

# The Herald.

DEVOTED TO PRONUNCIATION AND AMENDED SPELLING.

5th YEAR. TORONTO, CANADA, November, 1889. N<sup>R</sup> 49.

## HOW IT CAME ABOUT

Riting,\* that wonderful method of arresting sound which has made human memory independent of life, and has thus perpetuated noledg, was necessarily at first confined to the lerned alone, the priest and the filosofer. These fixt, as nearly as they cud appreciate, or their method of symbolization, necessarily insuficient, wud allow, the sounds of their own language as they herd them in their own day. Their successors venerating the invention, or despairing of introducing improvements, trod servilly in their steps and mostly used the old symbols while the sounds changed around them. Within limits of powers of old symbols some changes wer made from time to time, but very sloly. Then in quite recent days, the inovation of diacritic signs arose as in Fr. and Ger, whereby a modern modification of ancient usage was more or les indicated. Ocasionaly, hole groups of leters formerly correctly used to indicate certn sounds came to be considerd as groups indicating new sounds,—not in all cases, but in many perhaps, where sounds had changed by regular derivation. Before printing, ritters, become more numerus, had become also les controld by exampl of ancestors, and endeavord as wel as they cud, with numerus conventions, inconsistencis imperfections and shortcomings, renderd inevitabl by inadequacy of instruments, to expres on paper the sounds herd. When we ar fortunat enuf to find the real handiwork of a tho'tful riter, as Orrmin, we see how much might hav been done to clear our riting of inconsistencis. But with printing came belief in necessity of fixt orthog. to facilitate work of compositor and reader. The regulation speling was taken from the intellectual and givn to a mecanical clas. Uniformity at all hazards was the aim. And uniformity has been gaimd to a great extent in late years, but at sacrifice which uniformity is far from being worth—loss of noledg of how our ancestors spoke, concealment of how we speak at present, innumerable difficultis to both reader and riter, and hence great impediments to aquisation of noledg.—ELLIS, in chap. I. *E. E. Pron.*

## ACCENT.

How the prominence and distinction which constitute accent ar givn the accented sylabl is not to be simply and briefly defined, becaus even in the same language it varis considerably under varying circumstances. We ourselvs, tho we call our accent stres of voice, sufer it to find expresion in diferent ways: by higher pitsh, by prolongation, by increast force, by completeness and distinctnes of enunciation—any one of these, or two or more combined. Taking the language word by word, the first method, elevation of pitsh, prevails. Choose a specimen word of more than one sylabl, read a list of words, and the accented sylabl wil hav evry time a higher tone; to mark it otherwise wil either seem unnatural and affected, or wil giv impresion of saying something, of using the word as an abreviated sentence, with context oमित. For, in uttering a sentence, the modulation of voice belonging to the expresion of the sentence predominates, throing proper word-accent into a holly subservient place, as regards pitsh of voice and compeling resort to the other means of distinction: even in certn cases, reducing or annulling the accentual distinction. Giv out *Jonathan* to be spelt, or mention it as specimen of a proper name, and first sylabl wil be raisd above the others; so also when it ansers a question like “who is here?” But make a question of the word itself, and the relation of pitsh is reverst; uter the sylabls in monotone, and astonishment or reproach may be conveyd; and the same monotone wil be the effect of puting it after a strongly emfatic word: and each combination of tones may be shifted up and down the scale thru considerable intervals, to satisfy higher needs of expresion. If we enunciate a hole sentence together, the same subordination of word-stres or accent to sentence-stres or emfasis—most marktly in pitsh, yet not in that alone—wil be clearly aparent; tho accent no more notably makes the unity of a word than does emfasis that of the frase or sentence; to uter each word as if we wer pronouncing it alone wud be insuferably monotonous and tedius, wud distroy life and soul in speech.—WHITNEY, in chap. xi, *O. & Linguistic Studies.*

\*REVISED SPELLING:—OMIT useles leters CHANGE *d* to *t*, *ph* to *f*, *gh* to *f*, *tch* to *sk*, if sounded so—rules justified by Revision of spelling (in progres)