

be made of progres in England and in Germany. and mezurez looking to a closer co operation with foren societiez wil probably be taken.

PRÆR OR PRÆR?

Editor HERALD: SIR,—I think you hav taken the wrong vowel in such words as *care, fare, there, prayer*, etc. Insted of short a, as in *at*, it should be long a, as in *ale*.

Worcester refers all such words to the key word *fare* in which he marks the *a* with a vertical dash. In explanation he says, p. xiii. §11: "The third sound of *a*, markt with vertical dash, is its *long* sound, qualified by being followed by *r*; as in *care, fare, pare*.

. . . . Ther is obviously a difference between the sound of *a* in these words as pronounst by good speakers and its sound in *pain* and *fate*."

Webster, p. xli. §4. reads: "Some hav considered the *a* in *care* a distinct element; this however is not admitted by Smart, who maintains that it is *a* in *fate*, and owes all its peculiarity to the subsequent *r*. Such also is the statement of most English orthoepists. . .

. . . Thus, in the view here presented, the *initial sound* should always be that of *a* in *fate*, tho the final impression on the ear is that of an open or broad sound in consequence of the opening power of the *r*."

To the same purpos I might quote Smart Chambers, Nuttall, the Cabinet, the Imperial, and Stormonth. Pitman writes *they* and *there*, *shade* and *share*, *fate* and *fare*, &c., with the same vowel.

I think authority favors the vowel in *care, fare, prayer*, &c., being a modified *r*, and not 'a.'

Yours for correct pronunciation,
S. CLARE.

Toronto, May 29th, 1885.

[We agree that *R* following increases the *quantity* or *volume*. If last paragraf in Webster's §4 be red. it wil be seen that the other sound is allowabl; and W. regarded "the difference as unimportant." True, W. says the vowel *a* was chosen in New England in his day; but New Eng. then is all America now. By comparing sounds 3 and 11 on p.17 the reader wil infer that S.R.A. favors a.

Otherwise *care* shud illustrate sound 10. Its opinions ar commonly founded on exhaustiv comparison of aut:oritiez as wel as sounds. We believ the following statements wil hold: 1. In England the majority choose *a*; what about the rest of Britain? 2. In America the majority choose *a*. 3. For the present it is advisabl in this as wel as in other matters where ther is diversity of practice [e g. whether *fast* shal be fast or fast, see p. 17] to leave the choice optional. In *things doubtful, liberty*.—Ed.]

COBURG. — The subject ov Amend-ed Speling was discust at a meeting ov the Science Association ov Victoria University (Methodist,) and a very care-fully prepar'd paper was red by Mr D. R. McKenzie, set forth with arguments for and agens't Speling Reform. The paper was lisnd tu with much interest, and in the warm discussion which fol-low'd all wer in favor ov the reform ee-sept two, and felt that it was one ov the great questions ov the day, and one ov the most needed reforms. The stu-dents felt that the way in which the English child iz handicapt in lerning tu spel, in comparison with the German child, iz a most serius thing when the crush ov studiz iz so great —P. C. An-drews, in *Phonetic Journal*.

"REFORMING OUR ENGLISH."—This iz the title ov an able artiel in the *Bibli-otheca Sacra* for Oct. last, by Gen. J.D. Cox, ov Cincinnati, Ohio. I hoz inter-ested shud get it. He holds that our langwej haz lost meni good expresiv words which shud be restored; while others becoming obsolete shud be kept. Besides words, other beutiz ar disapear-ing. He mantains that certan changes shud be made in our pronounciation in the way ov both improvement and re-storation and that these amendments in the *spoken langwej* shud larjly præ-cede simplification ov its *printed form*. He iz not so ardent for radical change in the latr az he was formerly.

PROF. T.W. HUNT, A. M., of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N.J., contributes an able article on "How to Reform Our Speling." to the *North American Review* for April.