

respectively. Some years ago there was a communication from Prof. A. M. Bell in *The Journal of Orthoepy and Orthography* (Ringos, N. J., 20 pages 8vo monthly, \$1 a y'r) explaining their constituent elements. He failed to convince its editor. In the same journal for October three contributors (Mott, Collins, Lyon) have all assumed that ch and j are elements. Readers still in the dark but open to conviction may ponder this with prospect of light:—

In *cash*, cæf, insert t between æ and f, and we have cætf, *catch*, and nothing else. So, inserting t after the vowel changes *dish* to *ditch*, *lash* to *latch*, *wash* to *watch*, etc. Again, omit *ure* from *pleasure*, leaving plej; insert d after e, giving pledj, *pledge*; got, too, by inserting j after *pled*. That j is compounded of d and j is tacitly admitted by two prevalent spellings of one name: *Rogers*, *Rodgers*; as that ch is compounded by *Acheson*, *Atcheson*. Try saying *chop* without touching the tongue-tip to the gums and *shop* is said. So, *chin* becomes *shin*; *choose* or *chews*, *shoes*; *cheap*, *sheep*. The illiterate who misspells (?) *pigeon* with d, or *much* with t, is led right phonetically by his ear.

The ch and j are dual in orthoepy, we believe that in orthography it is better to treat them as we do.

✍ Readers who wish fuller explanation of our notation and principles or platform will find it on the red cover, one only of which is sent with every packet mailed. The Platform is yet imperfect. The part now sent has resulted from much correspondence, cogitation, suggestion. Readers who have their "thinking cap" on are invited to contribute or suggest other well-considered "planks" to be added later.

AT WORK.—Mr A. J. Pierce writes from Grand Forks, Dakota:—

"On the 23th the State Teachers' Association is to meet here. As usual, there is nothing on the program about the crying need of the time-better spelling. I take it on myself to do missionary work, and want to deluge them with the sensible idea. Can you help me with latest matter? What angers me is indifference of leading educators in conventions, summer schools, etc. I mean to shake 'em up."

We have sent a sufficient supply of THE HERALD for distribution. It is a leaflet for that purpose, and is about as much as an average intelligence will take as a dose. Being a serial, it is always fresh. More workers and subscribers are needed.

SIGNS OF PROGRESS.—A new edition of the *Manual of Phonography* (by Benn Pitman and J. B. Howard, Cincinnati, Ohio, 200 12mo pages, cloth, \$1, 355th thousand) has a number of amended spellings, as *practise* (noun and verb). Truly

"The Manual is clean and neat. It teaches, not filology, nor yet fonetics, but fonography, shorthand, pure and simple. On the left-hand page is clear statement, on the right-hand page is apt illustration; both are at once under the eye, and comparison is easy; the mind grasps the whole doctrine at a single view. Conciseness and comprehensiveness characterize the style."

All this we endorse, and add that the *Manual* is a lucid exponent. We endorse, too, its own statement, §37, that

"The practice of noting the deliberate utterance of a word, as distinct from its usual [or slurred colloquial] sound, will tend to give accuracy and finish to the student's own pronunciation."

NEWSPAPER PRONUNCIATION.—Recently a swindler named Macdonald came to Ottawa from Washington, as he asserted. He sold facsimiles of signatures for fraudulent purposes. The *Toronto Globe* of 14th January contained this:—

"Finally, Mr Ogilvie fixed a severe gaze on Macdonald and asked him about Alaska and the Yukon, where Macdonald said he had been for six years. Macdonald pronounced Indian names of rivers and places so that Mr O. considered he had obtained his information from newspapers, and pronounced them as would any ordinary newspaper reader."

This exposed him. It also exposes theretchedness of newspaper pronunciation. It emphasizes and illustrates what we have contended for long: a simple notation for orthoepy, such as could be printed by any printer, should be authorized by educators to be taught and used in schools. This would then be a perennial spring correcting thisretched mal-pronunciation.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### ALFABETIC NOTES — LINDSLEY.

SIR: I have always associated e in *err*, ea in *earn*, u in *up*. That was our Yankee pronunciation. It may be wrong to others.

Is it worth while to distinguish iu in *purity* and iū in *few*? Ought we not rather to seek simplicity for popular use? Leave to elocutionists the attaching of little frills.

K is well established and invariable. For its usual sound, it seems better than c. C is so variable.

There should be two letters to represent spoken and whispered th in *this*, *thin*, as much as in bp, gk, dt, etc., which pairs I take to be not separate sounds but variations of the same, differing only with force of utterance. H is merely forcible expulsion of *breath* requiring no movement of vocal organs; hence, not a consonant, but more like a vowel—a mute vowel, if there be such.

Of course, I would like to have separate letters for sh in *shall*, s in *vision*, ng in *sing*, so as to make a complete alphabet, if new letters are to be brought in; also, such arrangement of letters as would ally in mind and bring out phonetic relationship, such as bp, gk, dt, vf, fj, zs, etc. The present arrange-