

to advise or assist a beginner be ready to say "My dear sir,—this is the best form of phonography with which I am acquainted. It is as good as any other. It is far from perfect. Consider it a ground work and make the best you can of it." A spirit of this kind would go far to put an end to the petty rivalries that have so long disgraced the partizans of the various systems. J. W.

PRESENT AND FUTURE OF PHONOGRAPHY.

(From the *Reporters' Magazine*, London, England.)

The Editor of BENGOUGH'S COSMOPOLITAN SHORTHAND-WRITER in an article entitled, "Phonography vs. the New Systems," raises questions which he evidently thinks Phonographers will find it difficult to answer. We accept the challenge with this, the earliest opportunity, and assure our confere across the water that he has been deceived by mere smoke. 1. He tells us that Mr. Pocknell's pamphlet on "Legible Shorthand" undoubtedly foreshadows a struggle, not only as between that system and Phonography, but as between Phonography and all other systems. 2. That already "Legible Shorthand" has been by some of its reviewers called "The Shorthand of the future." 3. That Everett's has stood its ground in the competition with Pitman's Phonography. 4. That if the various authors persist in pushing their systems, the ranks of Phonographers must be divided. 5. That the work which Mr. Pitman is doing for Phonography cannot be done by any other hand; and, in conclusion, we are asked, 6. "In case of accident or illness, resulting in his sudden death, where is his successor?"

Now we will take these matters seriatim, and reply that

1. We see no indication whatever that Mr. Pocknell's pamphlet foreshadows a struggle; already it is almost forgotten here.

2. That reviewers are capable of saying all sorts of kind as well as unkind things; and that "Legible Shorthand" fell early into the hands of the mutual admiration reviewing society; that the most worthless things ever yet produced have been similarly flattered; and that we have yet to learn that a competent authority pronounced it "The Shorthand of the future."

Statement No. 3 rests upon a flimsy and utterly unreliable test of pitting a few amateurs against each other, and is as valuable as some of the testimonials used to puff this system, the absurdity of which we have exposed.

Of we can only say that if a few persons persist in getting this puffed in the press by the Mutual Puffing Society, they may create a belief so far away from the vantage ground of observation as America, that there is a grand tournament on the programme; but nearer

home we are not so easily convinced; indeed we believe that as soon as a real live reporter using any one of the *great systems*, is announced as on exhibition, Phonographers will flock from all parts of the country, and pay any reasonable admission fee to see the spectacle. Why, even Mr. Pocknell, as we have before pointed out, prefers to stick to Phonography rather than write his own very legible system.

To 5 we offer the most conclusive reply that Phonography for years has been standing on its own legs, and taking care of itself. More than six years ago, during a visit to Bath, we endeavored to get Mr. Pitman to acknowledge that, notwithstanding the great claims of the spelling reform, Phonography had still some claim on his attention, but he replied that Phonography was now capable of taking care of itself; and he has for years given his matchless energy to the promotion of the spelling reform, and in all probability will continue to do so to the end of his days.

6. His successor will be an army of Phonographers, counted by their tens of thousands, in this country, who will guard, with a more jealous eye than ever, the great inheritance of genius, of life-long labor, and of untiring zeal which he will leave them.

THE GOOD OLD TIMES.

In his very interesting sketch of journalism in the United States, Frederic Hudson, formerly editor of the New York *Herald*, relates the following:

RUFUS CHOATE'S CHIROGRA. HY.

Horace Greeley is a better penman than either Rufus Choate or Napoleon I. Any one who will compare Greeley's notes with the specimen of Napoleon's chirography in the lyceum at the Brooklyn navy yard will readily admit this to be a fact. Choate's penmanship was positively shocking. On one occasion he delivered an address at Dartmouth College, we believe, and two reporters from New York—one from the *Tribune* and the other from the *Herald*—were in attendance. Finding that Mr. C. had prepared his address, they arranged to take his manuscript after he had finished its delivery, and assist each other in making an extra copy for one of the two journals. So they formed a part of the audience, and congratulated themselves on saving the labor that taking stenographic notes of the oration would involve. The 1st word of the peroration scarcely reached the ear of the most distant hearer before the manuscript was in the hands of the reporters. They looked over the pages of Choate's brilliant eloquence; they turned the pages upside down, then sideways, then cornerways, then all sorts of ways, and gazed at each other in blank astonishment. Not a word could they decipher. They sought the orator.

"Why, Mr. Choate," said one of the report-