

and systematic orthograpy is necessary—indeed indispensable in printing offices and for national literatures—loosenes will never do. In this the *Times* is right. Further, tho a standard comparatively fixt is insisted on by the Pres, yet the existing slavish and over-rigid adherence to it is evil and shud be relaxt in *riting*, for:—

"More than one of our correspondents, irritated by the lengths to which pedantry has gon, hav rith as if ther o't to be no standard. The fairer inference, from their arguments, is, that a standard shud exist, and that lexicograpers who now difer shud come to agreement as to words now in dispute; but that deviations from rule shud be punisht les severely; that ther shud be fewer capital offenses, and that examiners, in particular, shud hav power of pardoning which they seem to think does not now belong to them. 'Moderat latitudinarianism,' to uze Dr Abbott's frase, wud be reasonabl."

#### FIXT SPELING.

Scolars and printers difer as to necessity for establishment of word-forms, as is shown by the *Times*' view givn elsewhere, but they must not remain at variance. On one hand Prof. Earle rote:—

"The way to slow but natural reform is to relinquish coercion and let all men spel as they like, [This prevaild before Caxton,] trusting that the natural proces of survival of fittest wil in due time bring about improvement."

On the other hand the *Times* says:—

"But is each man in this to be a law unto himself? The question has a practical side. 'One has to be inside a printing-office to appreciate difficultis of the situation' says Mr Horace Hart, printer to the University of Oxford. Ther ar obvios busines objections to foloing Nature's spelling. In a privat leter latitude is permisibl without inconvenience. But we presume that an author must be consistent in spelling if his pages ar not to be unsightly and perplexing. It wil not be suggested that each contributor to a newspaper shud, in this, go his own way. The result wud be confusion and ambiguity. The leters of Mr Randall, treasurer of the London Asocia'n of Corectors for the Pres, mentions a consideration of weight; uncertainty as to spelling means practical evils. It means so much los of time and money that the Asocia'n of Corectors for the Pres has helpt its members by compiling list of most comon doubtful words and coming to agreement as to their spelling. Mr Hart described in our colums the efforts made in connection with the Clarendon Pres to bring about uniformity. He compiled a set of rules, and oferd to send copis to those chiefly interested. 'The extent to which this ofer was immediately appreciated was rather startling, and showd univer-ality of need for a settlement. I received leters from all parts of Britain, Ireland, India, America and the Colonis; and leters stil come dropping in asking for these rules.'"

Right here is a chief caus why we make slow advances: we hav left the Pres out of account. In word-forms it demands fixity, stability and uniformity. Its demand is decisiv and inexorabl, tho not loud. One of Caxton's erly trubl (of which he gave a grafic sketch) was to establish, or *fix* so that it wud stay *fixt* for the time at least in his own office, suitabl set of word-forms. The requirement has grown stronger with

time as the Pres realize the advantages of stability whether the word-forms be good or bad. They cannot accept even good forms til genraly favord and systematic. We shal justify our statements. Meantime, the Pres is too busy to lisen to what they *no* wil retard their work and caus mischief. They may lisen when we hav a systematic tru Orthog. to ofer, not before.

This is not new: Callendar considerd it "essential to sp. ref'm" (*HERALD*, June, '89.) Fricke did the same, at least 8 years ago (*HERALD*, Feb., '89.) His "Warning Call to Agreement" went unheeded. Wil our voice, crying in the wildernes of discord, be beter receivd? Knudsen said in these colums that all variabl word-forms wer "crude and impracticabl." The veterans Fricke and Knudsen hav gon to their rest.

Even if the Pres wud be satisfied with disorder, wud the literary world be content to put up with it? Let us read:—

"The result of greater liens and genral indulgence to spel as one pleasd wud be startling. It cud not be confined to English. Those absold for spelng a word in their own language according to their fancis cud not be condemn'd if they speld French and German frases as seemd best to them. Ther wud always be the excuse that exercise of a litl ingenuity wud reveal the riter's intentions to any intelligent reader. We cud not wel object to similar freedom on the part of foreners: advocates of *laissez faire, laissez passer* ["let-it-alone, go-as-yu-please"] in spelling must contemplate the contingency of no two French books being printed alike, of the imens variety once existing in French orthograpy reapearing, and of difficulty of mastering a foren tung being prodigiously increast. Spelling and pronunciation ar bound up closely together; is ther to be individual liberty in both? Spelling and dialects also ar conected; is any authority to control the latter? Voltaire, who derided the orthograpy of French books of his time as ridiculos—adng that English orthog. was stil more absurd—described the ideal system when he said: 'Riting is the painting of the voice; the closer the resemblance the beter the picture.' Unfortunately, perfect likenes is not attainabl; it is found more convenient to agree on conventional representation than to circulate a multitude of bad copis unlike each other."

A COVER.—A 4 page cover for our litl paper is promist as soon as typografic obstacles allow. It wil contain a Platform, a Key with fuller explanation, a Table for transliteration, and other maters.

SPECIMENS.—Elsewhere ar to be found three specimens of 10-Vowel Orthograpy. Fairly they may be said to be *without new letters*: for 2 leters, *ð* and *ɪ*, ar but *restored* from the 13th century when *ð* went out and habit of doting *ɪ* began; 2 others ar already in use: *a* as italic *a*, *u* or *ʊ* as small capital for *U* (now they ar *assignd* definit values of *a* in *art* and *u* in *but*); 2 more ar *differentiated*, *e* from *æ*, *o* from *ō* by bringing the mark of length from above it to its left. With the 23 effectiv leters of the old alfabet and these 6 more we hav 29.