

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming /
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
					✓						

The Herald.

DEVOTED TO PRONUNCIATION AND AMENDED SPELLING.

5th YEAR.

TORONTO, CANADA, Mar., 1889.

NR 43.

DUBL* CONSONANTS.

There is much diversity of opinion as to doubling consonants or omitting one. In an article by Miss Rudeboc in *Jur. Amer. Orthoepy* for Mar. this is pointed out but no rule or remedy is suggested. We read:—

“THE HERALD drops one consonant in *passing*, *clipping*, *different*, *grammar*, *letter*, *better*, *intelligent*, but retains both in . . . *correspondent*, *correct*, *call*, *small*, notwithstanding the editor's rule to ‘omit useless letters.’”

Distinction must be made between Amended Sp. merely and a notation giving Pronunciation. In first set of words above a single letter is enough; in the others, we have open *o*, *o*, and it is unwritten law in present sp. that to indicate broad or open *o* and distinguish it from close *o*, *o*, two consonants are to follow. There are many exceptions—there always are in Eng. Such second consonant is not ‘useless.’ Shud *o* or any other sign be agreed on for open *o*, it will be useless. Till then, make no change. The fundamental value of *o* is *o*, and a cons. may be omitted from *droll*, etc., not from *doll*, etc.

Some maintain that in *passing*, etc., the double cons. shud be retained in accented syllables, the second cons. being the orthographic equivalent for orthoepic accent-mark: as, *clipping* = clip’ip. Such hold that a cons. shud not be doubled where there is no accent, as in *benefited* with single *t*. A selection on first p. of HERALD for Oct. gave spelling in comparative accord with this view.

“In *hammer*, *rubber*, *drummer*, *robber*, etc., etymology requires no double letter, as their roots are *ham*, *rub*, *drum*, *rob*, etc. . . but . . . ease of utterance requires it.”—*Ibid.*, page 41.

How this is is not explained. It is easier to sound one only; one only is heard, though the *Jurnal* editorially thinks a ‘faint’ second perceptible. The editor ‘takes a hand in,’ but arrives at questionable conclusions:—

“When a consonant ends an accented syllable, unless the succeeding syllable be inflectional, we begin the next syllable (provided the vowel in the next is not already preceded by a consonant) with the same consonant. . . The consonant is faint.”

Addle, etc., are given as ad’dul, etc.; Mur. gives ad’l. Taking this word as type of its class, let us examine its history: thru the fonetic stage of our lang. it was spelled with but one *d*. The *Ormulum*, ritn about 1200,

*REVISED SPELLING:— OMIT useless letters; CHANGE *d* to *t*, *ph* to *f*, *gh* to *f*, *sch* to *tsh*, if sounded so

is an exception of course, and the only one before 16th cent. Its author was a sp. reformer who proposed indicating short vowels by doubling succeeding cons. in all cases. So, in *Or.* we find ‘addlenn,’ just as ‘Iann itt iss addledd’ in line 6235. *Ælfric*, about 1000, says (*Enigma* in *Cod. Exon.* 110, 1): “Dæt her yfle adelan stinceþ.” Single *d* lasted till 18th cent.; *dd* began in 16th c.: so that struggle of *d* with *dd* lasted thru 16th, 17th, and 18th. The worst survivors like much *els* in our spelling.

He then proceeds to teach that a final cons. is held before an inflectional syllable is added. This is often so; but not in *selling*, a type word of those he gives. It is not always held when inflectional syllable begins with the very cons. the word ends with: thus, if *actual*: ‘ake’ly, we have ‘actuali’ (Murray.) He says that but one cons. is held in such words: granted, but it is not held. *N* is held in *sudden* before *-ess* is added, as also *n* in *openness* and *l* in *wholly*. *Bell* has a sign called a ‘holder’ put after any letter to show that it is held, as is done too in music. Let us, *pro tunc*, denote a held sound by small capital; so that these words are pronounced sud’nes, op’nes, hol’li. But *x*, *l*, etc., are orthoepic devices like the accent-mark—not to be dragged into Orthography any more than certain other marks in Elocution. Orthography, Orthoepy and Elocution are quite different—different in degree, not in kind. What shall we do in Ortho. when a sound is held? Answer, leave it doubled till a better way is promulgated. Our German coworkers have reached the same conclusion; that is, if we put proper construction on the words translated last month as ‘No double cons. in same syllable.’ The orthographic syllabification of words above appears to be *sudn’nes*, *opn’nes*, *hol’li*. Like holding is found too towards beginning of words especially if the remainder is still in use as a separate word. Thus, *unecessary*, i.e. *gal* = *illegal*. During *x*, *l*, etc., the tongue does not leave mouth-roof: if it does, the cons. is doubled, not held. Like held, (or doubled), cons. are quite a feature in Italian; as *immonso*, *addio*. In our word ‘innocent,’ *n* is not held: we have no word ‘nocent’—short of a Latin participial.

NOTES ON PRONUNCIATION.

GRAY'S ELEGY (continued).

The ploughman homeward plods his weary way:

The spelling *plough* is historic, indicating not its derivation but that it was once pronounced with a guttural over a wider area than now. This guttural, temporarily denoted by *ch*, is still heard in Scotland and north of England, chiefly among the rural population, more conservativ of orthoepy than townsmen and citizens. Besides *pluch* and *pluch* ar heard in Scotland. If an American attempt to giv it, he wil commonly say *pluh* or *pluk*. The sound is between them. The tung is bro't bak til it almost touches soft palat: if it touches it, k is heard; in h, tung is flat on mouth-floor, not drawn bak archt tords soft palat as in *ch*. *Ch* is quite frequent in German. Its proper pronunciation and that of its voiced yoke-felo *gh* is a shiboleth almost to yung America. Old foggy tutors ineffectually try to hamer-it-in by repetition insted of giving its formation to practis.

The first part of the difthong is givn as *o*, *o*, *o*, or *o*; its scend, *u* or *ü*. Sheridan, who in 1780 rote our first (leaving Kenrick's, 1772, and Perry's, 1775, out of account as minor) pronouncing dictionary, a complete copy of which we hav, says *o* and *ü* ar its parts. Jones, who rote "Sheridan Improved," stil givs *ou* so late as his 12th edⁿ, 1807. Walker, 1791 on, givs *ou*, saying distinctly that its first part is the vowel of *nor* or *coll*. Nobody now givs *o*. Has the difthong changed? or was Sheridan mistaken, others copying him too much? Original observation is yet rare. (Dictionary makers ar great copiers; thus, one omitted *uncle*, so did others, not observing omission!) Pitman givs *ou*; our corresp^t, N, foloing Ellis, givs *uu*, appearing to confound *o* and *u*. M. limits it tho: he says:—

"When the difthong precedes a vowel as consonant, the first element is vowel in *up*, but, *son*: when the difthong ends a word or is folod by a voiced consonant, the first element is vowel in *alm*, *father*. . . . In U. States it appears to me to be usually the vowel in *father* in all words."—HERALD, March, 1886.

Other authoritis ar cited there. Murray givs either *ou* (au) or *uu*. The later, au, is cokeny, also 'down east.' Whitney says:—

"The mouth-organs do not rest an instant in a position at begin^g: g, but use it merely as a starting point. . . . It is mater of dispute among English ionetists, whether initial position in these difthongal slides is that of a (*far*) or that of the neutral vowel, and some of the best authoritis (as Ellis) favor the later. Very probably ther is actual difference of usage in different parts of the English-speaking community. The fact that, as we hav seen, ther is in ordinary speaking no prolongation of the initial element, makes satisfactory determination difficult. I am fully persuaded that I begin with a *far*."—Part 8, §15, of 2d Series, *Oriental & Ling. Studies*.

Insted of *ou*, in which *o* and *ü* ar ex-

tremes of opness and closenes respectively, les extreme sounds ar really used, viz., *ou*. The reader shud ever bear in mind that *o* is elast with *a*-sounds.

(To be continued.)

PAIRD VOWELS.

The contention of a correspondent that *i*, as in *ill*, is the same in Ger. and Eng. is but an examp^l of a rule w. I put by Powell (*Introd. to Study of Ind. Languages*):—

"The difference of tone between long and short values of what is nearly the same sound is greater in Eng. than in almost any other language."

The stupidest hoodlum among us yeling in a crowd redily distinguishes *mill* and *meal*, *sit* and *seat*, *hit* and *heat*, *pill* and *peal*, and so on for scores of words. For *e*-sounds compare *tale* with *tell*, *saint* with *sent*, *mate* with *met*, *taint* with *tent*, etc. As to *a*-sounds, *a* is wel differentiated from *o*, but vowel in *what* not so wel from that in *father*, *art*, etc. These appear to form the only pair badly differentiated. For *o*-sounds compare *scald* with *scold*, *not* with *note*, *for* with *fore*, *got* with *goat*, etc. For *u*-sounds compare *full* with *fool*, *could* with *cooled*, *pull* with *pool*, etc. In Ger., *i*, *e*, *u*-sounds ar just about as widely differentiated as in Eng. They hav *e* and *i*, *a* and *e*, *ü* and *u*, much as we hav—not so with *o*- and *a*-sounds. We hope to giv diagrams tru to nature of vowel-scales in chief mod^l lang^s. In Romance Lang^s pairs ar not so wel separated—sound-shifting ertquakes hav not yet rent their vowel-systems.

Corollary: English requires more vowel-signs differentiated than other tungs.

U AND Ü.—As to Mr Jones' contention, last month, as to infrequency of *u*, we say that all depends on how *yu* count. Is *ou*-difthong to be counted in? We say, yes. Is *o* to be considered *ou*? Who shal decide? Estimats vary from 1/2 to 4 per centum—truth lies between, about 2 p. c. We read Mr Jones' leter with *u* 18 times, *ü* 23 times. We shal giv a table of 10 000 sounds.

"TYRANT CUSTOM."

"Custom calls him to it!
What custom wills; shud custom always do it.
The dust on antique time wud lie unswept,
And mountains error be too highly heapt,
For truth to overpeer."

KEY: *a a a e e i i o o u u ü*
as in art at ale ell cel ill Inor ox no up put ooze
= The f loing ar used in pronunciation only:—
: = lip-protrusion; ' = nasal; o = obscure.
Vari- (a er e i o u ü
etis.) (a e u E, i e i y o, o u, ü a, e, a
as in fast learn erect tunc God your fare
stanch firm remain jovial folly into there

These pages hav a missionary object.
Yur influence to extens circ^l is solicited

INDIVIDUAL WORK.—While considering what we can best do together, let none neglect what he can do by himself. Our work is not carrying elections, changing constitutions, making laws, but arousing tho't. Ev'ryone, irrespectiv of sex, age, abilitis or condition can do something—littl or much. A conversation, a suggestion, a question—giv a tract, loan a book, send a paper and even in one almost devoid of influence, strike a spark that, passing from mind to mind, may at last burst forth in wide illumination.—Look out for peopl with whom yu come in contact, or whom yu can reach, as by a letter, by a tract, or by any other way. Evry expression in favor of our doctriins has its weight. If it accomplish nothing els, it helps giv them respectability of numbers, and that is needed to compel atention of many minds closed to most obvius truth so long as they think its adherents few.—*N. Y. Standard.*

FILIP.—*Notes & Queries* asks "why the Spanish spel Philip *Felipe*?" We wud like to no why they hav '*Felipe*' insted of '*Fil*.' They use *f* for *ph* generally, a change bro't about with other changes by reform in Sp. orthog. 60 to 80 years ago. Portugal stil adheres to *ph* for *f*—Philippe—as stupidly as we. In Italian it is Filippo. Use of *ph* for *f* never prevaild in Italian. It began to gro in pre-Italian, or Latin, days but died out. About the first cent. pedantic Greeklings, not accepting Latin *r* as equivalent to Greek *f* (named *fi*) tho not of quite same shape, began to "sho off" by using *ph*, a way of representing this sound by the Greeks before they aded the new letter *fi* to their alfabet. That this had spred a littl in popular favor is probabl, as in some scribbling on walls of Pompeii that we hav seen, necessarily ritn in or before first cent., *ph* is found for *f*. Suthern Italy was calld Magna Grecia, as settld by Greek colonis. Tho found there it is not found in clasic Latin. Filip means lover (*filos*) of the hors (*hippos*) which explains *f*, singl *l*, and dubl *ph* of Italian. It is remarkabl how in Italian names, speld by them with *f* we insist ofn on the retrograde change to *ph*. Thus we spel their great painter as Raphael while on his tomb in the Pantheon at Rome and throuth Italian literature it is ever speld with *f*.

INTERNATIONALITY.—We hav several times herd it exprest how wel it wud be to hav a comon alfabet to denote European tungs, especially Ger., French, and Eng. Such a one wil allow comparison of sounds aproximately the same. The Paris *Teacher* has been for nearly 3 years giving sampls of Eng., Ger., Fr., Italian, Swedish and Danish, but with alfabet not entirely uniform. With 1889, this has been changed, the same alfabet being used, except for 3

nasalized vowels for which typografic forms (*faute de caracteres*) ar not yet redy. We consider it useful to compare pronunciation and thus reach Comparativ Orthoepy. With the alfabet itself, apart from this use, we ar not in love. Tho question it sets about solving is, *to revise and enlarge the Roman Alfabet* consistently, so far as may be, with curent use of lters by nations now using the unrevised alfabet. In its pages, then, the chief European tungs ar givn with accuracy absolutely fonetic, and not in 'trial corners' either but throuth its entire pages. It allows correspondents to use what pronunciation they prefer in each tung which makes its pages material for study by evry one having interest in (even one, as Eng., or more); modern languages. In English its orthoepy is too colloquial to our notion, yet givs fair average orthoepy for our tung with close *e* and *o* considered difthongs, (ei, ou). The best way to get it is to become a member of Fonetic Teachers' Association, of which hed-quarters ar at 6 Rue Labordere, Neuilli-sur-Seine, France. Ordinary members pay 2 francs a year and get a copy monthly free. Activ members pay 5 francs (\$1) and get 3 copis. Subscriptions may be sent to us.

CORRESPONDENCE.

GERMAN 'SHORT' I.

SIR,—At recent meeting of Mod. Lang. Asocia'n, Mr VanderSmissem's statement that 'short' i is pronounced alike in Ger. and Eng. was questiond. His position is upheld by Sievers [pronounce, Zefors] who, in his '*Grundzüge der Phonetik*' 3d ed., distinguishes open i of *Fisch*, 42 high-front-wide', from close i of *ihm, sie*, 41 high-front-narrow', tho not here speaking of quantity. Further, in the 'vocalabelle', p. 95, he givs as exampls of the same 'high-front-wide' both Eng. *bit, pity*, and Ger. *Fisch*. Tru, this is Bell's table: but Sievers wud not noingly propagate error.

Berlin, Ont.

J. W. CONNOR.

trial corner.]

ADOPTS FINAL FORMS.

SIR,—I take the opportunity to say that the *Herald* iz the best edited spelling reform journal that haz ever appeared in America. I should hav become a subscriber long ago, but..... I am ded opposed to new letters, and will not let *my* name go on subscription list of eni periodical advocating them. (My substitute iz diacritics, and these to be used in practice only in words which there iz danger of confounding.) At prezent, in private correspondence, I spel phonetically those words az to whose *final forms* there is no dispute.

New York.

F. A. FERNALD.

A BAD SPELL.—A clerk rote a chek for \$40 speling it "f-o-u-r-t-y." His employer directed his attention to his eror, remarking "yu seem to hav a bad *Spel* this morning." The clerk replied 'sure enuf, I've left out gh!'

ASAFETIDA.—In British Farmacopeia, this word is speld with dubl s and α , assafetida. In U. S. Farmacopeia it is 'asafetida.' The simpler appears the beter, becaus but one s is sounded. Again, as to α it shud be wel non that the best etymologists opose introduction of α and α into our language, they being alien imitations of Latin or Greek α and α ; for which we shud in general put e. Skeat's authority specially sanctions this.

A NOTATION WANTED.—We feel sadly the lak of some common system for marking sounds acuratly. Each fonetist or lexicographer—but the terms ar by no means synonymus—adopts his own system, or no-system, and the general reader must grope among diferent methods of characterizing the same sound, with the conviction at last that each method is objectionabl. If fonetists, or sp. reformers, wil remedy this deficiency, they wil help wonderfully.—GARNET in *Am. Jur. Philology*, vol ii, p.488.

"FELDSPAR" AND PREJUDICE.—In *Science* for 14th Dec. yu say "the form 'felspar,' " tho rong, has been so long employd that "no one who prefers it can be criticized "for using it." It shud be aded that all other nations' Gr. Britan and her colonis (alone excepted), also 99 per centum of all mineralogic literature spel it with d (or t, if the language requires it) and they do so becaus etymologically right; that the English drop the letter becaus the eror Gr. Britan has persisted in until it has become English; and that such national prejudice is not legitimat ground for scientific action even in Gr. Britan. Years since, the riter, thinking, like n many others, uniformity in scientific nomenclature very desirabl, sent a short paper, giving the British history of the word, to London *Philologic Mag.*, but national prejudice proved superior to all other considerations. In this cuntry prejudice has no right; and transplanting its effects shud not be alowd to pas without protest.—S. D. D. in *Science*, 4 Jan., '89.

"HIT HIM AGAIN."

The Chicago organ of Chancellor Tuley's 'Christian Anarchists' tries to ridicule Mr Lawler's proposition to reform the 'official' orthograpy of this cuntry a litl.—*Chicago Globe*.

The presumptuous critic is more absurd than the Congressman, whose proposition is perfectly legitimat. He proposes that Congress shal direct public printer to omit silent letters at end of certn words, and substitute *f* in place of *ph*, a direction Congress is perfectly competent to giv, and ther ar much beter reasons for giving it than any

that can be set up against. The folloing words sho the proposed reform:

ACTUAL.	PROPOSED.
Epilogue,	Epilog.
Hypocrite,	Hypocrit.
Coquette,	Coquet.
Programme,	Program.
Philosophy,	Filosofy

The educated reader wil observ that Mr Lawler's proposed order is litl more than a proposition to discontinue the abominabl practice of speling onest English words in foren fashn—not les bad taste than aping foren manners, or foren pronunciation of our own language.

Epilog, *hypocrit*, and *filosofy* come from Greek *epilogos*, *hupocrites*, and *filosofia*. The Greek words ar here givn with Latin letters nearest in sound to the Greek letters. It wil be seen that in naturalization (or Anglicization) of Greek words Greek speling has *not* been strictly follod. We hav changed the Greek *os* in *epilogos*, to *ue*; Greek *hu*, in *hupocrites*, to *hy*, and suprest final *s*; and Greek *f*, in *filosofia*, to *ph*, changing also final *ia* to *y*.

Why hav we made these changes? The Greek alfabet contains no such letter as *ph*, but a letter calld *fi* by the Greeks, whose fonetic value is exactly *f*. What is ther "in either rime or reason" to warant our substitution of two letters *ph* in place of Greek *f*, fonetically our *f*? The historic fact is, that we recivd the abominabl *ph*, in Greek words containing the sound *f*, from Latin; but why the Romans butsherd Greek orthograpy in that style no man noeth; ner can any giv a cogent reason why we shud go on forever practising Roman sin. Other nations, whose languages hav come holely or mostly from Latin, hav rejected that absurdity. In Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, the orthograpy is *filosofia*, exactly the Greek orthograpy. Why shud not we spel it *filosofy*, both beter English and nearer the original Greek?

Coquette and *programme* ar French, not English; yet ar completely naturalized in English, except that, by many (possibly most) riters, their foren clothes ar retaind. We ridicule the "heathn Chinees," who tho he may be Americian by birth, persists in wearing garments, and the pigtail of Celestial ancestry to the latest generation. Is persistence in alien speling of words that ar English by naturalization, more rational or les ridiculus, than that inveterat alienizism of the Asiatic pagan!

No, it is not. Ther is, consequently, a steadily increasing number of educated peopl who reject alien speling in program, epigram, coquet, filosofy, etc., and spel them as they o't to be speld.—*Chicago Tribune*.