

classification and aspects of vowels and consonants, their combination, assimilation, elision, fusion. Part 3d treats of language-representation exemplified by 170 versions of John iii, 16.

A brief statement as to Passy's work is in order: Bell gave us an entirely new set of symbols, not Romanic, not familiar—Visibl Speech. Ellis did the same in Roman forms—Palæotype. Sweet gives another version—Visibl Speech revizid, belonging Bell. Passy gives a Roman notation, comparabl to Palæotype, but simpler, les clumsy. Quite cosmopolitan and polyglot, with ful view of the labors of Bell, Ellis, Sweet, Storm, Vieter, Helmholtz, Sievers, Donders, Braecke, Western, and many others, he is yung, a recent expounder of fonetic sience, an expert fonetician. [By the way, Fonetics and New Speling ar very difrent fields, tho adjacent, overlapping—don't forget it. Orthoepy is a bridge between them.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

PRONUNCIATION OF *branch*, ETC.

SIR: Not satisfied with bransh, Frensh, insh, etc., I practist daily for two weeks and can only pronounce it bran f, with a perceptibl paus (to relax organs) before f, bran^hf with t faint but perceptibl, or branf with n aproaching ñ, Spanish n, (and perhaps ^h). *Pension* is hardly in point as n and f ar in separat syllabs giving time to relax, as in bran f. Old soldiers around here say pen^hfæn or peñ^hfæn.

A sister, a brother, and a frend succeeded no beter than I with bransh. This does not sho that it cannot be pronounced but that considerabl efort [to overcome habit] is required. As motion is toard least resistance, brantf, if not alrely curent, tends to become so. I do not object to orthoepic reform [choice?] where desirabl, but nf is a reform in an unnatural direction, perhaps departure from former uzage. Webster (Introduction, p. lxiv, §3) says:

"To ch in bench, bunch, clinch, drench, inch, trench, wrench, and many others, Walker givs . . . the sound sh [t] insted of ch [tf], as bensch, insh, etc. It wud seem by this and other exampls of rong notation that the author had been acsustomed to some local peculiarities, either in London, where all kinds of dialect ar herd, or some other place. In this he givs a pronunciation difrent from other orthoepists, one I hav never herd in either England or this cuntry. His notation is palpably rong, ours . . . universally corect."

This, in absence of proof to the contrary, shows that nf, or aproach toard it, is an English habit contracted since 1800. The speling ch raises presumption in favor of tf: burdn of proof is on those who change. Yu say yu ar neutral. If still so, stik to old speling. Change comits. The old may be defended on the conservativ principl: retain old speling if it represent pronunciation in good, reputabl use.

Addison, N. Y.

E. B. THORNTON.

[*The Standard* dictionary (page 2105) recognizes both: "*lch, nch*, as in *filch*, etc., *bunch*, etc., by English orthoepists genrally pronounced *lsh, nsh*." It appears mater of choice. Conventional decision (platform, plank 10) is requisit. American orthoepy in this, as in much els, reflects older speech. It deservs fuler consideration.—EDITER.]

CRITICAL COMPARISON BEGUN.

The riter on "Av. Am. Pron." (p. 56) is not avers to criticism. Readers ar askt to consider his work on its merits. We prefer to hav readers decide. We call attention to Blackmer's work because it is *a result*, not a wild scheme dremt over night or hatcht before brekfast; nor is Mr B. of a clas denounced by Dr Sweet (HERALD, Jan., '97) as "hatching one scheme after another." Their day is (or shud be) past. *Now* we shud sumarize and harmonize results of fifty years of work and agitation—not ponder briefly, then whoop "Eureka!"

On second tho'ts, noing THE HERALD appears seldom, noing many a good efort receivs neglect (too ofn merit's fate), we start discussion by an analysis: examining "DEVELUPMENT" (markt B) and "DEVELOPMENT" (H). Counting diferentials and markt leters in each we find:

	In B	H	B	H	
Dif-	{ a 21	i 15	Markt { i 13	letters: { ê 10	
eren-	{ e 35	a 14			o 3
tials:	{ u 32	u 14			

Not counted ar ö and ū (1 each in *law, improve*) because they mark distinctions not attempted in B. If these distinctions ar requisit or desirabl H furnishes a redy means to sho them—an advantage.

Difrences ar les than they seem: i or i is uzed for î, î being likely (from habit) to be pronounced as i in *fine*; ê or e is uzed for ē, ē being apt to lead to e in *he* insted of *they*. So, i and î ar alternativs, as ar ê, e. Again, i is î with mark dropt; e is ê, ditto.

However, tho î and i corespond, as do ê and e, yet of î and ê together ther ar 23, while of i and e ar 29. Inference, use of i and e is not shirkt where tho't requisit. Critical study of all this wil repay readers.

Oing chiefly to use of ð for dh, words in H hav 18½ ems space a line, those in B hav 19½: difrence 1 in 19½, over 5 in 100, 6 in 100 if superfluos g (?) in such words as *extinction, bank, single*, (ecstingcshun, bangk, singgl) be alowd for. We giv the figuring, as shud be done in such cases.

Overuse of v (32 times) is remarkabl. Ful haf is the weak neutral vowel (°).

Conclusions: (i) B has twice the diferentials in H (88 : 43); (ii) B requires 8 times as many markt leters (23 : 3); (iii) B is 6 in 100 longer; (iv) B uzes dh for ð and wud uze zh—both ar unfamiliar in Old Speling, "not in it." Is ther any good reason to inflict two awkward digrafts (formd by straind analogy) when ther is a beter way?

Brevity is not of first consideration, but an incidental advantage. Of cours, if H play retched havoc with orthoepy (a bul in a china-shop) we ar redy to take a bak seat, or even to be put in pound. Let us hear the other side, and by this or some means reach a model specimen of New Speling.