

Capt. de Haan says:—

"All languages spoken in Austria can be speld in Roman caracters; as German and Serbian. The latter is identical with Croatian, from which it differs in nothing but the Cyrillian alfabet [modified from Greek by Cyril (livd 827 tu 869) superseding an older Slav alfabet].

"Each of these (and several other languages) has its own simpl and unvarying system for rendering evry sound in it by letters uzed in aord with rules that leav no dout as tu pronunciation—precepts generally few, and very easily renderd in a synopsis tu accompany a book or chart.

"In most languages ar letters that can not be renderd in evry other language, becaus sounds indicated du not exist in both; as German ch in English, Eng. th in German, or Polish £ in both.

"Evry nation has, beside, its own peculiar way tu articulate sounds, that can not be renderd by letters, and scarcely explaid by words. Stil pronunciation and speling can be made tu go togeth-er sufficiently tu exclude dout as tu sound of a sylabl. A litl experience wil make evry reader pronounce a forin word in the same way and intelligibl tu the nation it belongs tu.

"Difficulty begins and is not tu be surmounted by such methods if English has tu be red and pronounced by a foriner. In it evry vowel has several difrent sounds, not indicated by speling and sylabls composed of quite difrent letters hav the same sound. It is necessary tu lern separately by hart how evry singl word is pronounced; it is imposibl tu rite an unknown or forin word in English so that evry reader is constraiud tu pronounce it exactly the same.

". . . . only in English pronunciation of evry vowel and sylabl must be indicated by signs or numbers, as in pronouncing dictionaries.

"No universal system indicating pronunciation of any human sound in any language by systematic use of letters and signs has as yet, tu my noledge, been introduced for practical purposes. Relativ endeavors form a subject of scientific filology and linguistic disiplin with which I am not conversant."

Now, all this but goes tu sho soundnes in plank 14 of our Platform, and need tu discover rules calld for by plank 33. Evry language must work out its own rules, as evry individual "works out his own salvation." What de Haan rote from Trieste but confirms what Crawley rote more recently from Washington:—

"I no nothing about a universal alfabet; but think each language wud du better tu find the alfabet [and rules] most suitabl tu its own needs without regard tu others' needs. Tu maintain the contrary is like inviting Fijis tu don Eskimo dres."—*Pioneer*, 1913, page 73.

We think planks 14, 22 and 33 quite pivotal at this stage.

F, S AND TH

An esteemd correspondent urges us tu spel of with v. The *SS Bulletin* (June, p. 11) tels of "enthusiastic reformers hu yern for complete fonetic speling, and hesitating ones hu wish tu use simplified speling." We hesitate becaus bound up with f ar s and th. The three stand or together change tu v, z, ð. Recently, Emerson urged change of s tu z when sounded so (*Ibid.*, p. 3), "which wud involv changes in many thousand words and final z in innumerabl plurals and present tenses." Emerson's "proposal was postponed" by hesitants. The SSS makes no distinction of *ths* in *thigh*, *thy*. The *New Standard Dict'y*, now in pres, wil hav difrence of ligature (as *th*) only. For a thousand years these rules prevail:

"þ may be pronounced as breth in *thin* at begining and end of words and after breth consonants as c, p: sō þū seȝst, yu speak truth [truth thou sayst]; hē slæpþ, he sleeps. Otherwise (that is, when folod by a vowel or a voice consonant such as r) it had the voice sound in *then*: on heofone and on eorþan, in hevn and on erth. f and s hav breth sounds f, s and the voice sounds v, z according tu the same rules.—SWEET, *First Steps in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 3. Effects of these rules last tu this day, and Planks 4 and 5 require us tu observ. Note *south southern*, *north northern*, *breth breathe*, and that *path*, *truth*, etc., hav plurals in (not þs, but) ðz. Ther is no break in *th* or in *s*, but for plurals of "nouns in f or fe change f or fe tu ves" (not vz) says an old rule. Shud this break justify a general change of f tu v? Let a 'strong man' anser.

#### NEWS-NOTES AND COMENTS

—The greatest posibl hindrance tu sp. reform comes from the atempt tu impose suthern mispronunciations on inhabitants of Scotland, Ireland, and the North of England, hu hav retaind correct pronunciation.—J. BLAIRIE in *Pioneer*, 1913, p. 57. Why not ad the Midlands and West and south-west of England? Speech there is very near what Skeat calls "our literary language." Parts of Upper Canada wer settl by these pepla. The south-west of Durham county swarms with Cornish and Devon-Somerset folk, hu now closely aproximate "our literary language" in speech, tho their elders often put v or z for f or s ("vine Zomerzet) and for *lord*, *horn*, etc., say lard, harn, etc., without dropping h or r. They repudiate London west-end speech with energy and emfasis, tho from suthern England.

—On 5th Jan., Mr O. C. Blackmer, Oak Park, Ill., died sudnly and unexpectedly at his own door, aged 85. He had just adrest a Congregational Sunday scool. His New Speling apcard on p. 56 other vews on p. 127. Limits of space forbid fuller notice due an admirabl character hu stedfastly, patiently workt in right directions.