

“PAIR” AGAIN—VARYING ORTHOEPEY.

SIR: *Re yur ansers* on p. 46, e was suggested becaus of plank 3. If yu wil uze new types, wud *pair pare pear* = per do?

The slight variation in pronunciation mentiond p. 47 requires very litl resling with: (1) the vowel in *pair* in America is not [exactly] long “short a,” tho nearer this than to “short e;” in London I hav herd both this (e:) and (e:), never (e:). (2) Why notice this small point, overlooking greater variations (if yu folo plank 13) as: (i) *parse* in London has no r, in America r is comon; (ii) *pass* in L. has a, “Italian a,” in A. long “short a;” (iii) “short o” in L. some sort of o-sound, in A. almost universaly short “Italian a” [our o]; (iv) *dense, tenth, French* L. dens, tenth, frensh, A. dents, tenth, frentsh (genrally); (v) *new, due* L. nyoo, dyoo, A. noo, doo; (vi) *while* L. wile A. hwile; (vii) *been* L. bean, A. bin.

I enclose \$1 to send THE HERALD’s extra edition for January to Ontario teachers. New Haven, Conn. EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

[What is said goes to sho that the vowel in *pare* is herd in two (among other) ways as shade vowel of (1) e in *let* or (2) a in *cat*. THE HERALD, after rather ful (we wil not say exhaustiv) consideration, reacht this conclusion in vol. i, p. 34, that shade vowels shud not hav separat alfabetic distinction. Ther is considerabl pro and contra between pages 22 and 59. Corespondents Clare (p. 23), Lyon, Larison, Albro, p. 30, Gholson, Rouse, Burnz, and others, wer lisnd to atentivly, and the authorities they quoted and others examind. Hence e wil not do. Phyfe (vol. i, p. 28) counts no les than six shade vowels, and so e wud need five mates!—right in Orthoepy-fonetics, not in Orthografy. The question is, which of eight vowel-signs now uzed (a, e, i, o, u, a, i, u) shud be taken as nearest what we shud “aim at” (plank 9). The “Oxford” Dicty favors e in *let*, the *Standard* favors a in *cat*, and we uze a out of deference to others, not becaus it is our own personal practis (for it is not) or choice. Shal *despair* on p. 52 be as there, *despar?* *despär?* (ü implying e:, or e held), *despær?* or something els? Who wil resl with this, giving it exhaustiv consideration, and thro it? Old subscribers no that (insted of overlooking) both eyes hav ever been wide to the cold, hard fact of varying pronunciation, as witnes on THE HERALD’s red cover our notation for it. Results ar deducibl from THE HERALD’s Word-Register, a record of conclusions. Words mentiond above as exampls ar considerd in the Register belo.—ED.]

Q—AN I-E SIGN—ð OR dh—“BRANCH.”

SIR: On p. 42 yu ask for a shape better than either a or ê. I think a very good. Yu can’t better it. While an e-form to suit continentals, it is so like script a that En-

glish-speakers read it redily. It is like Pat’s fidd: shaped like a turky, it looks a goose.

We do need a better shape for the vowel in *meet*. i difers so litl from i that an American wud call it ai (*eye*) or i. An e-form, as oposed to European uzage, wil not do. The problem is, find an e-form that shal be an i to the forener, an e to the American. Detach top and botm of E and reduce them to two triangular dots (a modified colon, uzed as a holder) that may be considerd i. Reduce the midl tung of E to a strait line, a makron, past completely thru the upright (as in Pitman’s 1844 sign for this vowel), thus, I. Printers may uze i: as substitute. Script may be i or e. The capital of e shud be E. [We uzed Ee, Ee, but abandond them.]

I favor ð insted of dh. Dh seems contrary to plank 17.

Why “bransh” on page 43? It is practicaly imposibl (or only with effort) to say t after n without t (more or les distinct) between. Find 75 c. enclosed for yur extra edition. Addison, N. Y. E. B. THORNTON.

[Is not *pension* redily pronounced without t? *Branch* is givn in the *Standard* as of disputed orthoepy, tho it appears to select -nch (= ntf); the “Oxford” givs -ntf alone, without t. See *French* above and belo. In this word too ther is the same difrence in the dictionaries named. The two sides of “the water” (the Atlantic) appear to difer. Is not this insertion of t between n and a foloing lingual an American habit? Shud it be resisted or adopted? We ar neutral. We took “bransh” merely becaus we must take one or other. How can Orthografy be non-comittal? Who shal decide? This is not a ded-lok but mater of detail to sett (plank 10)].

WORD-REGISTER.

[A dash (—) means, same as the preceding.]
[. means, infer from the preceding.]

OLD SPELING REVIZED (OR AMENDED)	NEW SPELING ORTHOGRAFY (“SYNDROM”).	COSMOPOLITAN ORTHOEPEY (VARIORUM).
been	bin	— bin, ben*
branch	bransh	brantf, brantf
dens(e)	dens	— dents
due	diu dyū, dū
French	Frensh frentf
new	niu nyū, nū
pars(e)	pars pa:s
pas	—	pas
tenth	—	tenþ tentþ
while	hwait wœil, mœil

*In the *New York Nation* (27th Oct., 1898, p. 310) a scolarly riter, F. Tupper jun., of the University of Vermont, under heding Provincial Rimes, says “How regard the cupling of ‘been’ and ‘seen’ as evidence of English sweldom when we Yankees hav always mated the two sounds.” Yet, most teachers correct bn to bin.. Whittier once rimes it with “pen.” Prof. Sheldon (in *Dialect Notes*, vol. i, p. 38) riting on *A New Englander’s English*, says “been is bin, not bn, which I hav herd from a Canadian.” In conclusion, we prefer to “aim at” (plank 9) pronouncing been, bin, to rime with seen, sm, tho we shal not insist on it.