INTRODUCTION.
INTRODUCTION.

Among the various attempts to facilitate the orthography and pronunciation of the English language, it is not a little surprising that the method here adopted should have been either totally overlooked or neglected. A Rhyming Dictionary in a living language, for the purposes of poetry, seems no very unnatural or useless production, and imperfect sketches of such a work have already been given us by Poole and Bysshe; but no one has hitherto thought of making a dictionary of terminations subservient to the art of spelling and pronouncing. The more obvious use of a work of this kind was perhaps an obstacle to the completion of it, and its latent, though more useful qualities, were by this means unobserved. A mere rhyming dictionary was looked on either as a bauble for school boys, or a resource for poetasters; and the nobler ends of pointing out the analogy of orthography and pronunciation, like many other advantages, were overlooked in the insignificance and puerility of the means.

Johnson's Dictionary is scarcely more valuable for so nicely tracing the various and almost vanishing shades of the same word, than for furnishing us with so copious a collection of nearly similar words of a different form. Those who understand the harmony of prose, pay a cheerful tribute to Dr. Johnson on this account, as he admits them to a more easy and extensive view of the powers of the language, than can possibly be suggested by the memory alone; and by this means assists that delicacy of choice, on which the precision and harmony of expression so essentially depend. This advantage, which perhaps was not foreseen by Dr. Johnson himself, was no more than a necessary, though not an obvious, consequence of so copious and perfect a distribution of the language into its constituent parts; and without the vanity of pretending to a parallel, it may naturally be presumed, that an arrangement, which is perfectly new,
may possibly produce advantages which were entirely unnoticed before this arrangement was actually drawn out; for experience furnishes us with a variety of instances of unexpected improvements arising from new and perhaps fortuitous combinations, which were never suspected by theorists, until a discovery had been made.

The English Language, it may be said, has hitherto been seen through but one end of the perspective; and though terminations form the distinguishing character and specific difference of every language in the world, we have never till now had a prospect of our own, in this point of view. Dr. Wallis has, with great penetration and sagacity, shown the general import of initial consonants; and with more appearance of truth than could have been conceived, has evinced, that words of a similar signification, which are radically English, commence with nearly the same radical articulations. Mr. Elphinston too has given us a very good idea of the general import of terminations, by strictures on the greatest part of them; but none have yet thought it worth their while to give us a complete and alphabetical enumeration of the whole, by which alone we can have an adequate idea of every part. In this arrangement of the language, we easily discover its idiomatic structure, and find its several parts fall into their proper classes, and almost every word as much distinguished by its termination as its sense. We at one glance perceive the peculiar vegetation of our own language, and the alteration foreign words undergo, by being transplanted into English soil. And thus by an acquaintance with the specific character of every termination, we are the more readily led to assimilate foreign terms, by stamping them with the current impression of our own.

---liquet semperque liebit
Signatum præsente notā procedere numnum. Hor.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

But an analogical insight into the recesses of formation is not every advantage arising from this new and complete prospect of it. Our orthography is not only an insuperable difficulty to foreigners, but an [endless] source of dispute and perplexity to ourselves; and, though it would
be in vain to think of removing every intricacy that is constantly arising from indolence and caprice, yet that a considerable number may be remedied by a view of the general laws of formation, will be readily conceived by those who enquire into the origin of the difficulties complained of. By an affectation of approximating to the orthography of the learned languages, we have rooted out many useful letters that sprang up naturally with exotic words, and have been led to exclude all letters in our compounds which are not actually pronounced, though their existence in these words is often no less necessary to prevent ambiguity than in the simples themselves.

Thus the useful servile e is hardly ever suffered to have a place in composition, though, from a feeling of its importance, we are almost intuitively tempted to let it remain in the branches, whenever we recollect it in the root. The omission or insertion of this letter occasions a numerous catalogue of rules and exceptions. The other serviles, l, s, &c. are no less absurdly omitted in composition, though their power remains, and by this means both orthography and pronunciation are confounded. The duplication of consonants, when an additional termination is assumed, forms another difficulty in our terminational orthography, as it may be called, which has embarrassed the most correct and accurate writers. Now the only clue to extricate us from this labyrinth seems the method here adopted. An immediate view of the similar formation of similar parts of speech, gives us a competent idea of the laws of terminational orthography, and enables us to detect the least violation of them. Thus when in our best dictionaries I find saleable, tameable, and a few other words of the same form, retain the silent e, I conclude these are either slips of the pen, or errors of the press; for that the whole current of similar endings, as blamable, adorable, definable, &c. omit the e, and that no reason appears for retaining it in the former, and not in the latter words.

But in order to detect the orthographical irregularities of our language, it will be necessary first to lay down such general maxims in spelling as have almost universally taken place. By these we may judge of the impropriety
of those deviations, which are owing perhaps to a want of seeing the laws of formation as here exhibited, and knowing how far the irregularity extends.

ORTHOGRAPHICAL APHORISMS.

APHORISM I.

Monosyllables ending with \(f, l, \) or \( s \), preceded by a single vowel, double the final consonant; as \( stuff, mill, pass, \) &c. of, \( if, as, is, gas, has, was, yes, us, thus \), are the only exceptions; and \( add, but, ebb, egg, odd, err, buzz \), are the only words where other consonants are doubled in the same situation.

APHORISM II.

Words ending with \( y \), preceded by a consonant, form the plural of nouns, the persons of verbs, verbal nouns, past participles, comparatives, and superlatives, by changing \( y \) into \( i \); as \( spy, spices, I carry, thou carriest, he carrieth, or carries, carrier, carriest, happy, happier, happiest \); but the present participle in \( ing \) retains the \( y \), that \( i \) may not be doubled, as \( carrying; y preceded by a vowel is never thus changed, as boy, boys, I cloys, he cloys, &c.\)

Observations.

By this rule we may perceive the impropriety of writing \( flyer \) for \( flier \), and \( defyer \) for \( defier \), and the still greater impropriety of writing \( father, oftner, and softner, for fattener, oftener, softener \); though we meet with them in our best dictionaries; for the common terminations of verbs, verbal nouns, participles, &c. never occasion any contraction in the radical word; \( entrance \) and \( remembrance \) pretend kindred with the French \( entrant \) and \( remembrer \), and are therefore incorrigible; but \( wondrous \) ought to be written with the \( e \), as well as \( slanderous \); and if we write \( dexterous \), why should we see \( sinistrous \)?

APHORISM III.

Words ending with the hissing consonants, \( ch, s, sh, z, x \), form the plural of nouns by adding \( es \), and the persons of verbs by \( est, eth, or es, as church, churches, I march, thou marchest, he marcheth, or marches. Geni-
ties of words ending in these consonants are formed by adding s with an apostrophe; as St. James's church, the church's ceremonies.

APHORISM IV.

Words ending with any consonant and silent e, form their plural by adding s only, as a place, places, and persons of verbs, by adding st, th, or s, as I place, thou placest, he placeth, or places. Genitives of words ending with these letters are formed by adding s with an apostrophe, as the place's pleasantness. Material adjectives in y, and comparatives in ish, are formed from substantives of this termination by omitting the silent e, and annexing y or ish to the consonant, as rpy, winy, slavish, swinish, &c. from rope, wine, slave, swine, &c. The past participles, verbal nouns, and comparatives and superlatives, add d, r, and st, to the simple, as placed, a placer, wise, wiser, wisest; but the present participle cuts off the e, and annexes ing, as placing. However, where the silent e is preceded by the soft g, the e must be preserved, if the sense of the word would otherwise be ambiguous; for we have no other means of distinguishing singeing, the participle of to singe, from singing, the participle of to sing; swingeing, from swinging, &c. As to cringing, twanging, &c. from cringe, twinge, &c., we trust to the common power of the letters, as we have no verbs to cring, twing, &c., to occasion any mistake; for with respect to participles and verbal nouns, a previous knowledge of the theme is supposed to be indispensably necessary.—See Aphorism x.

APHORISM V.

Words ending with a single consonant, preceded by a single vowel, and with the accent on the last syllable, upon assuming an additional syllable, beginning with a vowel or y, double the consonant, as to ubet, an abettor; to begin, a beginning; a fen, fenny; thin, thinnish, &c. but if a diphthong precede, or the accent be on the preceding syllable, the consonant remains single, as to toil, toiling; to offer, an offering, &c.
Observations.

By this rule, which is founded on an intention of ascertaining the quantity of the accented vowel by doubling the consonant, and which would be infinitely useful and agreeable to the analogy of the language, if extended universally, we perceive the impropriety of spelling the adventitious syllables of terminations with double letters, when the accent is not really upon them. Bishop Lowth has justly remarked, that this error frequently takes place in the words, worshipping, counselling &c., which, having the accent on the first syllable, ought to be written worshiping, counseling, &c. An ignorance of this rule has led many to write bigotted for bigoted; and from this spelling has frequently arisen a false pronunciation; [or rather the misspelling has arisen from a former mode of pronunciation, in which the accent was placed on the penult, as is occasionally done in Scotland to the present day;] but no letter seems to be more frequently doubled improperly than l. Why we should write libelling, levelling, revelling, and yet offering, suffering, reasoning, I am totally at a loss to determine; and unless l can give a better plea than any other letter in the alphabet for being doubled in this situation, I must, in the style of Lucian, in his trial of the letter T, declare for an expulsion. [Since Walker's time the superfluous t has been rejected from bigotted; but the l in the other words still improperly retains its duplicity.]

Aphorism VI.

Words ending with y, preceded by a consonant, upon assuming an additional syllable beginning with a consonant, change y into i, as happy, happily, happiness; but y preceded by a vowel is never thus changed, as coy, coyly, gay, gayly, &c. [but gaily is of daily occurrence.]

Observations.

By attending to this rule, we detect a number of typographical errors, from which even our best dictionary is not free; such as shyly, dryly, dryness, instead of
of the number from the genitive case, as this does not prevent the similitude when a vowel precedes, why should we fear a mistake between flies and fly's any more than between boys and boy's? It is highly probable that the origin of this insignificant and embarrassing change of the y into i, arose from the taste and sagacity of English printers, who considered the y as bearing too little proportion to the number of the other letters, and made this weighty reason the foundation of the alteration. But to this alteration once allowed by custom, even a Baskerville must submit; and certainly being more the object of language than perfect propriety, it would be the last absurdity, to deprive a rule, which has nothing else to recommend it, of its only merit—uniformity.

APHORISM VII.

Words ending with any double letter but l, and taking ness, less, ly, or ful, after them, preserve the letter double; as harmlessness, carelessness, carelessly, stiffness, stiffly, successful, distressful, &c.; but those words ending with double l, and taking ness, less, ly, or ful, after them, omit one l, as fulness, skilless, fully.

Observations.

Why one l should be omitted when less or ly is assumed, may be easily conceived to arise from the uncouth appearance three letters of the same kind would have when meeting together; but why the analogy between these simples and compounds should be destroyed when ness or ful is assumed, is not easy to comprehend; why should we not write dullness, fullness, skilful, and willful,
as well as stiffness, gruness, crosly, and crossness? Nay, the propriety of this orthography makes it almost impossible to root it out entirely, and we find these four words, illness, fellness, shrillness, and stillness, left in our best dictionary with the double l, but a greater number of words of the same form having the single l, as smallness, tallness, chillness, dullness, fulness, and the long catalogue of words of this termination, as triflness, blissfulness, &c., sufficiently show to which orthography custom has the greatest partiality; and indeed as the rage for curtailing our language of double letters seems incurable, the disease will at least be more tolerable if we determine its progress to some uniformity, and since there is no hope of restoring the lost l to

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Smallness} & \quad \{ \text{Illness} \\
\text{Tallness} & \quad \{ \text{Fellness} \\
\text{Chillness} & \quad \text{Shrillness} \\
\text{Dullness} & \quad \text{Stillness,} \\
\text{Fulness} & \quad \text{why should we write} \\
\text{And its numerous} & \quad \text{and}
\end{align*}
\]

unless we are determined to have no rule for our orthography, good or bad? This rule likewise serves to correct several typographical errors in our best dictionary, as carelessly, needlessly, &c., for carelessly, needlessly, &c.*

APHORISM VIII.

Ness, less, ly, and ful, added to words ending with silent e, do not cut it off, as palness, guiltless, closely, peaceful, &c., except e is preceded by a vowel, and then it is omitted, as duly, truly, from due, and true.

Observations.

But what shall we say then to bluely, bluness, rueful, &c., which, strange as it may seem, would be more agreeably to the general current of orthography, written bluly, bluness, ruful, &c. The reasons seem to be these; wherever the general laws of pronunciation in compounds supply the place of serviles in simple words, there the serviles are omitted; but bluly, bluness, ruful, &c., ac-

* These observations are not now applicable, as smallness, tallness, chillness, dullness, fullness, &c., are written with a double l.
According to the common rule of pronouncing, would be as justly sounded as \textit{bluely}, \textit{blueness}, \textit{rueful}, \&c., and at the same time would preclude the possible mistake which might arise if the simples \textit{blue} and \textit{rue} were not understood to be the root of the words in question; for in this case \textit{blueness} and \textit{rueful} might be pronounced as if divided into \textit{blu-e-ness} and \textit{ru-e-ful}; but as it is necessary the spelling should convey the sound of the compound, without supposing a previous knowledge of the simples, and without being liable to a double pronunciation, the omission of \textit{e} in \textit{bluey} and \textit{blueness}, as well as in \textit{duly} and \textit{truly}, seems most analogical.—See \textit{Aphorism x}.

This rule serves to rectify several mistakes of the press in our best dictionary.

\begin{align*}
\text{Chastly} \quad & \text{Chastely} \\
\text{Chasteness} \quad & \text{Chasteness} \\
\text{Fertily} \quad & \text{Fertilely} \\
\text{Genteely} \quad & \text{Genteely} \\
\text{Blithly} \quad & \text{Blithely}
\end{align*}

Nor can \textit{wholly}, though universally adopted, make us forget that it ought to be \textit{wholely}.

\textbf{Aphorism IX.}

\textit{Ment} added to the words ending with silent \textit{e}, preserves the \textit{e} from elision, as \textit{abatement}, \textit{incitement}, \textit{chastisement}, \&c., but, like other terminations, changes the \textit{y} into \textit{i}, when preceded by a consonant, as \textit{accompanion}.

\textbf{Aphorism X.}

\textit{Able} and \textit{ible}, when incorporated into words ending with silent \textit{e}, almost always cut it off, as \textit{blamable}, \textit{curable}, \textit{sensible}, but if \textit{c} or \textit{g} soft come before \textit{e} in the original word, the \textit{e} is then preserved, as \textit{changeable}, \textit{peaceable}, \&c.

\textit{Observations.}

This exception is founded on the necessity of showing that the preceding \textit{c} and \textit{g} in these words are soft, which might possibly be mistaken, and pronounced hard, if written \textit{changeable}, \textit{peaceable}, \&c. Another exception seems to take place in the compounds of \textit{move} and \textit{prove}, which are generally written \textit{moveable}, \textit{proveable}, \&c., but on an inspection into all the compounds of these
words in "Johnson's Dictionary," we find the e so often omitted as to make it very doubtful whether these words are an exception to the general rule or not, for thus they stand—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Unimproveableness} & \{ \text{Reprovable} \\
\text{Proveable} & \{ \text{Improvable} \\
\text{Irreproveable} & \{ \text{Improvable} \\
\text{Unrcproveable} & \{ \text{Improvable} \\
\text{Unimproveable} & \{ \text{Approvable} \\
\text{Unimproveable} & \{ \text{Approvance} \\
\text{Moveable} & \{ \text{Removable} \\
\text{Moveably} & \{ \text{Irremovable} \\
\text{Moveableness} & \{ \text{Inmovably} \\
\text{Unremoveable} & \{ \\
\text{Unremoveably} & \}
\end{align*}
\]

The uncertainty of our orthography in this class of words may be presumed to arise from a confused idea of the necessity of ascertaining the sound of the simple by inserting the silent e, and the general custom of omitting this letter when words are compounded with these terminations; and it will require some attention to discover to which of these modes of spelling we ought to give the preference; however, till better reasons are offered for a decision, let us suppose the following:—

The first object of spelling compound words seems to be merely a conveyance of the sound, without necessarily supposing a knowledge of the simples; that the elements of which the compound is formed, may be sufficient of themselves to suggest their sound. The next object of spelling compounds seems to be an omission of all services in the simples which were not actually sounded, and whose use may be supposed to be superseded in the compounds by the general laws of English pronunciation, which, contrary to those of the learned languages, suppose every accented vowel to be long and open, which is followed but by a single consonant. Thus the e in desirable is omitted, because the common rules of pronunciation indicate that the accent upon i, followed by a consonant succeeded by a vowel, with the accent upon it, has necessarily the same sound as in desire. But when the radical letters have not their ordinary sound in the
simples, the first law of orthography takes place, and inserts the servile e to suggest the sound of the simple, when blended with the compound; for though we are frugal of our letters to a fault, yet when the sound of any of the radical letters might be endangered by such an omission, we then find the e preserved. Nor is a previous knowledge of the simple supposed to be a sufficient security, as in changeable, peaceable, &c. From hence we may gather that every compound word is supposed to convey its own sound agreeably to the common sound of the letters, without the necessity of having recourse to a knowledge of the simples from which it is formed, and therefore as the sound of o in move, prove, &c., is not the general sound of that letter, and consequently if the e were not preserved to suggest the simple, it might be liable to the sound of a in rove, grove, love, or shone, we find it perfectly agreeable to the first general law of English orthography to retain the letter by which alone the sound of the radical part of the word can be ascertained; and therefore as we very justly write moveable, proveable, &c., so we ought to write removable, improvable, &c., moving, proving, &c., being affections of the verbs move and prove, necessarily suggest their simples, and make the insertion of e unnecessary.—See Aphorism iv.

With respect to reconcileable, unreconcileable, and reconcileableness, which we find in Johnson with the e, though irreconcilable, irreconcilably, and irreconcilableness, are without it, we must class these with saleable, tama-
able, unshakeable, untameable, and sizeable; for as these are the only words of this form in the whole language, where the silent e is preserved, it is reasonable to suppose that its insertion here was owing to the inadvertence either of the author or printer; for as the preservation of e in these words is founded on such reasons as would oblige us to preserve the silent e in all compounds where it is now omitted, and consequently entirely alter the current orthography, the omission of it, wherever the preceding vowel or consonant retains its general sound, is certainly the most analogical; as there is no more reason for retaining the silent e in saleable, tama-
able, &c. than in blamable, tunable, consumable, &c. titho-
able has a proper claim to the e, to show that th has its flat or obtuse sound.

APHORISM XI.

The verbs to lay, pay, and say, by an unaccountable caprice, form their preterites and participles passive, by changing y into i, and omitting e in the assumed termination ed; and instead of layed, payed, sayed, we always see laid, paid, said, which orthography is preserved in their compounds, as un laid, un paid, un said. This is an exception to Aphorism ii.

APHORISM XII.

Words taken into composition often drop those letters which were superfluous in their simples, as Christmas, dunghil, handful, &c.

Observations.

The uncertainty of our orthography in this article calls loudly for reformation, and nothing can better show the danger of indulging this excision, than a display of the diversity that reigns in Johnson's Dictionary.

To recall  To miscal  Clodpoll  To enrol
To comptroll To control  To undersell  To foretel
Snowball  Overfal  Watermill  Downhil
Suweall  Tivadstal  Windmill  Dunghil
Laysball  To forestal  Numbskull  Handful
Rakehell  To bethral  Hourglass  Daireful
Bridewell  To inthral  To repass  To reinstal
Draywell  Downfal  Unbias  Bias
Molehill  Muckhil  Quarterstaff  Windfal
Uphill  Downhil  Tipstaff  Waterfal
Handmell  Thumstal  Scoveygrass  Twibil

The origin of this ridiculous irregularity which has prevailed within these few years, is not hard to guess. Some shallow writers, or perhaps printers, have heard that good authors have complained that our language is clogged by clusters of consonants. This was sufficient to set these smatterers at work on so easy a business as that of unloading the language of its useless letters; and we find, under the notion of useless letters, and clusters of consonants, we are near being deprived of
the most useful letters we have. But words are evidently mistaken for things. Clusters of consonants to the ear are very different from assemblages of consonants to the eye; these are often no more than double consonants of the same kind, and are sounded as easily as single ones; but those knots of discordant consonants to the ear, however disgustful, are not to be removed without entirely altering the language. The clusters of consonants of which Mr. Addison complains, are those that arise from sinking the intervening vowels in pronunciation, as drewn'd, walk'd, arriv'd, for drowned, walked, arrived. The double letters at the end of words, which are ridiculously confounded with what is termed clusters of consonants, as to install, windfall, handful, &c., are often so essentially necessary to preserve the true sound from being mistaken, that, if we deprive words of one of these double letters, they are in danger of degenerating into a different sound; for what security have we but a previous knowledge of the simples, which is contrary to the first principles of our orthography, that the last syllable of waterfall is not to rhyme with the first of shallow, and the last of handful with the monosyllable dull?

In short, as Mr. Elphinston very justly, as well as pleasantly, observes, "Every reader, both young and old, must now be so sagacious an analyst, as to discern at once, not only what are compounds, and what their simples, but that all in composition is equal to all out of it; or, in other words, that it is, both what it is, and what it is not."—Prin. Eng. Lan. vol. i. p. 60.

Thus have I ventured, with a trembling hand, to point out a few of the most glaring inconsistencies under which the orthography of our language labours, without daring to make the least step to a reformation myself; for if ever this be done to any good purpose, it must certainly be by the joint labour of both our universities; till when, no individual can do better service to the orthography of his country, than to let it remain as it stands at present in that monument of English

Note.—Some of these double letters have been inserted by the subsequent editors of Johnson's Dictionary; but whether from the remarks here made, or their own sagacity, we are not informed.
philology erected by Johnson. Those who see beyond the surface, regret the many deviations from that only standard of our language by the Greeklings and Latin-tasters of this smattering age; and it is certainly to be feared, that, if this pruning of our words of all the superfluous letters, as they are called, should be much farther indulged, we shall quickly antiquate our most respectable authors and irreparably maim our language.

SYLLABICATION.

As the inverted order of arrangement gives us a consistent idea of the structure of language, so a division of words into syllables directs us in their sound; for the division here adopted is not founded on any rules drawn from etymology, or the practice of languages essentially different from our own, but on such principles as are the result of the language itself, and arise naturally from the very nature and practice of pronunciation. This part of language, which has been left to chance or caprice, is of all others the most important and delicate. Hardly anything like a system has been chalked out, or have any rules been given that have produced the least uniformity, or answered any valuable purposes of pronunciation. Till Dr. Kenrick's Rhetorical Dictionary, we have scarcely seen anything like an attempt to divide words as they are pronounced; but the Latin and Greek syllabication implicitly adopted, to the evident disadvantage of children, and embarrassment of foreigners; and for the very same reasons that Ramus contends we ought to divide doctus and Atlas into do-c tus and A-tlas. Mr. Ward insists we must separate mag-net, pop-lar, lust-re, and re-p tile into ma-gnet, po-plar, lust-re, and re-p tile.

Now if the end of syllabication may be supposed to be the most likely method of directing us to the means, we shall find nothing can be more absurd than such a division. For the object of parcelling out a word into distinct portions, seems to be to instruct us either in its etymology or pronunciation. If in the division of words into syllables we have only etymology in view, we must undoubtedly resolve compounds into their simples, without paying the least attention to the sound of these simples, either as united, or in a state of separation.
But though this method of syllabication be very proper when we would investigate the origin of a word and show its derivation, yet, when a distinctness of sound is the only object of such a division, as is ever the case in the pronunciation of language, it would be the highest absurdity to clog the instruction with etymological divisions, as these are frequently opposite to actual pronunciation. Here then, sound alone should be the criterion of syllabication, and we ought to reduce a compound word to its simple impulses of the voice, as we would a bar of music to its simple notes; for etymologists may surely content themselves with their own divisions where sound is not in question, without disturbing those whose principal object is the conveying of sound, and who consider etymology as entirely independent on it.

Easy, however, as such a division may appear at first view, an attempt to extend it to every word in the language will soon convince us that the ear in a thousand instances will prove but a very uncertain guide, without a knowledge of those principles by which the ear itself is insensibly directed, and which, having their origin in the nature of language, operate with steadiness and regularity in the midst of the ficklest affectation and caprice. It can scarcely be supposed that the most experienced speaker has heard every word in the language and the whole circle of sciences pronounced exactly as it ought to be; and if this be the case, he must sometimes have recourse to the principles of pronunciation, when his ear is either uninformed or unfaithful. These principles are those general laws of articulation, which determine the character, and fix the boundaries of every language; as in every system of speaking, however irregular, the organs must necessarily fall into some common mode of enunciation, or the purpose of Providence in the gift of speech would be absolutely defeated. These laws, like every other object of philosophical inquiry, are only to be traced by an attentive observation and enumeration of particulars, and when these particulars are sufficiently numerous to form a general rule, an axiom in pronunciation is acquired. By an accumulation of these axioms, and an analogical comparison of
them with each other, we discover the deviations of language where custom has varied, and the only clew to guide us where custom is either indeterminate or obscure.

Thus, by a view of the words ending in *ity* or *ety*, I find the accent invariably placed on the preceding syllable, as in *diversity*, *congruity*, &c. On a closer inspection I find every vowel in this antepenultimate syllable, when no consonant intervenes, pronounced long, as *deity*, *piety*, &c., a nearer observation shows me that if a consonant intervene, every vowel in this syllable but *u* contracts itself, and is pronounced short, as *severity*, *curiosity*, *impunity*, &c. I find too, that even *u* contracts itself before two consonants, as *curvity*, *taciturnity* &c., and that *scarcity* and *rarity* (for whose irregularity good reasons may be given), are the only exceptions to this rule throughout the language. And thus we have a series of near seven hundred words, the accentuation of which, as well as the quantity of the accented vowel, is reduced to two or three simple rules.

The same uniformity of accentuation and quantity, may be observed in the first syllable of those words which have the accent on the third, as *demonstration*, *diminution*, *lucubration*, &c., where we evidently perceive a stress on the first syllable shortening every vowel but *u*, and this in every word throughout the language, except where two consonants follow the *u*, as in *curvilinear*, or where two vowels follow the consonant that succeeds any other vowel in the first syllable, as *deviation*; or lastly, where the word is evidently of our own composition, as *reconvoy*; but as *u* in the first syllable of a word, having the accent on the third has the same tendency to length and openness as was observable when it preceded the termination *ity*; I find it necessary to separate it from the consonant in *butyraceous*, which I have never heard pronounced, as well as in *lucubration*, which I have, and this from no pretended agreement with the quantity of the Latin words these are derived from, for in the former word the *u* is doubtful; but from the general system of quantity I see adopted in English pronunciation. This only will direct an

---

*Some orthoepists do not now account *rarity* an exception.*
English ear with certainty; for though we may sometimes place the accent on words we borrow from the Greek or Latin on the same syllable as in those languages, as accumen, elegieæ, &c.; nay, though we sometimes adopt the accent of the original with every word of the same termination we derive from it, as assiduity, viridity, &c., yet the quantity of the accented vowel is so often contrary to that of the Latin and Greek, that scarcely the shadow of a rule can be drawn, in this point, from these languages to ours. Thus, in the letter in question, in the Latin accumulo, dubius, tumour, &c., the first u is every where short; but in the English words accumulate, dubious, tumor, every where long. Nuptialis, murmur, turbulent, &c. where the u in the first syllable in Latin is long, we as constantly pronounce it short in nuptial, murmur, turbulent, &c. Nor indeed can we wonder that a different economy of quantity is observable in the ancient and modern languages, as in the former, two consonants almost always lengthen the preceding vowel, and in the latter as constantly shorten it. Thus, without arguing in a vicious circle, we find that as a division of the generality of words as they are actually pronounced, gives us the general laws of syllabication, so these laws, once understood, direct us in the division of such words as we have never heard actually pronounced, and consequently to the true pronunciation of them. For these operations, like cause and effect, reflect mutually a light on each other, and prove that, by nicely observing the path which custom in language has once taken, we can more than guess at the line she must keep in a similar case, where her footsteps are not quite so discernible. So true is the observation of Scaliger, *Ita omnibus in vehem certissim velation sibi ipsa respondet natura.*—De causis Ling. Lat.

**PRONUNCIATION.**

Syllabication having sound for its object, and the association of similar terminations contributing so largely to facilitate syllabication, it is evident that the most obvious advantage of this inverted prospect of our language is the assistance it affords to pronunciation. In other dictionaries, words of a totally different form promiscuously suc-
ceed each other, while in this we find the words sorted by their species as well as letters. It is recommended by Mr. Sheridan, in his Lectures on Elocution, to select those words which we find difficult to pronounce, and to repeat them frequently till a habit is acquired. This rule is founded on good sense and experience, and ought to be carefully attended to by foreigners and provincials; but if the difficulty of pronouncing lies in the latter syllables, as is most frequently the case, what immense labour must it be to select these from a common dictionary? But in this, how readily are we introduced to the whole species of any termination at once, and by seeing the whole class, gain an intimate acquaintance with its specific orthography and pronunciation; for by this means, not only a more precise idea of the spelling of words is obtained, and an opportunity of habituating the organs to every difficult termination, but the dependance of accent on termination is at large displayed, and a habit induced of associating the stress with its correspondent ultimate syllable. This view of accent will show us that our language is much less irregular than is generally imagined, and we soon discover termination to be, as it were, a rudder to accent, a key that opens to us an unexpected scene of uniformity, and proves, as Mr. Elphinston admirably expresses it, "that speech, the peculiar glory of rational intercourse, is neither given or guided by an arbitrary power, but that use in language, as in all nature, is no other than the constant agency of harmony and of reason."—Prin. Eng. Lan. vol. i. p. 8.

There are few but must observe with what difficulty children, and even youth, acquire a secure pronunciation of the technical terms in the learned professions, and how frequently they are at a loss for the sound of an English word they have not been accustomed to even at the time they are making great advances in the learned languages. This observation will naturally lead us to presume that the present work, of all others, must be the most useful for such schools as are not entirely negligent of their mother tongue. Here the words of any difficulty are selected in a moment, and by being repeated a few times over in the order they lie, will imbue the ear with
such an accentual rhythmus, if I may call it so, as will infallibly regulate the pronunciation ever after.

The division and accentuation of words, according to the length or shortness of the vowels, is an advantage to pronunciation which must strike the most cursory inspector. The utility of such a method, if just and agreeable to the analogy of the language, will be readily acknowledged by those who are so frequently disappointed in the inspection of other dictionaries. It is not a little surprising that a method of accentuation, so peculiarly useful, should till lately have been almost entirely neglected. This defect in the generality of our dictionaries did not escape the judicious Mr. Sheridan, who insists largely on the utility of placing the accent on the consonant, when the preceding vowel is short, and on the vowel, when the vowel itself is long; and though this does not specify the kind of vowel, with respect to sound which is the subject of accentuation, it at least determines its quantity, and is so far infinitely superior to the common method of placing the accent on the vowel, whether it be long or short.

Another and almost exclusive advantage of the present work is, that every monosyllable which swerves from the general rule of pronunciation, is rhymed with such a word as cannot possibly be pronounced otherwise than it is written; or if this cannot be done, it is spelled in such a manner as to take away all ambiguity. Thus as the more general sound of the diphthong ea is like e long and open in here, mere, &c., wherever it deviates from this sound, a rhyme is inserted to ascertain its pronunciation; head therefore is rhymed with bed, that it may not be liable to the Scotch pronunciation of this word, as if spelled heed; and great is rhymed with bate, that it may be distinguished from the sound the Irish are apt to give it, as if spelled greet. A bow (to shoot with) is rhymed with go, and bow (an act of reverence) with cow; and prove, dove, &c., are determined in their pronunciation by the univocal orthography prove, duv, &c.; by this means the stamina of our language, as monosyllables may be called, are freed from ambiguity of sound, and compounds rendered easier by fixing the pronunciation of their simples.
RIHYME.

The last, though perhaps the least, advantage of the following work, is the complete collection of all the rhymes in the language. However insignificant it may seem in this respect, it is at least new. For though Bysshe has given us a Dictionary of Rhymes at the end of his Art of Poetry, his Dictionary, if it may be called so, does not contain six thousand words, when Johnson’s Dictionary, to which this approaches nearer than any other, has very few short of forty thousand.* Here, then, as in the French Dictionnaire des Rimes of Richelet, the whole language is arranged according to its similar endings, and the English are no longer unfurnished with an assistance to versification, which Abbé du Bos tells us the French poets—Quoiqu’ils en disent ils ont tous ce livre dans leur arrière cabinet. But had the author seen no farther advantage in this work, than barely furnishing similar sounds for the purposes of poetry, he should have thought his labour ill bestowed. It is by no means his intention to vindicate the cause of rhyme to the least prejudice of a nobler verse, which is the peculiar glory of the English as a living language; nor will he insist on the proofs, both from nature and experience, that rhyme may be sometimes admitted to advantage, while Waller, Dryden, and Pope are in everybody’s hands.† It will only be necessary to observe, that, for fear those who have been accustomed to the common dictionary of rhymes annexed to Bysshe, should find a difficulty in discovering words by this new arrangement, an index of Rhymes, much more copious and correct than any hitherto published, is added, in which the old method of classing the words is continued, and a new and numerous class of allowable rhymes pointed out, with authorities for their usage from our best poets; but for a more satisfactory account of this part of the work, see the Preface to the Index, at the end of this Dictionary.

* Into this edition nearly 1800 additional words have been introduced.

† See the subject of rhyme judiciously discussed by Mr. Rice, in his Art of Reading.
TELEGRAPHIC ERRORS.
TELEGRAPHIC ERRORS.

Among other uses of the Rhyming Dictionary, and one that will most commend it to commercial men, is the assistance it affords in deciphering errors in telegrams. All merchants having business relations with America or the Far East use Telegraph Codes, so arranged that each word in their Telegrams represents a whole sentence. Frequently, however, these words are so mutilated in transmission as to be almost unrecognizable. As a rule there is not much difficulty in finding the proper word if the ciphers (or symbolical words) in the code are alphabetically arranged, unless the first letters in it have been altered or lost. It is especially in the latter case that this work will be found useful, and every merchant who receives Telegrams of importance should obtain a copy, and insert in their places such proper names or unusual words: as he may be likely to receive in his Telegrams, if he does not find them already printed.

An instance of not uncommon word-mutilation may be added to show the value of the book for the purpose above-mentioned. In a Telegram received, a word appears as "Sterturn." The merchant goes through the usual course of looking through his Code for any word like this, which will make sense in connection with the remainder of the message, and after wasting an hour or more in trying to decipher the true meaning, is compelled to return the Telegram to the Telegraph Company for repetition.
Probably in the course of the following day he receives the amended message, showing that the word originally despatched was "Overtum," meaning "Sell-to-arrive 1,000 bales Timmivelly Cotton at 5½ pence per pound." By this time, however, the London price has declined to 5¾d. per pound, so that he must either run the risk of holding the cotton in a falling market, or submit to an immediate loss of £300 on the previous day's quotation. Now had this merchant referred to this book under the letter N for words ending "erturn," he would at once have found the word "Overtum," and saved some hundreds of pounds.

We may explain that such an error as the above is not unfrequently caused by incorrect reading of the "Morse" alphabet; the letters St being expressed in "Morse" by --- — and the letter V by ----, the initial "O" was either lost or very likely attached to the end of the previous word.

Thousands of instances of errors and consequent heavy losses might be given, but no Merchant or Banker requires to be told of them, as they are of almost daily occurrence.

As a further assistance in deciphering badly transmitted messages, we append the Morse Alphabet, as used on almost every Telegraph wire throughout the world, and a list of the more common errors occurring in Telegrama.
# COMMON ERRORS IN TELEGRAPHY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Morse Signs</th>
<th>Separated Would Be</th>
<th>Confused in Transmission with</th>
<th>Confused in Writing with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>U R T N</td>
<td>u.n.d H o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>te.ee tee ni.nes.de.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I Ch f.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.ke te tae tae.tae.</td>
<td>W G F P K R</td>
<td>b.l.o o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.ee</td>
<td>B L N.</td>
<td>a L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>c.i G o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.tee ee.see.tee.</td>
<td>C L P R W.</td>
<td>H 1 b J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>me see</td>
<td>W C M P J Z Y J L O</td>
<td>E q y e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see ee.see.see.</td>
<td>S N.</td>
<td>L n A P R K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>S T.</td>
<td>c e v J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>Y G P Q W O</td>
<td>L f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>D P F W.</td>
<td>R H h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>G W O K</td>
<td>n W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>R D A T U V</td>
<td>r v a u h m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>G W J M P Q</td>
<td>c a v C Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>C F J Q. O L Q W</td>
<td>h L R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>J O P.</td>
<td>g O y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>E C N A F V.</td>
<td>e P B * K n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>H L A.</td>
<td>L T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>A N L E.</td>
<td>b l S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>A N V.</td>
<td>a n v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>U R N W</td>
<td>P r o i n u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>U R N W</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>P G F J M V C O</td>
<td>y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>G J.</td>
<td>g q x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>ee.see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>