a little over a year, and during that time have attained a sale and popularity scarcely hoped for by the most sanguine friends of the Spelling Reform."

By 1855 (according to a standing notice appearing throughout Volume VIII), phonetic depots were established in New York and in Philadelphia, with the firm of Fowler and Wells (publishers of Life Illustrated); Boston, Massachusetts, with Otis Clapp; Bangor, Maine, with William Bartlett; Providence, Rhode Island, with J.C. Thompson; Chagrin Falls, Ohio, with S.L. Wilkinson; Hiram, Ohio, with L.W. Trask; Freeport, Illinois, with A.B. Pickard; St. Louis, Missouri, with E.W. Spaulding; Lansing, Michigan, with S.D. Newbro; and Yellow Springs,
Ohio, with Julius Cone. In the latter part of 1855, a phonetic depot was also established in New Orleans, Louisiana, with R.C. Kerr.

It must be noted, however, that after the establishment of the American Phonetic Alphabet in 1853, the earlier school books were obsolete. The description of the various books published by the firm has been given in Chapter IV, and it was with the later group of books that the firm was most successful. There can be no doubt that the promotional efforts of Longley in circulating his periodical, coupled with the considerable publicity he gave to all favorable notices of the educational desirability of the spelling reform, aided materially in the sale of his phonetic school books and in so doing gave additional impetus to the educational aspects of the phonetic movement.

In conclusion, then, we note: that approximately one year after opening his publishing business, Longley began to publish phonetic school books, and also began to agitate the adoption of phonotypy as an aid to the teaching of reading; that instead of advocating a general reform of all printing and spelling, he began to advocate the application of the phonetic principle to learning to read common print; that the promotion of this aspect of the phonetic movement became increasingly popular with teachers, and decreasingly objectionable with the public. After Benn Pitman came to Cincinnati and entered the phonographic publishing business, Longley dropped out of that phase of the reform, concentrating more and more on his phonotypic works. Even his book *The American Manual of Phonography*, one of the very popular texts on the Pitman system of shorthand, was printed in phonotype, and probably owed its popularity to the fact that the phonetic shorthand was discussed in relation to the American Phonetic Alphabet.
During the life of his periodical, Longley seemed to be able to hold the various alphabet factions together by the fact that his rather widely circulated magazine, as well as his school books, represented a system of phonetic spelling that was more generally known than any other. After the dissolution of the publishing firm, there is a hint of a gradual breaking up among various educators over the question of whether the phonotypic alphabet as Longley had employed it was best for educational purposes. Some of the later reports on the phonetic system raised that question, though at the time they did not propose an alternative.

It is not known whether any of the Longley brothers were personally involved in the American Civil War, or what effect this conflict may have had on Elias Longley's new publishing venture, *The Journal of Progress*. It is, however, known that four months after the firing on Fort Sumter Longley's publishing business was terminated, and never again, so far as we know, re-established. The development of the phonetic reform after the end of the activities of the publishing house of the Longleys is outside the scope of this study, but it is to be hoped the suggestion of this field of investigation will prove an incentive for further research.
CHAPTER VI

REFLECTIONS FROM THE PRESS

In any research problem there are potential digressions. Avenues open in many directions and indicate problems for additional investigation. The material of this chapter is of such a nature that it might be thought to be unrelated to the main course of the study. An attempt will be made to retain the focus of attention on the Longley firm by considering the relations of other publishers to the "spelling and writing reform," in terms of their relation to the Longleys. Accordingly, the only publications to be discussed in this chapter are those which are mentioned by Longley in his periodicals.

The Longleys, like the usual publishing company of their day and ours, exchanged widely with other periodicals. Some of their exchanges were strong, well established papers having continuous publication destined to run well into the twentieth century. Others were short-lived attempts to promote a rather localized idea or reform, and many of them survived only a single year, sometimes less. The number of publishers who may have received Longley's publication and threw it in the wastebasket, refusing to exchange, can not be known. No doubt, though, there were some who chose to ignore the spelling reform movement, believing that it would soon disappear. However, Longley frequently praised those periodicals which gave favorable recognition to the spelling reform movement, granting them the accolade of being collaborators with him in what he considered to be the great work of orthographic reformation.
It is proper that we recognize a possible bias in the fact that the periodicals which Longley called attention, either by editorial comment or by reprinting their remarks on the reform, were in the main those which were favorable. The dangers inherent in taking this position are realized and acknowledged, but at present the position appears unavoidable, for it is possible that other periodicals than those acknowledged by Longley may have mentioned the movement, and it is also possible that some may have commented unfavorably upon it. Scientific accuracy in reporting the history of the spelling reform during this period would require the examination of all the issues of all the available periodicals published during the time, in order to get a complete picture of the spread and influence of the movement. Such an undertaking would be mountainous, and would constitute a sheer physical impossibility within the limits of this study. Consequently, this chapter will confine its attention to those periodicals which are known, by reason of Longley's mention of them, to have commented on the movement.

There are two groups of publications that are to be considered. First, there are those periodicals which actually used phonotypy altogether or in part for printing, or at least which printed the phonotypic alphabet with a sample of phonetic printing. Second, there are those periodicals which never did adopt phonotypy in any of their printing, but which published favorable comments on the spelling reform movement, or printed news articles placing the movement in a favorable light. Since the first mentioned group is the smaller, we shall examine it first.

At least four other publications contemporary with Longley's claimed to be primarily phonetic periodicals, devoting their greatest
attention to the spelling reform. The oldest of these, The Anglo Sacsun, has been already mentioned in Chapter I, though we did not give its entire history. It is appropriate, then, that we give such additional information as is available about this periodical. The Anglo Sacsun carried a streamer under the title, "Devoted to the Diffusion of Knowledge and News through the Medium of Phonotypy." It was first published December 6, 1846, about a year and a half before Longley began publishing his Phonetic Magazine. However, as has been previously explained, the partners who published The Anglo Sacsun, Andrews and Boyle, went bankrupt in 1850 and the periodical ceased. In November of 1850, one of the partners, S.P. Andrews, formed a new partnership with a certain Mr. Trow, and the firm of Andrews and Trow began publishing a paper with the title The Propagandist. About midway their first volume, they decided to send to England for a font of phonotype so that they could make their publication phonetic. In November 1851, with the beginning of Volume II of their publication, the name was changed to The Phonetic Propagandist, though the avowed purpose denied the meaning of the title. In the prospectus of the new volume, which Longley published, the purpose of the periodical was stated to be "To supply suitable reading matter of various types for family reading, and to supplement phonotype texts for children." They specifically disavowed the practice of printing long discussions of phonetics (a subtle jab at Longley, who at that time was allowing his paper to be a sounding board for the impending alphabet revision). As to phonetics, they claimed only that they would keep their readers informed of the general progress of the reform. At the end of one year as a phonetic paper, however, The Propagandist went out of business.
The other member of the former partnership, Mr. Boyle, also found a new partner, and the firm of Boyle and Dyer began publishing a periodical known as the New York Phonetic Journal.\(^1\) Little is known of this publication except that it was primarily concerned with the shorthand aspects of the phonetic movement, and as such is not within the boundaries of this study.

A second periodical which devoted itself, according to its own claim, to the subject of phonetics, was the Plowshaer, [sic] (1849-1889) published in New York by Henry M. Parkhurst. This periodical carried the legend "An Exemplification of Alphabetic Reform," and was printed in phonotype. Longley quoted from this periodical on numerous occasions, and evidently had a high regard for Parkhurst. The Plowshaer began publication in 1849 and lasted, except for a brief suspension from 1855 to 1862, until 1889. Whether it continued its phonetic character until the end of its publication is a question that would be an interesting investigation, but is not known at this time.

In 1854, in Cincinnati, R.G. Prosser, who had earlier been in partnership with Benn Pitman in the publication of phonographic books, formed a separate firm, and began publishing a periodical entitled The American Phonetic Journal (1855-1859). Little is known about this journal except the brief mention that it was phonotypic, and the information in the advertisement which Longley carried that it was published

\(^1\) For the sake of brevity, those periodicals and newspapers which are not listed in either the Union List of Serials or in the companion volume American Newspapers will be indicated on first mention by an asterisk in parentheses thus: (\(*\)). Publications listed in either of these standard reference works will on first mention show the publication dates in parentheses immediately following the title.
monthly, that it had forty-eight pages of octavo size, that it con-
tained "interesting Historical and miscellaneous matter," and that it
furnished "a repository of Art, Science, and Agriculture; together
with a copious fund of information for the general reader." It com-
bined both phonetic and ordinary type.

The fourth periodical, known but unavailable, so far as has
been ascertained at the present time, was Comstock's Phonetic Telegraph
(*) All that is known of it was that it was published in Philadelphia,
and that it made use of a different alphabet from that of any of the
other phonotypic publications. Comstock's disagreements with the other
spelling reformers have been discussed in an earlier chapter. Since
his system did not make the impact upon the American public that phono-
typyo did, his publication will only be mentioned.

The oldest publication to make use of phonotype, however, was not
strictly a phonetics paper, but was, rather, devoted to a wide variety
of reforms. This publication was the Chronotype Boston (1846-1850). In
the first volume of The Anglo Sacsun, as was mentioned in an earlier
chapter, was an acknowledgement that to the Chronotype belonged the honor
of being the first newspaper to print a part of its pages with phono-
type. It had begun publication in February, 1846, and continued in print
until December, 1849. In August, 1850, it resumed operations by merg-
ing with the Boston Commonwealth (1850-1851), ² which continued a
favorable attitude toward the phonetic reform. Whether the Commonwealth
continued the practice of using phonotype in part of its pages is not
known, though Longley did frequently mention favorable comments from this
paper.

²From: Union List (Newspapers).
In the issue of December 1, 1849, Longley announced that phonotype fonts could be obtained from Cincinnati. This possibility was due to the action of Epinitus Webster of Philadelphia. Both the firms of Longley and of Andrews and Boyle had bought their phonotypic fonts with the specific agreement they were not to use them for casting additional type. The responsibility of Webster in getting the privilege of casting additional type is described by Longley in this manner (II:109):

Webster has been instrumental in having the matrices made for casting these type. By some hocus-pocus he procured a small fount of English phonotypes without an injunction against their being electrotyped, and sent them to Mr. Wells, type-founder of this city, who passed them through the galvanic mill, and is now prepared to furnish type as good as that made in England.

Webster ordered a large font made up for himself, and evidently left the matrices with Wells for filling future orders. In a short while, several fonts of phonotype had been shipped from Cincinnati.

News of this action by Webster had been made public as early as October, 1849, when Longley mentioned that several inquiries had come to him as to where phonotype fonts could be procured. He had replied editorially (II:61),

We are happy to inform our friends that an exceedingly neat set of phonotypic matrices have been prepared by Messrs. Wells and Co., of this city, from which they are now casting type, and are ready to supply the article in founts from twenty-five pounds to any greater amount.—Their charges will be the same as for other type.

By March, 1850, fonts of phonotype had been shipped to:
Stark County Democrat, Canton, Ohio (1834-1911); People's Weekly Journal, Columbus, Ohio (*); Chronopress, New York City (1850-?); E. Webster, Philadelphia, for use in either the American Phonographic Journal
(1848-1851) or in the Phonographic Intelligencer (1849 - ?), or both, which he published; Practical Observer of Valparaiso, Indiana (1853-1857); and The Planter, of Rockport, Indiana (*). Little is known about most of these periodicals, but those items mentioned by Longley concerning some of them are of interest. For example: In the latter part of 1849 a small monthly of eight pages with the title New York Eagle, edited by A. Honeywell, began circulation. Though it did not live long, this much is known about it from Longley's reference. With the beginning of 1850 the name was changed to the Chronopress. The former Eagle and the newer Chronopress were both described by Longley as advocating "all kinds of reforms, at least all such as promise to promote the welfare and good order of society. The Spelling reform is to occupy a prominent place in its pages; ..." Longley then mentions that Honeywell has ordered a font of phonotype from Cincinnati in order to introduce it into his paper. This was shipped in February, and in March, Longley commented:

... today we have the pleasure of seeing a beautiful specimen of phonetic spelling in the Chronopress, the small monthly we noticed sometime since. About a fourth of this paper is hereafter to be printed phonetically. We were much pleased to observe the spelling so exactly agrees with ours.

Thus is phonotypy, orthodox phonotypy, once more established in what was once headquarters. . . .

We can not but notice the sarcasm in the reference to "orthodox phonotypy," which was directed at the Anglo Saxon's persistence in using the old alphabet of 1845 rather than the later one used by both Pitman and Longley. (The feud between Andrews and Boyle in New York and Longley in Cincinnati has been discussed in Chapter I of this study.) The fifth font of phonotype was sent to the Practical Observer, published by William C. Talbot in Valparaiso, Indiana. After receiving it, Talbot
wrote, according to a quotation in the Advocate (II:172):

We have just received what we have for several years been wishing and striving to obtain, a fount of phonotypes, with which to print true specimens of the reformed system of spelling; the specimens heretofore given, as often stated, not having been perfect for want of a few sorts of new type. We now intend to publish occasionally a brief article in the new orthography, that readers may gradually, and before they are aware, become familiar with its beauties and immense advantages. — None however, need apprehend that we shall impose upon them the task of studying out what may at first view seem to them like Greek, in order to read the important matter in our paper; we contemplate no such thing; the articles printed in phonotypy will be brief and comparatively unimportant, and many of that sort which makes people laf.

If it is asked why we should go to such expense and trouble to advocate a reform which, if practicable at all, is the work of future generations, and, at all events, can not be materially advanced by anything which we, in our very limited sphere of action and influence can do? We answer. Having had a full understanding of the merits of this reform ever since 1842, and months before we knew of any system being published, and having been a devoted friend and close observer of its progress during eight years past, although circumstances have not enabled us to render this reform any essential aid, we have an unwavering confidence in its practicability, and that it is the work of this present generation. Therefore, although we are painfully conscious of how very little our humble efforts can accomplish, yet we feel impelled by a sense of duty which we owe to mankind, as well as constrained by the pleasing interest we take in this most beautiful system of reform, to do what we can, little as it is, for its promotion.

After The Planter had been supplied with phonotype, Longley commented concerning it (II:170):

There is now set apart in its columns a "Phonetic Department," edited by Messrs. J.C. Vetch and John Crawford, the one, we believe, is the county Auditor and the other the county Clerk. Our cause—the world's cause—is in good hands there; and we have every reason to believe their efforts will be blessed with permanent results. The number before us contains a judicious disposition of the subject—one column being in phonotypy, and two in the common spelling, giving an exposition of the system, and arguments for its adoption.

In 1851, two fonts of phonotype were mentioned as having been sent to other papers, one to Winooski Falls, Vermont, to a supporter of the cause who planned to have the publisher of the Burlington, Vermont Free Soil
Courier (1846-1853) publish a column with it; the other to Sparta, Illinois, but there is no mention of the paper for which it was intended. Early in 1852, the Western Gem and Musician (*), a musical magazine, was reported to have "a portion of its pages printed in phonotype." In the middle of 1852, H.M. Addison, publisher and editor of the Cleveland Commercial (1851-1855), ordered a font of phonotype "from which to make up a column weekly for his paper; ..." with the expressed intention to "set half of it in phonetic type hereafter," if the response proved favorable.

However, during the latter part of 1852, all of 1853 and most of 1854 there was but one mention of any other periodical appearing with phonetic type. This was The Blade (*) of Greenville, Ohio, which printed half a column in phonotype. The failure of the general press to adopt phonetics during this period was probably occasioned by the unsettled condition of the alphabet. Whether all the persons who had obtained phonotype fonts before the alphabet change chose to bring their alphabets up to date after the change, or whether they discontinued the use of phonotypic material, is not known. We do know that some of the periodicals were of such short duration that they were no longer in existence after the American Phonetic Alphabet was settled upon. It was not until October, 1854 (VII:325), that Longley printed the notice of the next new order of phonotype. This was from the Canton, Illinois, Weekly Register (1849-1918), which printed a column in phonotype each week.

Though there is no revelation of the names of all the periodicals which adopted the new phonotype alphabet, Longley made a statement regarding the reception of the new alphabet in an editorial entitled
"Adoption of the American Alphabet." After mentioning that Isaac Pitman had written scornfully regarding the American changes in the alphabet, Longley said (VIII:346):

Beside our own weekly paper, which gives more phonetic reading annually than all other periodicals put together, there are three in Ohio, two in Vermont, and two in Illinois, that contain articles on phonetic spelling agreeing with our own; and there are several others whose publishers have written to us inquiring about phonetic types.

One is specifically mentioned, however, at a little later date, and the editorial comment of the receipt of the phonotype font is copied from it. The paper was in Elgin, Illinois, and was entitled Illinois Palladium (1853-1856). The editorial read, in part (VIII:357):

Through the aid of Mr. J.B. Newcomb, for several years a teacher in this city, and who has for a long time been interested in Phonography and Phonotypy, we are enabled this week to present to our readers the new alphabet of Phonotypic characters, and several items printed in the new kind of type. We have made education a prominent subject in the Palladium, and have devoted considerable attention heretofore to the spelling reform, and now we are happy in being able to give our readers a practical demonstration of the errors in common spelling, and how much improvement can be made by adopting the new system.

In the next issue Longley said:

J.B. Newcomb, of Elgin, Illinois, who recently ordered a fount of phonetic types, is so well pleased with his success in setting phonotypy and benefiting the Reform, that he has ordered an additional supply, so that he may pass articles in Phonotypy occasionally to the different printing offices within reach of his town.

During the latter part of 1855 and for some time in 1856, there is evidence of Newcomb's activity in having phonetic articles printed. He would, in his spare time, set up columns in phonotype, then persuade editors to insert a column in their pages. Since no typesetting was involved, editors probably usually obliged. There is no record of the number of papers he introduced to phonotypy in this manner, though, as
just mentioned, there was specific notice of his local paper, the 
Palladium, as well as one in Aurora, Illinois, entitled Aurora 
Guardian (1852-1857). Once on a trip to Chicago, Newcomb prevailed 
upon The New Covenant (1846-1880), Prairie Farmer (1841-1857), and Demo­
cratic Press (1852-1858), a Chicago daily, to insert his columns.

In addition to these, two other periodicals were mentioned as 
having expressed their intention to print a part in phonotype. However, 
there is no later confirmation that they did so. These were the 
Freeport Journal of Freeport, Illinois (1848-1913), and the Independent 
Press of Ravenna, Ohio (1855-1857). Also, in December, 1855, the Ohio 
Journal of Education of Columbus, Ohio (1852-1926) began printing a page 
in each issue with phonotype. (This was the organ of the Ohio Teacher's 
Association.)

No further mention was made of other papers appearing with phono­
type until early in 1858. Then there was a notice that The Indiana 
American (1858-1872), published in Indianapolis by T.A. Goodwin, had 
"resumed its phonetic department." Later that year this notice also 
appeared (XI:303):

Some weeks ago we filled an order for some phonetic type 
from Mr. John McKelvy, of Lampsville, Ohio. Since then 
we have received a copy of the Barnsville Intelligencer 
having a column of matter devoted to the subject of phonetics; 
an explanation printed in romanic, followed with an article 
in phonetic dress.

---

3 The designation X in a publication date indicates the periodical 
was currently being received at the time of the 2nd edition of the 
Union List in 1937. (This is the current edition of this reference.)
The final two periodicals which Longley mentioned as having used phonotypy were on opposite sides of the continent, and were both reported to be religious papers (XII:214). One of them was named Star of the Pacific (*), and was published in Petaluma, California; the other was named the Radical Spiritualist (*), and was published in Hopedale, Massachusetts. Nothing is known of either of these papers except what Longley said of them.

The mere fact that all of these periodicals were mentioned as having printed in phonotypy does not, of necessity, imply that they did so continually, or with any consistency. Some may have introduced the matter as an accommodation to some friend of the reform; others may have printed the phonetic alphabet and a sample of phonotypy as a matter of general news—for the movement was attracting some attention at the time. However, if we count all the papers and magazines of which there is a specific mention of having printed phonotypy, regardless of their reason and regardless of the length of time they employed it, we find at least twenty-eight periodicals to have used phonotype during the eleven and a half years covered by this study, with a hint that there may have been more. By far the most of them were located in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, with a secondary concentration in New York. The rest were widely scattered.

In addition to the more than twenty-eight papers which adopted phonotypy in whole or in part, a large number of others took favorable notice of the reform movement, and commented editorially in such a way as to try to promote the cause. Since some of the periodicals which expressed cooperative attitudes toward the phonetic system were those which had shown enough interest to order fonts of phonotypes for their
own use, and since these have already been mentioned, we will exclude them from this second half of this chapter.

One of the earliest favorable notices of the reform came in March, 1849, from a Presbyterian paper published in Cincinnati. This periodical was said to have published the phonotypic alphabet and an editorial in approbation of the reform, though Longley did not reprint the editorial (II:189). At about the same time a New York paper entitled the Young People's Mirror (1848-1849) was mentioned as having a sympathetic attitude toward phonotypy as a practical solution to the phonetic problem.

The next mention of a periodical reference to the reform came in September, 1849, in an editorial from the True Democrat, published in Mount Pleasant, Iowa (1849-1852). It said, relative to the Longley publication (II:24),

It is an excellent periodical, conducted with taste and sterling ability; and commands the respect of every reader. . . .

This Spelling and Writing Reform should command the attention of every member of community [sic] . . . . Its advantages are that it will enable every one to learn to spell correctly in one week's time; it will teach the correct pronunciation of words that are unfamiliar; and it will save a great deal of time and room in writing and printing.

Let every one who can, (and who can not?) subscribe for the Phonetic Advocate.

In January, 1850, Longley printed several more remarks from other papers, generally describing the Advocate and mentioning the fact that it was primarily concerned with the spelling reform. The Barnstable Patriot,
Hyannis, Massachusetts (1830-1915+), said, for example, "The Advocate is exclusively devoted to the reform which this system has introduced, and which at no very distant day will be the most popular, as it is in itself the most true and analogous to the natural utterance of articulate speech." The Culturist and Gazette of Pittsfield, Massachusetts (1818-1858) said of the reform, "We consider it well worth the attention of scholars, were the object only to give a clearer idea of the true power of each letter, in the pronunciation of words." A few pages later, Longley commented on the frequency with which such notices had appeared, and mentioned by name the Victoria Chronicle of Belleville, Canada, and the Chicago, Illinois, Democrat (1833-1861).

During 1850, references were made to a number of periodicals which were alleged to have spoken favorably of the reform. Among these were: The Teacher's Magazine, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; The Protective Union, reported to be the trade paper of the Printer's Protective Union, and published in New York (*); The Evangelical Repository of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1816-1891); The Republican (1826-1862) and The Virginian (1810-1862), both of Winchester, Virginia; The Free Press (*), reported to be from Charleston, Virginia, a city which is now in West Virginia; Southern Family Journal, of Oxford, Georgia (*); The Scholar's Leaf of Portland, Maine (Jan. 1849-Dec. 1850); The Massachusetts Teacher of Boston (1848-1874) (the organ of the Massachusetts Teacher's Federation);

---

5 There is no mention of a periodical by that name in the Union List, though a Victoria Magazine was published there from October 1817 to August 1818. Perhaps this periodical, though unlisted, was a continuation of or a successor to the Victoria Magazine.

The Pittsburg Visitor of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (1834-1864); and the Medical Reformer, Memphis, Tennessee (8 months only, 1850); Fountain and Journal (*), Gardner, Maine; Holmes County Democrat (printed in German) Millersburg, Ohio (*); and the West Liberty Banner, West Liberty, Ohio (*). An article reprinted from *The Teacher's Magazine* said, at the close of an exposition and recommendation of the reform movement (II:240),

> There are now but few educational papers in the whole United States that have not given attention to the subject of phonetic spelling, and without exception, we believe, they have expressed their approbation of the system.

Whether this generalization was completely true we have no way of knowing, but there must have been considerable outspoken approval of the movement to have justified the opinion.

Early in January, 1851, the editor of the Wollsville, Ohio Patriot (1845-1861) printed a similar expression dealing with the general press:

> Almost every newspaper contains something of the usefulness of the system in an educational view. It is recommended by the Hon. Horace Mann, Lewis Cass, Henry Clay, S.P. Chase, E.B. Emerson, and a host of such men. . . . If children can learn to write and spell every word in English Language (sic) in a few weeks, we see no reason for years being spent in learning to spell the same words and to write them only 1/5 as fast.

The reference to writing them "only 1/5 as fast" is, of course, a reference to phonography, with which phonotypy was intimately associated at the time.

Other papers which were mentioned as having given notice of the Advocate and the spelling reform were: Local Press (*7) Greensburg, Indiana; Primitive Expounder, Lansing, Michigan (1843-1848); Genessee Whig (titled Wolverine Citizen after 1855), Flint Michigan (1850-1911);

---

7The reference to "Local Press" may not be a title.
Ohio Teacher, Cincinnati, Ohio (1850-1852); Aberdeen Courier, Aberdeen, Ohio (*); Maine Farmer, Augusta, Maine (1853-1924); Chelsea Union, Chelsea, Massachusetts (1850-1852); Evening Post, New York City (1801-X); Times (1844-1901), Gazette (1804-1913), Nonpareil (1849-1852), Dispatch (1848-1850), Star in the West (1827-1880), Journal of Man (1849-1856), Western Christian Advocate (1834-1929), and School Friend (1846-1851) all of Cincinnati, Ohio; Traveller (1825-1899), Transcript (1830-X), Commonwealth (1850-1854), Pathfinder (1846-1850), South Boston Gazette (1846-1852), and Star Spangled Banner (1846-1856) all of Boston, Massachusetts; Times (1850-1851), Organ (1838-1850), Reveille (1844-1850) and Intelligencer (1850-1857) all of St. Louis, Missouri. The several Boston papers wrote concerning the exhibitions that were given of the children taught by the phonetic method. The substance of some of these accounts follows: the Transcript said of phonetic teaching that it was a "boon for the education of the masses"; the Traveller mentioned that the children taught by the phonetic method were the only ones able to read an editorial from the Traveller without stumbling, the sixteen other children taught by the usual method failing. The Commonwealth said, "Children that have enjoyed two months instruction in that school, ... read with far more ease and propriety than those who have been taught two years in the common schools by the usual method--...," and then emphasized that this reading was with the common alphabet, not the phonotypic one; the New York Evening Post, which was also represented at the exhibition, admitted to being prejudiced against phonetics beforehand, but was strongly converted on seeing the demonstration, and praised the reform highly. The Maine Farmer summarized the general impression made upon the public by these exhibitions by saying, following
the seventh phonetic exhibit in Boston.

A great impression seemed to be made on those present. One gentleman declared that a new world had been opened to him by the exhibition; and another stated that he had never in his life heard such intelligent reading and such distinct pronunciation from any scholars, however advanced. All expressed themselves delighted and surprised.

During the fall of 1851, the attempt to establish a phonetic school in Cincinnati on an experimental basis ran into a bit of difficulty in the obstinate opposition of a certain Dr. Mudd, a member of the board of education, evidently of considerable influence. Most of the press of Cincinnati took the part of Longley and the promoters of phonetics. For example, the Gazette suggested that the fact of Longley's Readers being sent in quantity to Boston schools should indicate they are not going to "humbug" the Cincinnati schools, as Dr. Mudd seemed to believe. This paper further pointed out that the endorsement of ex-governor Briggs of Massachusetts, Horace Mann, Rev. Pierpont, and others of like prestige should be enough to prevent the movement's being "hooted down by those who have not examined it closely." The Times took a similar position, pointing out that such favorable reception in the east should merit its careful consideration by the Cincinnati Board of Education. Because of Mudd's influence, however, the Board of Education voted to discontinue the phonetic school. After this action, phoneticians of the city got together and raised enough money by private contributions to keep the school going. Shortly after it was decided to continue the school in spite of the action of the board, the Times editor visited the school. Evidently he had been influenced somewhat by editorials in the Cincinnati Daily Commercial (1843-1883) which had a short time previously launched a series of
attacks on the phonetic movement, labeling it the "greatest humbug ever gotten up," and denouncing it as just another money making scheme promoted by a group of fanatics. At any rate, the Times editor said, concerning the visit (IV:98):

Yesterday, we yielded to the importunities of a phonetic friend and visited the upper Race street schools, where there is a class of juveniles learning to spell and read by phonotypy. At first our judgement and taste was revolted; the conversational explanation and remarks of the teacher failed to satisfy us; even to reconcile us to the system. Our friend, it seemed to us, had placed our good feelings upon the hazard of a die, and had—lost. It was a dead set against the system. We listened for a while, however to the recitations, out of courtesy, and gradually we became convinced, by the demonstrations of the children themselves, that the phonetic system is decidedly better than the common method of primary instruction. We then passed into other rooms, and our convictions were confirmed by contrast. This may be considered a victory. We state the fact for what it is worth.

The Nonpariel, during this argument with the Board, stated, "Our educators should not lose a moment more under the old method of instruction. . . .Let us learn phonotypy. . . ." and doubtless the other papers which Longley claimed to have supported the cause made similar remarks, though they are not all quoted in the Advocate.

In 1852, the exhibition which was held before the Massachusetts State Legislature was reported by the Boston Bee and the Worcester (Mass.) Spy (1845-1904). Another such exhibition was held in Lynn, Massachusetts, and covered by the Bay State (1849-1865) of that city. After giving the details of the contest between the children taught by phonetics and the ones taught ordinarily, the paper reported:

8The Bee (1842-1858) combined with the Boston Daily Atlas and took the name Bee and Daily Atlas, then lost its identity entirely, becoming Boston Daily Atlas. (From Union List of Serials.)
These [the ordinary children] were older than the phonetic children, and some of them were very good scholars, yet it is probably no disparagement to even the very best of them, to say that they were equalled if not surpassed by the phonetic children.

Other commendatory reports on the spelling reform were alleged to have been made by: Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio (1831-1904); Fall River News, Fall River, Massachusetts (1845-1926); Fox River Courier, Elgin, Illinois (1851-1852); American Republic, Ashfield, Massachusetts (*); and the Common School Journal, Boston, Massachusetts (1838-1852).

Beginning in August 1852, with Volume V of the Advocate, a number of other periodicals are mentioned as having favorably noticed phonotypy and the spelling reform. These were: Pennsylvania School Journal, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania (1852-X); Morning Star (*); Journal, Ellenville, New York (1849-X); Observer, Mount Pleasant, Iowa; The Plaindealer, Oquawka, Illinois; Daily Dispatch, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (1846-1923); Daily Sun, Halifax, Nova Scotia (1845-1867); The Eclectic, Portland, Maine (1850-1855); Christian Register, Boston, Massachusetts (1821-X); and the Democratic Advocate, Lewiston, Maine (1852-1861). Most of these were simply mentioned as having given a favorable notice of the Advocate or of the spelling reform. One of these, the Democratic Advocate, had evidently written negatively on the reform, for it was quoted as printing a letter from J.D. Pulsifer, of Minot, Maine, in reply to their attacks on the movement. The letter not only answered the attacks, but went to

---

9 This paper is not mentioned in the Union List until 1854. Publication prior to that date has not been verified.

10 This paper is not mentioned in the Union List until 1866. Publication prior to that date has not been verified.
some length to explain the nature of the movement and the good that
was evidenced for it. The fact that the paper printed two such letters
from Pulsifer indicated the matter was not a closed issue with them,
and the letters from Pulsifer were used by Longley as propaganda for
the reform.

During Volume VI, after the adoption of the American Phonetic
Alphabet, there was a note taken from the Yates County Whig (location
unknown) stating that they intended purchasing a font of phonotype as
soon as they were sure the alphabet was permanent. Another note on
the same page (VI:13) from the Wayne County Whig (location unknown) ob­
jected to the shape of the phonotypic letters, though agreeing in
principle with the idea of phonetics. In 1853 there appeared three
letters to the editor of the New York Tribune (1853) which explained
the reform and urged the Tribune to support it and to give a sample of
the new American Phonetic Alphabet. The Tribune editor, evidently, from
the tone of the letters, was not much moved by the appeal, on the grounds
that he could not be certain which of the various contending alphabets
was going to become the permanent alphabet. The Tribune suggested that
it preferred waiting until phoneticians agreed among themselves. The next year this paper made some concession by stating (VII:240), "There
is a perceptible progress making toward agreement on a phonetic alpha­
bet, and whenever that point shall have been gained, the ultimate
triumph of phonotypy will be assured." It was not until 1857, however,
that the Tribune was converted to the phonetic cause. In December of
that year, Longley said (X:237):

The New York Tribune has done the phonetic cause great
services by the publication of a leading editorial on
the subject of 'Learning to read by Phonotypy,' in which
both fact and philosophy are brought to the support of
the system. At the close there is a reference to the
Cincinnati publishers, for books and further information. . . .
But meanwhile other periodicals were reported to have given support to the cause. Two papers from San Francisco, California, were mentioned, The Pacific Statesman (1853-?) and The Alta California (1849-1891). Another teacher's magazine, The Massachusetts Teacher, (1848-1874) was also reported. In January, 1851, a new phonetic periodical appeared, titled Cosmotype (Jan.-Sept., 1851). Longley expressed regret that the editor, A.J. Graham, had not chosen phonotype in the style of the American Phonetic Alphabet, but had chosen some sort of cosmopolitan system. Whether Graham used Comstock's alphabet or Isaac Pitman's alphabet, or had invented one of his own is not known at the present, and an investigation of Graham's work is not practicable in this study. Other periodicals mentioned during 1854 and 1855 were: The Ogle County Reporter, Oregon, Illinois (1851-); Daily Times, Cincinnati, Ohio (1840-1859, now the Times-Star); Daily Independent Enterprise, Columbus, Ohio (*) ; and the Friend's Review, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1847-1894). However, there were probably many more than are mentioned by name, as evidenced by this editorial remark (VIII:357 #2)\textsuperscript{11}

During the last two months not less than one hundred different newspapers and periodicals in the United States have published one or more articles in connection with the spelling reform and referred to our publishing business in flattering terms.

Typical of some of the sorts of remarks that were being made is this editorial comment from the Palladium of Richmond, Indiana (1831-1906)\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11}In Volume VIII there was duplication of numbers from pages 350 to 368, the dates and contents being entirely different. For that reason, page reference to this section must be designated as being either the first or the second appearance of that page number.

\textsuperscript{12}Though bearing the same title, this is not the same Palladium previously mentioned. The other was from Elgin, Illinois.
The phonetic system is now being extensively introduced in seminaries and schools in the Eastern states, and it is proposed to introduce it in our new Union School. The advantages of the system are apparent to every one who examines it but for one moment, and there cannot surely be any objection to trying what is no longer regarded as an "experiment."

Such remarks as this point up the fact that phonotypy had begun, by this time, to establish itself firmly as a preferred method of teaching.

In April, 1857, another teacher's journal, The Voice of Iowa, published in Cedar Rapids, Iowa (1857-1858) as the official organ of the Teacher's Association of Iowa, joined the many others in praise of the phonetic system of teaching. This was followed later that year with the Indiana School Journal, organ of the Indiana teachers, and published in Indianapolis (1856-1900). Other periodicals joining in praise of phonetics were: Independent Press, Albia, Iowa (*); The Ruralist, Palestine, Illinois (*); Courant, Berlin, Wisconsin (1854-1916); Argus, St. Charles, Illinois (*); Rock River Democrat, Rockford, Illinois (1852-1865); The Gazette, Elgin, Illinois (1850-1874); Republican, Mt. Carroll, Illinois (*); Thibodeaux Minerva, Thibodeaux, Louisiana (1815-?); and the Los Angeles Star, Los Angeles, California (1851-1879). The Los Angeles paper carried, according to the notice, articles on the phonetic system written in both English and Spanish by J. Harvey, a teacher who operated a private phonetic school in that city. There is evidence that this school was phonotypic rather than phonographic, in the fact that Harvey had ordered a quantity of the First Readers and Transition Readers at the time of announcing his intention to open the school (XI;4;9).

Early in 1858 Longley referred to there having been an article favorable to phonetics in Emerson's Magazine and Putnam's monthly (1854-
1858), in Volume V, pages 700 and 701. This article was of a general
nature, however. A great many of the periodicals quoted during this
year were commenting on Longley's recent publication Vocabulary of
Names. In promoting this book Longley quoted from the Rockford, Illi-
nois, Register (1855-1918) (XI:166):

Longley and Brothers of Cincinnati have just published a
book that should be in the hands of everybody that writes,
reads, or speaks... At the risk of stirring up another
controversy in our city, we will say that we wish their
system of writing and spelling were more universal.

Commendatory remarks were quoted from the Mt. Carroll, Illinois, Home
Intelligencer (*), the New York Educational Herald (1857-1861), and the
Philadelphia School Journal (*).

At the meeting of the Missouri Teacher's Association in St. Louis
in the summer of 1858, a resolution was introduced which mentioned the
spread and increasing acceptance of phonotypy, and stated that it had
stood the test of time and of acceptability to leading educators. This
resolution is reported to have been printed in the St. Louis Republican
(1836-1919) and in the Missouri Educator, Jefferson City, Missouri (1858-
1860), official organ of the association.

Perhaps the attitude of the press is summarized effectively by
Longley himself when he said (XII:117):

The time was when the press almost without exception
ridiculed and denounced the orthographic reform which
we advocate; now it is very rare that we meet with an
objection urged by a member of the Press. On every
hand we find vigorous and even enthusiastic allies
among our contemporaries... .

It seems almost incredible that a movement which was known as
widely as was the phonotypic reform in reading and spelling should
have virtually disappeared, so as to have been almost unheard of for
nearly a century. This disappearance could not, reasonably, have come
suddenly, but must have been accomplished by a gradually fading out over a period of years. During the years following 1860, the press was probably more occupied with war than with reform, so that the falling away may have been due to the increasing accumulation of more important news from political areas and from war areas. It is this unknown which provides a potentially fascinating opportunity for subsequent research.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study we have examined a system of phonetic printing known as phonotypy, with particular emphasis upon its application to the publishing business by Elias Longley and his brothers. In doing so we have considered (1) the development of the phonotypic alphabet itself and (2) the application of this alphabet by the Longley printing establishment in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The leading figure in the development of phonotypy was Isaac Pitman, of Bath, England, who evolved it out of his phonetic shorthand system. Closely associated with him during the experimental days of the alphabet was A.J. Ellis. After the phonotypic alphabet was established as a practical system of printing in 1877, Ellis devoted a great deal of his time to the promotion of the educational possibilities of phonotypy, writing numerous books for children and printing them in phonetics. He was also instrumental in setting up in phonetic type a number of standard literary works on the assumption that phonotypy would soon supplant ordinary orthography completely. However, as time progressed and it became apparent that the English speaking world would not accept a complete revision of its orthography, he focused attention on the use of phonotypy as a means of teaching children to read and spell in the ordinary manner.

The theory by which the educational advantages were to be obtained was that phonotypy and standard orthography should bear as close resemblance to each other as possible. This theory was largely Ellis', and after Ellis and Pitman separated, Pitman returned to his original purpose, to design a "philosophically perfect phonetic system."
Six months after Ellis and Pitman settled upon a practical alphabet, Elias Longley, of Cincinnati, Ohio, undertook to print a phonetic periodical. This periodical continued under a number of different titles until 1858, a total of approximately eleven and a half years. Though the periodical varied in format from volume to volume, one feature remained constant. This was its phonetic character and its advocacy of phonetic reform. After his first year of phonetic publishing, Longley began promoting phonotypy as an educational reform, following the lead of Ellis in England. During the ensuing years, Longley undertook to publish a number of texts for children. As the phonetic movement attracted more and more attention in educational circles, his phonetic texts gained increasingly greater circulation.

Though Longley used the same phonotypic alphabet which Pitman and Ellis used in England, he did not agree with them in matters of phonetic spelling, stating that the American pronunciation did not correspond to that indicated in the English phonetic journals. Consequently, one of his first attempts at printing school texts was to re-print Ellis’s Readers in an American style of phonetic spelling. It must be observed at this point, however, that the differences between Longley and the English phoneticians were not extreme, so that the casual reader would be unlikely to note any difference at all.

However, many readers of Longley’s periodical believed that the phonotypic alphabet he was using did not adequately symbolize American pronunciation. Furthermore, there were many items over which there was disagreement about the proper symbolization. As a result of these disagreements, an American Phonetic Council was formed, which undertook both the revision of the alphabet and the standardization of its usage.
This revision occupied the space of about two years, during which time Longley's publishing business declined somewhat. The revision of the alphabet caused the previous text books to be obsolete, and necessitated publishing a new series of texts in the new type. This Longley did, and launched an extensive promotional campaign for them, so that the process of phonetic teaching spread over an increasingly wide area.

Though the expansion of Longley's publishing business and the increased acceptance of phonotypy as an educational tool in the teaching of reading and pronunciation were chronologically concurrent and positively correlated, they have been dealt with separately in this study for the sake of convenience. The settlement of the alphabet in 1853 and the firm agreement among phonetic publishers in this country to make no further changes in the alphabet for a period of not less than ten years gave Longley a stronger propaganda weapon than he had had during the period of bickering over the acceptability of the Pitman alphabet. This he made full use of by editorial reassurances as well as by employing agents to propagate the adoption of phonetic texts among teachers and school officials. As a result, phonotypy was increasingly accepted in the common schools, and received the sanction not only of local officials but of state organizations of teachers and, in several states, even of legislative committees on education.

There were two basic applications of the phonetic principle in common school education. The first, and more widely publicized, was in teaching children to read and to spell by teaching them to analyze the elementary sounds contained in a given word; the second was in teaching older children correct articulation and pronunciation by instructing them in the elementary sounds and the proper method of producing them.
Both applications received the highest praise of teachers using them, and merited the approbation of official educational bodies.

There were two centers of great activity in phonetic teaching, both of them under the primary influence of the Longleys of Cincinnati. The first was in the state of Ohio, and its closely neighboring states, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan; the second was in the state of Massachusetts. The acceptance of phonotypy in the schools was increasingly widespread, so that by the time of the dissolution of the firm—which roughly coincided with the outbreak of the Civil War—phonetic teaching had been adopted in a large number of schools in nine different states and in occasional schools in fifteen others. The only states for which there was no specific mention of the introduction of phonotypy into the schools were: New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, Delaware, New Jersey, Alabama, and Florida. The movement had even been carried across the continent and planted in the new state of California and in the territory of Oregon.

While recognizing the obvious weaknesses of the system of phonotypy because of the failure on the part of its originators to develop the concept of the phoneme, we must admit certain practical advantages inherent within it. One of the outstanding of these was the adoption of a system of symbols based upon English rather than continental or international values. In this respect, Ellis and Pitman's alphabet of 1847 was superior to the American Phonetic Alphabet developed in 1853. One can not help wondering whether the adoption today of an alphabet based upon the same principles of analogy with English words would facilitate teaching elementary phonetics to English speaking students. This speculation is not intended to reflect upon the usefulness of the
International Phonetic Alphabet now generally adopted, but rather to suggest that the international system might properly be reserved for scholars and linguists. Is it possible that such an alphabet based upon American English values for the symbols, could be useful in the modern teaching of reading, thereby alleviating a widespread inability on the part of many high school and college students to interpret the printed page effectively either silently or orally? Could the experiments conducted in Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Indianapolis, and many other places during the 1850's, which were reported to have demonstrated the decided superiority of the phonotypic method of teaching over the ordinary methods, be duplicated today as a part of modern pedagogical practices? In this question might lie the germ of another research project.

A feature of the movement which may have contributed to its downfall was the failure to separate phonetic printing from the Pitman system of phonetic shorthand. This close association also increased the difficulty of following the story of phonotypy in this study. There are sufficient hints during the latter days of the Longley firm's publishing business to enable one to theorize that phonotypy may have faded away because the focus of attention shifted from the needs of general education to the advantages of commercial education. Such a shift would place the emphasis on the phonographic features of the movement, and without a phonotypic periodical to keep phonotypy before the people, the movement disappeared in the turmoil of later controversy over the proper alphabet.

Several avenues of additional investigation have been suggested by this study. Probably the most significant of them are: an analysis of
probable standard British pronunciation in the mid-nineteenth century based on Pitman's and Ellis's discussions of phonotypy; an examination of American pronunciation and its dialectal distinctions based on the published opinions of the members of the American Phonetic Council; a study of the course of phonetics after Longley's periodical ceased; an investigation of the possible direct effects of phonotypy on the later phonetic thinking of Sweet, Jones, and others; and a critical evaluation of the effectiveness of the use of phonotypy in modern teaching of reading, spelling, and diction.
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Pitman's Journal of Commercial Education. Title varies.
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- Volumes XVII and XVIII, 1858-1859, as Phonetic Journal.
Bath, England: Isaac Pitman, publisher Volumes I-VII;
Fred Pitman, Publisher Volumes XVII-XVIII.
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- Volume II, 1849-1850, Phonetic Advocate;
- Volumes III through VI, 1850-1853, Weekly Phonetic Advocate;
- Volumes VII through XII, 1854-1859, Type of the Times.
Cincinnati: 1848-1859. Longley and Brother, or Longley Brothers, editors and publishers.
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APPENDIX

The following alphabetic list consists of the periodicals known to have given some attention to the phonetic reform by virtue of their having been cited in Longley's periodical.

Aberdeen Courier, Aberdeen, Ohio: No dates known. (ca. 1851).
The Alta California, San Francisco: 1849-1891.
American Republic, Ashfield, Massachusetts: No dates known. (ca. 1852).
Argus, St. Charles, Illinois: No dates known. (ca. 1850).
Banner, West Liberty, Ohio: No dates known. (ca. 1850).
Barnstable Patriot, Hyannis, Massachusetts: 1830-1915 (?).
Barnsville Intelligencer, Lampsville, Ohio: No dates known. (ca. 1853).
Bay State, Lynn, Massachusetts: 1849-1865.
Bee, Boston: 1842-1858.
The Blade, Greenville, Ohio: No dates known. (ca. 1852).
Chelsea Union, Chelsea, Massachusetts: 1850-1852.
Christian Register, Boston: 1821-present.
Chronopress, (A. Honeywell, ed.) New York: 1850-?
Cleveland Commercial, Cleveland, Ohio: 1851-1855.
Commonwealth, Boston: 1850-1854.
Culturist and Gazette, Pittsfield, Massachusetts: 1858-1858.
Democrat, Chicago: 1833-1861.
Democratic Advocate, Lewiston, Maine: 1852-1861.
Dispatch, Cincinnati: 1848-1850.
Eclectic, Portland, Maine: 1850-1855.
Emerson's Magazine and Putnam's Monthly, 1851-1858, Volume V.
Evangelical Repository, Philadelphia: 1816-1891.
Evening Post, New York: 1801-present.
Fall River News, Fall River, Massachusetts: 1855-1926.
Fountain and Journal, Gardner, Maine: No dates known. (ca. 1850).
Free Soil Courier, Burlington, Vermont: 1846-1853.
Gazette, Cincinnati: 1804-1913.
Genesee Whig, Flint, Michigan: 1850-1911 (Title: Wolverine Citizen, 1855-1911).
Home Intelligencer, Mt. Carroll, Illinois: No dates known. (ca. 1853).

Holmes County Democrat, Millersburg, Ohio: No dates known (ca. 1850).

Illinois Palladium, Elgin: 1853-1856.


The Indiana American, (T.A. Goodwin, ed.) Indianapolis: 1858-1872.


Intelligencer, St. Louis: 1850-1857.


Journal of Man, Cincinnati: 1849-1856.


Maine Farmer, Augusta: 1833-1924.

The Massachusetts Teacher, Boston: 1848-1874.

Medical Reformer, Memphis: Jan. 1850-Aug. 1850.

Missouri Educator, Jefferson City: 1858-1860.

Morning Star, Location and dates unknown. (ca. 1852).


Nonpareil, Cincinnati: 1848-1852.


Ogle County Reporter, Oregon, Illinois: 1851-present.


Ohio Teacher, Cincinnati: 1850-1852.

Organ, St. Louis: 1839-1850.

The Pacific Statesman, San Francisco: 1853-?

Palladium, Richmond, Indiana: 1831-1906.
Pathfinder, Boston: 1846-1850.

Patriot, Wellsville, Ohio: 1845-1861.


People's Weekly Journal, Columbus, Ohio: No dates known.
   (ca. 1850).


Phonetic News (Fonetic Nuz), Bath, England: 1849-?


The Phonetic Telegraph (Andrew Comstock, ed.) Philadelphia: No dates known.

The Pittsburg Visitor, Pittsburg: 1834-1864.

Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio: 1831-1904.

The Plaindealer, Oquawka, Illinois: No dates known. (ca. 1852).

The Planter, Rockport, Indiana: No date known. (ca. 1850).


Prairie Farmer, Chicago: 1841-present.


The Protective Union, New York: No dates known. (ca. 1850).

Radical Spiritualist, Hopedale, Massachusetts: No dates known.
   (ca. 1858).

Register, Rockford, Illinois: 1855-1918.


Republican, St. Louis: 1836-1919.

The Republican, Winchester, Virginia: 1826-1862.
Reveille, St. Louis: 1844-1850.


The Scholar's Leaf, Portland, Maine: 1849-1850.

School Friend, Cincinnati: 1846-1851.

South Boston Gazette, Boston: 1846-1852.


Star in the West, Cincinnati: 1827-1880.

Star of the Pacific, Petaluma, California: No dates known. (ca. 1858).

Stark County Democrat, Canton, Ohio: 1834-1911.

Star Spangled Banner, Boston: 1846-1856.

Thibodeaux Minerva, Thibodeaux, Louisiana: 1845-?

Times, Cincinnati: 1844-1901.

Times, St. Louis: 1850-1851.

Transcript, Boston: 1830-present.

Traveller, Boston: 1825-1899.

Tribune, New York: 1841-present.

True Democrat, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa: 1849-1852.

The Virginian, Winchester, Virginia: 1810-1862.

The Voice of Iowa, Cedar Rapids: 1857-1858.


Western Christian Advocate, Cincinnati: 1834-1929.

Western Gem and Musician, Mt. Holly, Ohio: No dates known. (ca. 1852).
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From 1937 to 1941 he followed the calling of the ministry in the Methodist church, resigning in July, 1941, in order to enter the armed service. Following his discharge from the army, he chose to teach school. He taught in several high schools in Louisiana until 1949, when he returned to the University for graduate study.

In 1951 he was awarded the degree of Master of Arts, and the next year was employed by the University of Mississippi as an instructor in public speaking. During his tenure with that University he did research toward his doctoral dissertation. In the summer of 1955 he resigned from the University of Mississippi and returned to Louisiana State University to complete the work for the Ph.D. degree.
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