

The Herald.

DEVOTED TO PRONUNCIATION AND AMENDED SPELLING.

4TH YEAR.

TORONTO, CANADA, DEC., 1888.

N^R 40.

THE 24 RULES.

The linguists hav formulated 24 Rules for Amending Speling. The rules ar givn on p. 31. They ar found cumbrus and highly impracticabl as a guide to spel by. An ordinary user of them canot hav his evry word

"Sicklid o er with the pale cast of tho't."

but shud hav his speling "come by nature," like Dogbery's; in other words, he must hav a guide redily aplid. So, over 3 years ago, we proposid the simpl rules we hav folod and hav givn so ofn.

Cern rules hav been specially objected to: as

6.—For *e* having the sound of *u* in *but*, *rite* *u* in *abuse* (*abuv*), *dozen*, *some*, and the like.

7.—Drop *e* from *ou* having sound of *u*, as in *journal*, *nourish*, *trouble*, *rough* (*ruf*), *tongue* (*tuf*), and the like.

8.—Drop silent *u* after *g* before *a* and in nativ Eng. words, as in *guard*, etc.

22.—Drop *t* as in *catch*, *pitch*, *witch*, etc.

On p. 140, Mr. Knudsen has objected to rules 6 and 7, objections he has repeated in Nov. no. of Phonographic Magazine. If we change above to *abuv*, and *u* is to retain cosmopolitan values as in put and rule, then "abuv" will not be final but wil hav to be reformd to *abuv* or some such form—a stil-begining, never-ending affair. Mr. K.'s opinions, not having been formd hastily, ar entitled to weight as is likewise that of Mrs. Burnz, an advocat of orthographic amendment for years. On p. 108, she has found fault with rule 8 because no one unles he be an Anglo-Saxon scolar can tel when to aply it and when not.

The 22d Rule changes *catch*, etc., into *catch*, etc. But *ch* is by very many held equivalent to *t* and *sh* and so it wud be beter to change *catch*, *pitch*, *witch*, etc., to *catsh*, *pitsh*, *witsh*, etc. It wud be beter to hav a rule reading "Change *tch* to *tsh* if sounded so" which cud then be grafted on the Rules* we spel by. If so wisht, it cud be made more sweeping stil by having

it read "Change *ch* to *sh* if sounded so." Then French, branch, Michigan, etc., become French, bransh, Mishigan, etc., tho it may wel be questiond if proper names shud come under rules—in general they ar to be left unchanged.

INDIVIDUAL AND LOCAL PRONUNCIATION.—No two persons, almost, pronounce exactly alike. This difference is most strongly markt among vulgar dialects, and even in educated circls ther is anything but uniformity of pronunciation. This is a difficulty with which any system of wordnotation has to cope. On one hand no notation cud be made so all-embracing as to include the infinit varetis of dialectic and individual peculiaritis of pronunciation. On other hand no system of orthograpy cud be firmly establisht as to abolish that variety. We must make up our minds that whatever reform we achieve, the Scotsman, the Irishman, the Welshman, the north and the south cuntryman wil each as heretofore indulge his litl peculiaritis. Let him. It is not proposd that he shud hav opportunity of offending our eyes with them on paper any more than he has now. All that is aleged is that ther is such a thing as CORRECT pronunciation, and that we want a system of orthograpy which wil represent that pronunciation as nearly as possibl, allowing for differences, and going upon the principl rather of clasifying and aranging, than one of hair-splitting.—F. J. KINGSEY at Manchester "Shorthand Rriters' Asoc'n."

—Ther is a riding master in Prag who has had his hole larynx removed, and who not only livs in aparently good health but is enabled to speak by means of artificial vocal aparatus. One of these appliances is used for issuing his orders in riding-scool and another for ordinary conversation.

*REVISED SPELLING:—MIT uscles letters; CHANGE *d* to *t*, *ph* to *f*, *gh* to *f*, *ch* to *tsh*, if sounded so

These pages hav a misionary object. Yur influence to extend circulo'n is solicited.

PRONUNCIATION.

GRAY'S ELEGY (continued from p. 151.)

The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea,

The is *de*, as explain on page 154.

Loving is lo^uiy or lo:ij, the difference being in the the later having o lip protruded, which it comonly has under accent. A good o can be made without protrusion as we believ comon when unstrest, as in *innocent* (in 'o sent, colloquial in o'sent). To employ a notation which, as ours does, exhibits lip protrusion as an adjunct or accident of a vowel appears at once grafi, as wel as truthfvl, becaus in acord with the actual: Whitney says:-

"One may hold his lips fixt immovably in a singl position (that, for instance, in which e or i is naturally pronounced), and yet uter the vowels of a *hat* and *all* with perfect distinctnes; one can also, by an effort, make an o and oo, clearly recognuzabl as such and nothing els, the wanting smoothnes of quality which belongs to our usual o and oo. And, on the other hand, one can fix the lips in oo-position, and yet, by a violent and exaggerated action at base of tung, say an unexceptionabl a (*Jar*)."—Part viii of 2nd Series of *Oriental and Linguistic Studies*.

Loring is pronounced lo^uiy too, as explaind last month. Prof. Garnet has told us on p. 146 that "certainly many [about all] Americans say *no* without this u-prolongation." The Cokny will say lou^uij, just as he says hou^uli goust for Holy Ghost. We last month gave expresion to the objection that the international asosiation thru its mouth-piece, the *Paris Teacher*, reflected local peculiaritis of pronunciation. Tho this be stil tru to some extent, which shal be pointed out in time, it is but just that a recent statement of views be givn. They occur in Nov. issue in noting a litl work of Prof. Rambeau, Hamburg, on use of fonetics in teaching French and English, (O. Meissner, Hamburg, 1888). It says:

"He prefers the general stan lard of English pronunciation, the medium between (educated) Londonese, Scotch and American English, to the specially suthern or Londonese English which most disps of Sweet and Ellis recomend. On this point..... we hartily agree with the author."

In noting a pamphlet by Zoëga, of Reikiavik, Iceland, for teaching English to Icelanders, we ar told on the same page with the above: "Z. recognizes nearly the same standard of English speech as we do here; but one text, borrowd from Sweet, is givn in London pronunciation." It is of good promis to find an average general orthoepy superseding a local one. The reader o't to giv careful attention to this. The articles on British-American Speech in our Feb. and Sept. issues shud be re-red with March's opinion quoted in that of Nov. 1886.

Herd is herd; that is, is either herd or hurd, as explain on page 154.

Winds is windz. The inflectional s be

comes voiced z, due to its being preceded by a voiced sound, *d*. "Lerning to read" is instiling this and like precepts into the mind by comiting word-forms "by hart". the principl on which they depend never once being stated—a rotn canker-spot in our much boasted-of educational system.

Slowly is slo^uli, slo:li, or slo^uli. How *æ* came in *slou* is an interesting question. Is it a survival of the time when men speld by sound? Was *æ* then sounded *u* and was *æ* ritn for *u* only because it was not customary, as it is stil unusual, to end a word with *u*; just as then, and now, *y* is ofn put as finish where *è* wud be expected; (compare *pity* with *pitiable*, etc.) Of a time about 500 years ago we read:

"It is comon to disregard the speling, and look up on it as lawles. It is true that it was not uniform but the Scribes had a law nevertheless, for their general object was to represent sounds, the speling is fonetic, not conventional. The variations in speling arose from variety of ways in which sounds can be represented. Thus *i* and *y* were consider interchangeable, and it is mere chance which is used."—SKEAT in p. xlv. of *Introduction to Piers Plouman*.

Was *slou* once sounded slou? The present pronunciation in south-eastern Eng. (slo^u) appears (not a survival, but) to hav originated within the present century. It may be argued with a show of plausibility that *æ*, which is akin to *u*, the labial vowel *par excellence*, shud be retaind in orthograpy, tho but its gost, lip-protrusion, indicated by its sign (:), now remains in orthoepy an extremely conservativ view.

O'er is or, or oar, by elision of *o* from *over* o'ar. Ther ar ten sybls in each. If *o'er* is oar, ther wil be elevn, counting or as one, spoiling the mesure. Some say that o cannot be sounded with r unles a intervene questionabl.

Lea is le. In south-eastern England it is liy, where we understand y to be as in *yet*. The y being faint, li is more acurat representation.

(To be continued.)

trial corner.

PRO ARIS ATQVE FOCIS.

Tu evry man upon this erth

Deth cumeth sun or let.

And how can man di beter

Than fasing ferful ods,

For the ashes of his fathers,

And the templs of his gods.

MACAULAY'S *Horatius*.

KEY: a a a e e i i o o o u u u
as in art at ale cel ell ill l or ov no up put ooze

IN PRONUNCIATION ONLY.

: - lip protrusion; ^ = nasalization;

' or ' = accent; o = 'neutral vowel.'

ETYMOLOGY.—If the present system had historic value as indicating the source, the original pronunciation, or any other important fact about a word, we might reconcile ourselves to it. But its *positive* *mis* takes are so many that we can never place faith in it. We rite *sovereign*, from the ridiculous idea that it has something to do with *reign*; *posthumous* with *h*, from the error, long since exploded by Latin scholars, that it referred to *post humum*, after death; *egleat*, the scholars now always rite *silet* in Latin; *island*, from an imagined connection with *insula*, whereas it is Anglo-Saxon, and shud be *iland* or *eyland*. Why shud we rite participles *spread*, *dead*, but on the other hand *led*, *fed*? That some historic information may be conveyed by present orthography cannot be denied; but where half of such information is demonstrably false, the other half is open to suspicion and practically useless. Even if this half were absolutely reliable, it is an open question still whether retention of old orthography, or keeping orthog. abreast of the times, yields more information to the historian. MAR TINEAU in *Trans. Phil. Society*, 1867.

CHAUTAQUA. How to spell an Indian name is often a puzzle. Each nation tries to represent its sound by letters whose values accord with powers of such letters in the speaker's language, whatever that may be. In Dr Vincent's new book (*The Chautauqua Movement*, Boston, 1886) we find at p. 55: "It is interesting to trace changes in the name Chautauqua. Indian, Frenchman, and American have had hard work to get it into its present shape. 'Jat-to-ca,' 'Chat-a-co-nit,' 'Tchad-a-ko-in,' 'Tjad-a-so-in,' 'Chat-a-kou-in,' 'Shat-a-ko-in,' 'Jad-ax-qua,' 'Jad-a-qua,' 'Chaud-dawk-ka,' 'Chat-augh-qa,' 'Chau-tau-que,' until a few years ago, by special legislative enactment, the present name 'Chautauqua' [Sho tok'wa] was given."

ARKANSAS. The proper pronunciation of 'Arkansaw' is [not 'Ark'an so', but] ['Ark' msa']. This was the old Indian pronunciation, which early French traders expressed in letters as 'Arkansas'. French *a* is always broad, and the final *s* is silent; so 'Arkansas' to the French was pronounced ['Ark-msa]. Congress spelled the name, in the act organizing the territory, 'Arkansaw', and for some years it continued to be so spelled. Finally, as every one new the pronunciation, the original spelling was brought into use again. Then came people who new not the history or pronunciation, who called it 'Arkansas', and this mispronunciation throve. In 1830 the State Historical and Eclectic Societies jointly investigated the name and its

pronunciation, and on their report, the substance of which is given above, the state legislature decided that 'Ark'an sa' was the legal pronunciation. *Notes & Queries*.

Why one *f* in *claf* and two in *cliff*? Because *claf* is Italian, a language spelled with common senses.

WHAT OFFERS? The following accounts are offered for sale cheap:

John Johnston, Inspector of Schools, Belvid, Ont., . . . 3 years' subscription @ 25 cents;
A. Crichton, B. A., Waterdown, 2 years' do
D. H. McDermid, London, Ont., 1 "

FRENCHIFIED INDIAN.

The comments on Arkansas and Chautauqua in this issue are but examples of a large subject: The representation of a North American Indian name with French letter values. This comes of Frenchmen having been early explorers in N. America. The Spaniards, with and after Cortes, overran south and west; and so places there have names spelled simply as Spanish orthog. is simple: witness, San Bernardino, Pasadena, Los Angeles, El Paso, and many others.

Up to middle of last century, British possessions were confined to a narrow strip along Atlantic coast, with Dutch possessions about N. Y. The remainder was French from Hudson Bay to Gulf of Mexico. This explains Frenchified spelling in names from Indian. French power ceased with fall of Quebec in 1759, historically but yesterday. They spell such names with their values familiar to them. Thus *ou* in Fr. is either *u* or *u*, which explains *ou* in *Louisiana*, *Missouri*, *Sieur*, etc.; *ch* sounds *sh* as in *Chicago*, *Michigan*; *ther* being *no w* in Fr., *Ouisconsin* (U is *con sin*) was what is now *Wisconsin*, as we have *w*. So, Fr. having no *k*, *qu* did for *k*, and *au* often representing the sound *o*, we have *Esquimaux*, with Fr. plural *Esquimaux*. That people call themselves *Inuits* (In wet), but the Creeks nicknamed them *Es'ki mo*, meaning *flesh-eaters*, as English are called "beef-eaters", and French missionaries mistook this for their name. Of late only is sensible Eskimo to be found.

The question is, should such words accord with our use of letters, or with French, Spanish, or what else? There should be no national values, but international ones only; and this the Geographic Society very properly does. Its rules with abundant examples were given in these pages for Nov. 1886 and Nov. 1887, which see.

Applying this principle, Arkansas would be *Arkansa*. As state legislation settled orthography of the word, it should now settle orthog. amputate useless, silent, French *s* final.

PUBLIC OPINION OF AMENDED SPELING.

It requires no very close observation of signs of times to be aware that reform of orthography is rapidly becoming one of the most important of minor questions of the day. It is perfectly correct to assert that only a few years ago it scarcely excited any particular interest outside a very limited circle of scholars. Suggestions of change, of whatever nature, were rarely even referred to save as illustrations of harmless lunacy of crack-brained theorists. If they were spoken of seriously, it was nearly always for purposes of protesting against the audacity and impiety of that fanaticism which, for sake of ideal perfection in unimportant details, would be willing to unseat foundations of language, and impair, if not entirely destroy, a sacred legacy from the past, bound up forever, whether for good or evil, with the literature of the race.

All this is now altered. Within five years, the question has assumed an entirely different character. Demand for reform is no longer confined to a few scattered scholars without influence and usually without even so much as notoriety. On the contrary, it has extended in some cases to whole classes. Philologic societies appoint committees to examine and report what is best to be done. School boards petition government to establish a commission to investigate the whole subject. Nor is participation in the controversy that has sprung up limited to those alone who have direct interest in educational aspects of the question. Either on one side or the other, men of letters of every grade, and scholars in every department are entering for a tilt in the orthographic tournament now going on. All this to be sure is strictly far more true of England than of this country; but, to a certain extent, it is true of this.

What has brought about this sudden change it is not easy to determine. Doubtless there has been for a long time wide dissatisfaction with existing state of things, though it has found little audible expression. To this dissatisfaction a powerful impulse has been given by study of our speech in its earlier forms, a study which has made its most rapid progress during the few years just past. The principal objections which prejudice opposes to change have their force almost wholly destroyed when facts of language are brought directly home to attention. Shrines upon which ignorance conferred sanctity, and to which stupidity bowed with

unquestioning adoration, have been utterly and instantaneously demolished by the remorseless iconoclasm of scholarship. Early English. Moreover, the character of the advocates of reform is something that of itself makes an impression. To opinion expressed by them, their abilities and attainments may not be sufficient to command assent, but are sufficient to impose respect. There is an uneasy consciousness in mind of those most opposed to change, that it is no longer quite safe to indulge in the contemptuous treatment of the subject which, a short time ago, was the only argument. A reform which numbers among its advocates every living linguistic scholar of any eminence whatever, which in addition includes every one who has made the scientific study of English a specialty, may be inexpedient, impracticable, even harmful, but it can't well be demolished by brief editorials nor superficially thrust aside with an air of jantiness and superiority. If the question is to be argued at all it must now be argued on its merits. In such a discussion it will be found that favorers of change, however unreasonable in their expectations or not, know precisely what they are talking about, and a charge that can rarely be brought against their opponents.—THE TEACHER.

WHAT A LANGUAGE IS.—A language is a number of connected sounds which convey a meaning. These sounds, carried to other persons, enable them to know the speaker is feeling, and what he is thinking. More than ninety per cent of all language used is SPOKEN language, that which is written forms an extremely small proportion. But, as people grow more and more intelligent, the need of written language is more and more felt; and hence all civilized nations have, in course of time, slowly and with great difficulty made for themselves a set of SIGNS by aid of which sounds are, as it were, indicated upon paper. BUT IT IS THE SOUNDS THAT ARE THE LANGUAGE, NOT THE SIGNS. Signs are a more or less artificial, more or less accurate, mode of representing language to the eye. Hence the names "language," "writing," and "speech" are of themselves insufficient to show that it is SPOKEN and not WRITTEN language that is the language, that is the more important of the two, and that indeed gives life and vigor to the other.—MEIKLEJOHN.

PLEASE SUBSCRIBE: Terms, 25 c. a year; 5 years, \$7.00. 7 copies to one address, per year, 50 cents; 15 ditto, \$8.00. Foreign stamps taken. Bound nos. for any past year, 25 c. Address THE HERALD, 125 Harbord St., Toronto, Canada.