

News5. [*underlined words and letters are presented as headings or in italics here.*]

Simplified Spelling Society. News. July 1984



CONTENTS PAGE

Section 1

The House Style of SR1 has been applied to this section

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mona Cross — Editor | 4. W. Reed | 7. Ayb Citron |
| 2. Jolly — Chairman | 5. Edward Starnett | 8. Robert Seysmith |
| 3. Stanley Gibbs — Secretary | 6. J.R. Brummell | 9. J.R. Brummel |
| | | 10. G. Rae |

Section 2

11. [L. Fennelly](#)

Section 3

Other Ideas

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 12. S.S. Eustace | 15. J. Beech | 18. R. Craig |
| 13. D. Stark | 16. C. Upward | 19. R. Elser |
| 14. V. Yule | 17. E. Gregersen | |

Section 4

Special Articles from China, Japan and India

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 20. Peh-ling Lee | 21. T.R. Hofmann | 22. M.N. Gogate |
| | | 23. Jacob Nettikkatt |

Section 5

Miscellaneous

- | | |
|---|---|
| 24. Recommended magazines | 25. First Roman Lipi Sammelan |
|---|---|

[Mona Cross: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#)]

SECTION ONE

The House Style of SRI has been applied to this Section

1. Letter from Mona Cross, Editor, Northampton. July, 1984.

Dear Members and interested people,

You will be as disappointed as I am that your articles and letters have not been dealt with from last December until now. In future we shall aim at a bulletin made in February and March, another in June and July, and a third in October and November. I shall need articles intended for those particular periods to reach me by February 1st, June 1st or October 1st respectively. Thank you for your support of the News Bulletin and for our work done through committee meetings. It has been a special reward to us to have visits from members at our meetings. Maybe we shall have the pleasure of seeing you there sometime, and of meeting you too at the Conference which is to be held on one weekend in the Summer of 1985.

I have designed the cover of this Bulletin to show you the countries from which we receive letters and articles. I have put words in the border to test your reaction to some of the spellings proposed for Stage I and later stages. So far two people have stalled on the same two words. Let me know if you do the same please. (Answer elsewhere in the bulletin).

The S.S.S. News Bulletin is a forum for those interested in spelling reform. Therefore it not only uses as the House Style those reforms accepted by the committee and based on the 1984 "Working Party Proposals", but informs you of other reforms, the chief of which are "cut spellings". If you are about to repeat those familiar words, "Why, they can't even agree among themselves," — pause before uttering them, then ask yourself, "In which group of people is there agreement? In the Church of England? In the Conservative Party?" It is in neither of those comparatively orthodox groups, yet each has a firm goal. So have we.

It seems to me that promoting methods of gaining publicity for our cause is harder than creating a spelling system, judging by the number of well considered ones created this century. John Ogden, Preston, Lancashire, a new member of our committee, has recently made special proposals. And I am delighted that he will be a coordinator with regard to the letters and articles published in newspapers. We need to "follow up" every article. If you send the article (not cut out, but preferably with the newspaper or part of it) to Mr. Ogden, he can then pass it on to one of a group of society members who will endeavour to write in the appropriate way according to the tenor of the newspaper. You will then have to forward the anticipated correspondence to him.

Do you recall that Valerie Yule tried to promote a "SPELLING SPOTTER'S DAY on SEPTEMBER 30th". She has first class material for this, including games and illustrations. Maybe your newspaper would enjoy taking up the idea. Valerie would gladly send you suitable material.

This is a long News Bulletin to make up for the missing February one. I hope I have published something representative of all your correspondence. If I haven't, then I'd be glad to note.

NOTE CORRESPONDENCE for *STANLEY GIBBS* our Secretary, needs to be *SENT* to *ME* so that I can forward it to wherever he is living in the next TWO MONTHS.

Yesterday I saw this in a Building Society window:
"XTRA SAVINGS. XTRA INTEREST. XTRA. XTRA. XTRA."
Their spelling is improving isn't it?

Yours sincerely, Mona Cross (Publicity Office).

(Answer: the tribe)

[Chris Jolly: see [Bulletins](#), [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#), [Media](#), [Books](#).]

2. From the Chairman, Chris Jolly.

Back in March this year we sent you the proposed 'Stage 1' reforms that had been drawn up by a Working Party — and invited your comments. As you will remember these are a modest set of five separate spelling reforms, ones that were felt to make sense for use in everyday work. Indeed we intend to use them as a 'house style' and you will see that they have been used in many items in this News Letter.

In summary the five reforms were:

SR1: Spell e sound in bet with a. eg: friend

SR:DUE: Drop Useless E's. eg: have, opposite

SR:ph: Reform ph spelling. eg: photo

SR:ough: Reform ough spelling. eg: caution

SR:ough : Reform ough spelling. eg: coffee

As I mentioned, we sought your views on these proposals — so what did you have to say about them? Well, broadly you felt they were good and the right way to go forward. However a number of you felt they do not go far enough.

Examples of the general comments received are these:

Frederick Schmitz-op der Beck: "Let me congratulate your committee on the excellent work done in a very stony garden. It makes respelling fun — even internationally."

George O'Halloran: "I *very* hesitantly approve."

Christopher Upward: "I am glad that moves are now afoot to introduce some specific reforms, and I think those that are planned are for the most part good ones."

Robert Craig: "I think they (the proposals) represent a truly positive step."

When it came to the specific new spellings proposed there were a number of points put forward. Christopher Upward gave us the benefit of his linguistic experience with a very thorough and detailed critique. In discussions with him we have been able to improve some of the reform examples given. Abe Citron has expressed some concern over the amended examples we have used in DUE (Drop Useless E's) but he acknowledges our views about the confusion in pronunciation that we seek to avoid.

To return to an earlier point, a number of you considered Stage 1 to be limited with more far-reaching reforms being needed. Examples of such views are:

Laurie Fennelly: "It (Stage 1) doesn't make enough difference in a letter to show."

Chris Upward: "Valuable though they are in their own right, they (the Stage 1 proposals) appear too limited and fragmented to have the impact which would gain widespread public support"

As a society we are a forum for discussion and will always be so. We will need to develop and extend our proposals beyond those for Stage 1. In the process we will probably move closer to New Spelling which is the best ideal available though impractical for a single stage implementation.

In the meantime we shall need to promote the Stage 1 reforms and give full encouragement to their use. I do hope you will be able to use them yourselves and give them your support.

[John Downing: see [Bulletins](#), [Anthology](#), [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#)]

3. PROFESSOR DOWNING'S VISIT ON 26th MAY, 1984

Dr. John Downing, speaking to a General Meeting of the Society, traced some of the history of English spelling by quoting from Professor Scragg's excellent book, "The History of English Spelling".

Dr. Downing warmly recommended this book to us and quoted several names of men who had attempted to influence the prevailing spelling of the distant past; in 1582 Mulcaster, the theorist and Coote, the schoolmaster, in 1596 wer singled out for special mention.

We wer shown how pronunciation has changed over the cors of nine-hundred years. Our present spellings frequently represent pronunciations which hav been ded for several hundred years.

Alas for the efforts of spelling reformers, by 1700 English spelling became almost stabilized. Dr. Johnson's dictionary publisht in 1755, sanctioned sum spellings and condemned others. Speaking generally, Dr. Johnson set his seal of approval on the alredy stablized — but unsatisfactory spellings of the 1700s.

Since the 1700s English spelling has remained fossilized whilst pronunciation has very noticeably changed.

Lack of space prevents me from presenting the full text of the lecture, but I offer several quotations in the hope that they may promote thaut and discussion.

"Psychology teaches that fysical (motor) skills ar no different from intellectual (cognitiv) skills, in the sens that there ar twenty factors to a skill."

"Eye-movements ar extremely important in reading."

"English spelling should be called complex rather than irregular." "To learn eny skill, you must do the whole operation from the beginning. Do not start by learning sub-skills in isolation."

"Learning to read is mor like a puzzle to be solved rather than a relationship between the printed and spoken word."

Stanley Gibbs.

[Stanley Gibbs: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#), [Leaflet](#)]

NOTICE

Letters to Mr. S. Gibbs our Secretary, should be sent to me for the next two months. I shall immediately forward them to his new address.

Extracts from two of the many letters received by Mr. Gibbs:

H.W. Herbert, Kenmore, Australia, Professor Hofmann, Toyana, Japan.

H.W. Herbert, Kenmore, Australia.

I agree with the four reforms, but might add as a fifth, these difficult, simpl words: one, once, right, ache, eight, women, foreign, build, tongue, thumb.

No (1) reform aut to be the ough and augh words. English speaking people themself's regard these spellings as ridiculous, and if we cannot succeed with the oughs and aughs we cannot succeed anywhere. So I suggest a first reform: aut, naut, thru, tho, thurru, tuf, trof, plou (or the American plow?), Kof or cof. Should we include laaf, kaut, slauter?
(Editor: I agree with Mr. Herbert).

Professor Hofmann, Toyana University, Japan.

Of the Big Four, the 2nd, "respell all the ough and augh words" will be sympathized with by all adult speakers of English. Much mor I am sure than the important 3rd, or the questionabl 1st.
(No. 3 hav, gon, liv, etc. No. 1 hed, sed, insted, etc. S. Gibbs).

4. W. REED

This is a photostat of part of S.S.S. [Pamphlet 10](#) by Mr. W. Reed, retired hedmaster, present committee member and former Secretary and Treasurer of the Simplified Spelling Society.

REFORM MUST PROCEED FROM INFORMED PUBLIC OPINION

Spelling reform concerns other bodies as well as the teaching profession. It concerns the universities, the press, and Parliament. What is believed in the universities, in newspaper offices and in Parliament *tomorrow*, depends on what is thought and taught in schools *today*. Teachers should, by our teaching and by our example, draw attention to the importance of the language problem, and to the possibilities of reform. Ruskin's words will remind us of our very great responsibility in this matter.

Knowing that children are entrusted to our care, we must see that they do not suffer by reason of any thoughtlessness or prejudice on our part.

5. Extract from Edward V. Starnett's articl in the last Spelling Progress Bulletin — [Winter 1983](#)

"Without public acceptance, any spelling reform is unlikely or impossibl"

One cannot realistically expect change of attitude to come overnight. To ignore this fact is to assure failure. Acceptance, then, is the key word in spelling reform, for without it even the most logical and erudite system ever proposed for English will be relegated to the trash heap.

In order to overcome public indifference or resistance and to gain acceptance, it will be important to proceed gradually and logically over a period of years. Whatever changes the public is asked to make should at first be rather simple or innocuous.

6. THE KWIK BROWN FOX The Case for Simplified Spelling

by J.R. Brummell

The article by Editor Reg Orlandini, on computers, suggests a great many exciting avenues for exploration. One fascinating avenue leads us to the inescapable conclusion that we must simplify our spelling.

We now have the box, which displays what we say, translating sound into vision. There is one big snag. The spelling. How can we teach the box to spell words like "thorough" and "rough" and all the other weirdies? We are forced to the conclusion that we must simplify the spelling of English. We must have consistency as regards the spelling of each sound.

And we need it for a great many reasons besides the needs of the box. We need it so as to make it easier for our children to read and write, and to reduce illiteracy. Above all, we need it for the sake of English as an international language.

More people use English than any other language. Now we need to create one language for one world in the hope of achieving international understanding.

We can see how important this is and how dangerous is the present position, when we remember that, not long ago, Nikita Sergeyeovich Khrushchev rose in the United Nations shouting his objections to words which had just been spoken, although the words did not mean what he thought they meant at all.

In many ways English is already a simple language. That is one reason why it has spread throughout the world. But any plan to reform the spelling would meet with a great deal of opposition. There are few subjects more likely to arouse passion among exponents of English than the idea that it should be altered or reformed in any way. To these people it is tantamount to saying that it should be desecrated. Some of us, at times, even use "correct" English as a means of superiority. How shocked we would have been if Eliza Doolittle had said "you woz" instead of what she did say. Yet it would have been very sensible, and she would have been adopting the same usage as Boswell.

But "correct" English is only frozen English, and what is more, frozen at about the worst possible point in its development. English is not a pure language. It is a mixture of many tongues.

When the Romans came they brought a new language in the shape of Latin. Then came the Angles, Saxons, Jutes and Danes, followed, in due course, by the Normans. By the time Chaucer was writing his *Canterbury Tales*, English was a rich mixture:

*"Ran cow and calf, and eek the verray hogges.
So were they fered for berkynge of the dogges."*

So Chaucer describes the uproar when the fox runs away with the cock Chauntecleere.

It will be seen that in six or seven hundred years, the words "verray", "hogge" and "dogge" have all lost a few letters. On the other hand the word "berkynge" has sustained a net loss of one letter, though the word "fered" has acquired one extra letter.

But English did not stay put in Chaucer's England. When the English speaking people began to settle in North America, English became the leading language there, receiving additions and enrichments from many languages, such as French, German, Spanish, Scandinavian languages and many more besides.

The development of the British Empire and Commonwealth spread English still wider, to Australia, Africa, India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya and Hong Kong. They have all added something. Everybody knows what "O.K." means, what "char" is and what is a boomerang.

There is, therefore, no such thing as pure English. English is not the language of a pedigree tribe. It is the language of many peoples, rather surprisingly called English. The student in Hong Kong or Uganda is not bowing to the language of a master race. He is simply playing his part in the creation of a worldwide tongue.

Unfortunately, the arrival of authorities, such as dictionaries and books of grammar, brought the process of evolution to a much slower pace. Whilst English was essentially a spoken language, it could go on evolving, free from academic restraint. Once it became official and used by learned persons, and when it became written down, it had to conform.

Writers had, at first, to decide the spelling for themselves. Nobody bothered about a few letters here and there. However, once written down, it became a precedent, and the more important the person, the more important the precedent,

The printing press froze English still further. By the time Caxton began to use his printing press and had printed the first book in English in 1477 there was a splendid riot of spelling, which the presses served only to perpetuate.

We have to thank people like Sir Walter Raleigh, not only for tobacco and the potato but also for some of our spelling. But the English are not a stuffy people. They are more interested in ideas than spelling. We cannot blame him too much. He had to do the best he could.

There were few to challenge him. In that heroic age of non-conformity, we can think of many who gave their lives at the stake for their theology, but none who would risk so much as a little finger in challenging official spelling.

But we must challenge it now. Quite simply we must defrost the language and get the process of evolution going again.

The kwik brown fox disguised as a word processor, is jumping over the lazy dog in the shape of a typewriter, and the computer industry may achieve in a few years what learned societies have failed to do over many decades.

In Britain the Simplified Spelling Society was founded in 1908. It has H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh as its patron. There is a vigorous society in California and another in Australia. They have produced many schemes and systems over the years, but have not been able to give one hundred per cent support to any one system.

The battle has always been between complete systems on the one hand and simple "evolutionary" changes on the other. There is the forty letter alphabet devised by George Bernard Shaw, for which he left most of his fortune. But others say we need fewer letters, not more. It is also argued that some, apparently inconsistent, groupings of letters should be left alone on the grounds that they are easily recognised and that they achieve what might be called molecular consistence,. Thus pal and "pale" are both O.K. — "ale" being taken as a molecule.

Time is running out. We must start and knock out the unwanted letters. We can all agree about that. We won't miss them. We are able to reach out into space and yet we speak a multitude of different language. It is time to begin. The kwik brown fox is jumping over the lazy dog.

[Ayb Citron: see [Bulletins](#), [Anthology](#), [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#)]

7. AYB F. CITRON

Ayb Citron of the group called *BEtSS (Better Education thru Simplified Spelling)* in the U.S.A. has recently written to the Committee with reference to the Stage1 recommendations. On the whole he agrees with us. If you would like a copy of his letter which gives details of his own committee's opinions, I can send you one.

Example:- "We recommend that ther be only *one* sound for the letter "e" (as in bet, fed, error) and 'her' be spelt 'hur', 'were' be spelt 'wur', etc.

8. SPELLING REFORM. TORONTO 1984

[I hav to thank Ken Tillema, an ardent and active reformer, for the following article by Robert Seysmith.]

Comment

The Committee ar bearing in mind what he says — that we "must follo what the general public is likely to accept."

But I myself disagree with the last paragraph, for as the Americans now read what we print, and we read what they print, in traditional orthography, so we can continue in a common simplified orthography. Dialect in Britain and in America need no more affect simplified spelling than it affects traditional orthography.]

The 'practical' approach is the wun to be strongly urged for all those pushing for spelling reform — RUSSELL, TILLEMA, COBER, SEYSMITH re use of *ENUF*. A sticker — ENOUGH is ENUF — wuld be good for a general spelling-reform slogan on all correspondence in which it may be 'practical' to use revised spellings.

It shuld be pointed out that 'spelling reform' is the term that may be better than 'simplified spelling' because, altho simplification is the first step, it is the grōss inconsistency in English spelling, rather than 'silent letters', that is the really serius problem, and which must be tackled if any real improvement is to be realized.

Agreed that spelling reform shuld not be a 'hobby' like the pursuit of som exotic language. It has to be regarded as somthing to be practiced as far as possible whenever possible. It shuld be added that any and all changes actually used must follo what the general public is likely to accept and which anywun can easily read without wondering if the revised spelling shows a different meaning from the usual spelling — a problem because of the outstanding use in English of homonyms with different spelling (meet, meat).

There ar quite a number of words — ruf, gaf, staf, gard, guarantee, caracter, dolfin, fonetic, bundel, hassel, alow, delite, definite, foren, luv, rime, rithm, sithe, strait, freit, hight, hauty, fraut, drout, rehearse, bolder, sholder, poltry, controler, wether, receipt, buraucracy, hemorrhage — which culd almōst certinly be practiced as of right now along with thru, tho, thoro and enuf. Mōst silent terminal E's, when not modifying the preceding vowel, culd safely be dropped, from 'som' to 'chocolat' to 'activ'.

Wun point tho, it seems to me, is that national boundaries form a problem. We really can think of changing English spelling ōnly within our ōwn cuntry — thus in effect pursuing a national dialect.

Robert Seysmith

9. EXTRACT FROM A LETTER BY: MR. J.R. BRUMMELL, Isle of Wight.

Support for the Committee's approved spelling changes and for the efforts to publicise.

"Thank you for your invitation to write, and congratulations on the quality of the News Letter.

On the question of the controversy between the method of change by means of individuals on the one hand and change by the adoption of a complete new system on the other, I would like to make the following observations. I think both methods are needed:

You ask: Does the use of spelling reform by individuals make converts. I think this depends very much on the circumstances. The time and place and so on.

When a Chicago newspaper was printed in reformed spelling, it was a flop. People were not ready for it. The position today is very different. As the world number one international language, English cries out for simplification of its spelling.

There is now great interest in spelling reform. Many more people are ready to accept it and opposition is much less than it used to be. The dropping of unwanted letters here and there is being accepted widely especially if it is done by educated persons. Incidentally it is not necessary to drop *all* the unwanted letters in a letter in order to have an effect. This may sometimes be better done by docking one or two words here and there.

I support the big four.

I also support the view that e as in ale can stay at the end in order to qualify the a and need not be put after the a. I call this kind of group of letters a molecule and consider that it is alright so long as we have molecular consistency.

But the pioneers need the backing of the S.S.S. The society could issue a leaflet from time to time, setting out the reformed spellings which they have accepted. This should, as far as possible, be a list of actual words rather than in the form of rules, and should deal firstly with the basic 500 words of the language.

In addition to all this I think the Committee should produce a booklet setting out the complete system which they recommend in case they are asked by some august body what they propose.

Our strategy should be to be ready with a considered scheme so that we can expound it and advocate it.

[Gilbert Rae: see [Journal 2](#) Item 9, [News 3](#) Item 6]

10. THE PENGUIN ENGLISH DICTIONARY 3rd EDITION

by Gilbert Rae

The Penguin English Dictionary 3rd Edition, which is the current edition continues to use a simplified spelling system for making pronunciation clear. Its Pronunciation Guide explains — "A system of phonetic spelling is used, which consists of letters and groups of letters, the pronunciation of which is already familiar to the reader." It is in fact a kind of synthetic simplified spelling. Mr W.B. Aitken M.A. devised and applied the system.

The 'regularization' method of simplifying spelling extolled by Axel Wijk is the basic method employed. It could be called 'standardization'.

Why is the Aitken system of phonetic spelling not used as the alternative English spelling for which we have been searching? The answer is that it lacks an important attribute for this purpose. The visual connection between it and the current spelling is often non-existent, e.g. 'l' represents l, AYE, and EYE. For pronunciation only, this does not matter. (It should be mentioned that this dictionary does not give derivations.)

Another difficulty is that even where there is a visual connection in spelling, homophones are still confusing, e.g. RIGHT WRIGHT RITE and WRITE, are all 'Rit'. (Capital R, means that it must be pronounced properly. Capital l, means that it must be pronounced as a long vowel.) However, pROninsi-ayshon in THIs skeem iz wiTHowt konfowzhon,

Mr W.S. Aitken has produced a practical and ingenious pronunciation system, using only the letters of the English alphabet. It is very useful to English people; and fascinating to those who are interested in simplified spelling, as it reveals phonetic details perhaps not previously appreciated. The dictionary has other virtues explained in the opening pages.

Editors Note:

I had hoped that the dictionary would help us. But no child could be expected to rite clearly with capitals in different parts of a word.

[Laurie Fennelly: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#), [Pamphlet 12](#), [Leaflet](#)]

SECTION TWO

A REPORT by LAURIE FENNELLY, HON. TREASURER AND MEMBER OF THE "WORKING PARTY" on REFORMS, 1983 – 1984.

11. The Revision of NEW SPELLING

At the Annual General Meeting the following important resolution was passed by the majority of the members present.

"Proposed that the Society should carry out a review of NEW SPELLING in order to prepare a revised version, which will include, in addition, a programme for its introduction by stages."

The Committee will be setting up a sub-committee to co-ordinate this work, but of course, this is emphatically a task in which every member of the Society can help, and we hope as many members as possible will send in their views on the two aspects of the problem — the actual nature of the changes to be introduced, and the method by which they are to be introduced — Letters to the Secretary.

NEW SPELLING is a book which has been rather neglected by spelling reformers in recent years. Some of it may have dated, but nowhere else is there to be found such a systematic study of a complete system of reform, supported by the necessary statistical analysis of present spellings.

Laurie Fennelly.

Note by the Editor:

I feel that I should mention some of the outstanding workers of the past forty years, e.g. the work by Professor Axel Wijk which would be described as a 'complete system of reform', I am sure. His analysis of problems and changes required was most scholarly. Also Dr. Walter Gassner of Australia constantly worked on the details of his "Consistent Spelling". Vic Paulsen's detailed schemes for children's learning was very carefully worked out too. I do not know whether he added a statistical analysis of present spelling. AS WE HAVE NO LIBRARY or COLLECTION of the SOCIETY'S BOOKS it is impossible for people to learn of the work of other reformers. THAT IS A BAD SITUATION. CAN YOU HELP AMEND IT?

M. Cross.

A Quotation from the [Teachers' Manual](#) (ref. children's books in New Spelling) written by Maurice Harrison, M.A. M.Ed. B.Sc. Econ.

You may note that such a report could well have been about i.t.a. Initial Teaching Alphabet.

So the value of both have been proved. But our propaganda has been too weak for such proofs to help our cause.

M. Cross.

It was proved that a later transition to normal spelling was simple, and that children first taught by the simplified method had advantages in reading the normal spelling over others who had seen nothing other than normal spelling. From a school where a group of children was split, one part receiving their first lessons from a simplified reader, the other from an ordinary reader, came the following report:

"The Simplified Spelling pupils, taken at random from a group of new pupils, after ten months' instruction in Simplified Spelling and four months in the conventional spelling, could read the latter as well and spell as well as the pupils who had worked at it exclusively for nineteen months. The balance of advantage was altogether on the side of the children who had been taught on the new lines. They had had a better training in the relations of sound and symbol; they had acquired a better and more natural utterance and expression, and had laid a more solid foundation for the subsequent cultivation of good, clear speech."

His Majesty's Inspector reported of one school:

"The children (i.e. those taught by Simplified Spelling) at the end of the year are much better readers than they used to be under the old system."

At another school: "In six months, not only were twenty-two out of the twenty-five children reading fluently, but they had approached a clearness of speech and a fluency and originality of expression hitherto unapproached."

At another: "At the end of six weeks they were two or three months ahead of what they would be under normal spelling."

The catalogue could be prolonged, but for sixpence the complete story of the experiment can be read in S.S.S. [Pamphlet No. 7](#)

The clue to it all seems to lie in this report from one head teacher:

"The children soon discover their own power of building new words . . . they delight in exercising this power, because they are never disappointed by being wrong, and they are never afraid to attempt to pronounce an unfamiliar word for the same reason."

A *Sample of "Nue Spelling"* from S.S.S. [Pamphlet 5](#) called "A Breef History of Inglish Spelling."

The Committee and members present at the 1984 A.G.M. agreed to make Nue Speling the basis of their final form of Nue Speling. Nevertheless a new working party has been formed to see how Nue Speling relates to the recent "Working Party Report". This is intended as a preliminary to the re-publishing of Nue Speling. Editor.

Dhe chaenjez which dhe pronunsaeshon had undergon wer remarkabl, az wil be kleeer to eni wun huu haz hurd a pasej from Shakespeare red widh dhe Elizabeethan pronunsaeshon, a taask ov which eny Inglish skolar shood be kaepabl. [1] Dhe speling had soe long seest to represent dhe soundz dhat its orijinal funkshon woz kwiet obskuerd. Indeed, Dr. Johnson had niedher dhe nolej ov dhe history ov dhe langgwej nor dhe fonetik traening rekwizit in a reformer ov dhe speling. He woz kontent to taek dhe speling az it woz, meerly maeking a chois (and not aulwaez a wiez wun) whaer a wurd woz spelt in diferent waez.

Sins hiz dae dhaer haz been litl chaenj in due printed form ov wurdz. We noe longger spel **musick**, **cloathes**, or **tyger**, az he did; but in dhe maen we spel az Dr. Johnson spelt. Dhe pronunsaeshon, houeever, haz continued to chaenj, bikuming mor remoet from dhe speling in sum kaesez; in udherz, tending to be influenst bie it. We noe longger pronouns **oblige** widh dhe **i** ov **machine**; we hav lurnt to pronouns dhe **I** ov **fault**, and sum eeven giv to dhe furst vouel ov **English** dhe sound ov **e** in **end**.

We spel our wurdz midh leterz and diegraafs dhat survd to represent raadher rufly, dhe pronunsaeshon dhae had in Elizabeethan tiemz; leterz and diegraafs maenly due to Angloe-French rieterz huu stroev to rekord dhe soundz aafter dhe French maner. Dhe speling iz renderd wurs bie dhe misgieded eforts ov dhe siksteenth sentuery pedants huu wisht to displae dhaer nolej ov Latin. Dhe printerz braut about a surten ueniformity, on which Dr. Johnson baest hiz dikshonary. Dhis, to aul intents and purposez, iz stil our standard ov korekt speling.

SECTION THREE

Other Ideas

12. SYSTEM 2

Extract from a letter by: S.S. Eustace of London. He was a former officer of the society.

Forward

The Working Party, which is made up of three Committee Members, used New Spelling not System 2 as a basis upon which it built. The faults of Nue Speling are being rectified, thereby giving a blessing to both chosen systems.

"I hav ə cəlechən əv scorz əv speling rəformz from 1540 including meny SSS pamflits ən pæpərz. Sistəm 2 iz iuneeek in having wun ekstrə letər ən wun oenly, ən beeing thərfor tiypabəl widh ə standərd sheen miniməly ədaptid. It iz iuneeek in 20 or 30 udhər wayz əz wel. It wəz ivolvd tə cərect thə faults əv Niu Speling, haz meny əv its feetjərz ən canot be sed too o en thing elsə əksept coeinsidentəly too eny əv the udhər sistəmz.

[David Stark: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#)]

13. CUMBERNAULD.

25th May, 1984

The Editor,
Language Monthly,
Nottingham.

Dear Sir,

In the past, spelling reformers have justified their curious new orthographies by stating that because English was so inconsistent alphabetically, drastic alterations were essential. The George Bernard Shaw reform even proposed an entirely new, more efficient alphabet. These types of reforms offered such wholesale change from traditional orthography that they were unpalatable to people already literate in English.

Today we understand more about the psychology of reading and writing and the part which phonographic correspondence plays in the coding and decoding processes. In English, alphabetic (single letters or digraphs), syllabic (groupings of letters) and morphographic (whole words or sections of words as units of meaning) elements are all important in reading, and we are in the habit of processing whole words and even sections of sentences at a time.

If we were forced to break words down into individual graphemes, translate these where necessary into revised alternatives and then build the words back up into meaningful units, reading would be reduced from about 300 words per minute to around 60, at which speed the text would become incomprehensible.

However, wholesale interruption of traditional orthography is not necessary to make reading and writing easier to learn. Phonics merely provides one clue to the understanding of text, and there is no need to stick rigidly to it and to accurately represent all the phonic elements in speech. For example, there is no need to graphically differentiate the two th sounds (thin, then) or the two a sounds (spa, cat). Pairs of sounds like these are close enough for English not to have allowed pairs of words to be distinguished purely by them, thus avoiding semantic confusion.

Likewise, in traditional orthography, long and short vowels tend only to be positively distinguished in short words, by using vowels to lengthen preceding vowels or double consonants to shorten them. Thus "item" has a long first vowel where "sitting" has a short one, but it doesn't matter if the first vowel in the word "itinerant" is long or short, as there are enough other visual clues (in text) or verbal clues (in speech) to gain access to the meaning of the word. The conclusion therefore is that accurate representation of all the phonemes in English is unnecessary, and would probably involve new graphemes or grapheme digraphs to be invented to cope with the large number of phonemes in English.

The simplification of phonemes as represented in text would be of benefit to foreigners learning English (some languages have as few as 15 phonemes and Esperanto has only 5 vowels), not to mention dialect speakers of English with less phonemes in their speech than Received Pronunciation. This "looseness" in the relationship between graphemes and phonemes would also help to alleviate the fears of those who would not be happy to accept Received Pronunciation as standard. You can still say "tomato" (long a) and I can still say "tomato" (short a) without the need to alter the spelling.

What this approach is suggesting is regularising the rules and patterns in the present orthography rather than achieving one to one phoneme/grapheme correspondence. The present requirement to learn the spelling of thousands of words individually would be replaced by spelling rules which would be acquired during the period of language learning when one is grappling with word usage and semantics.

However, even a regularised orthography would result in a fairly high level of disturbance to traditional orthography, and a system of stage reforms would be necessary. This has been successful in other languages. When the Simplified Spelling Society in Britain was asked to submit evidence to the Bullock Commission, the intransigence to any form of partial reform was a major factor in only passing mention being made of proposals for revised orthographies (apart from the initial teaching alphabet) in the Bullock Report.

Omitting "unnecessary" letters would appear to be a good first stage, which would help to highlight present spelling patterns and irregularities, offer economics in text and start the process of making reading and writing easier. However, while these aims may be admirable, they still require general support. But perhaps this is at hand. Every time a teacher fails to correct a pupil's spelling mistake, preferring to concentrate on the content of his composition rather than orthographic convention, the spelling straightjacket is loosened another notch.

Yours faithfully,

David Stark

Captain Imran Khan made an inspired return to the helm with an innings of 83 that took Pakistan to a formidable first innings total of 470.

Australia were on the rack, losing openers Kepler Wessels and Wayne Phillips for 88 before close on the second day of the fourth Test in Melbourne.

Imran missed the first three Tests because of a stress fracture in his left shin. He shared a vital eighth wicket partnership with spinner Abdul Gadhiri whose 45 was his highest Test score.

The Society's Stage 1 word (N.Sp.)
alter in the above the words
before — befor
score — scor

Captin Imran Khan made an inspired return to th helm with an innings of 83 that took Pakistan to a formidable first innings total of 470.

Australia wer on th rak, losing openers Kepler Wessels and Wayne Phillips for 88 before close on th second day of th fourth Test in Melbourne.
LINE SAVED

Imran missed th first three Tests becos of a stres fracture in his left shin. He shared a vital eighth wicket partnership with spinner Abdul Gadhiri whose 45 was his hiest Test score.
LINE SAVED

Example of D. Stark's reform

[Valerie Yule: see [Bulletins](#), [Anthology](#), [Quarterly](#), [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#), [Personal Views](#) 10 & 16, [Media](#), [Books](#).]

FROM VALERIE YULE OF ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY AND ORGANISER
OF THE S.S.S. 1979 CONFERENCE. June 1984.

**14. THE ADVANTAGES OF DROPPING SURPLUS LETTERS
AS A FIRST STAGE SPELLING REFORM**

1. It can be the first stage for *any other spelling* reform using the roman alphabet. All of them will involve dropping surplus letters.
2. Omissions cause fewer problems with readers than changing letters.
3. It can fit in well as alternative spellings with present spelling.
4. It can help many readers to read faster and more accurately.
5. It prevents waste.
6. It can help poor spellers — "When in doubt, leave it out."

The slogan is easier to remember than lists of words — although changes in particular dreadful spellings can still be promoted at the same time, if it is SSS policy.

Types of surplus spellings add up to 5% of what you read.

e is the most common extra letter, as in the remembered / showed / seemed / examined / covered

final e when misleading as in private / nerve / delicate / minute / appropriate / give / have / were / are / more following unnecessary double letters as in apple/ bubble/ pebble/little.

Unnecessary double letters that do not show short vowel sounds or stress in a word, as in really / immediate / awfully / usually / specially.

These often cause spelling problems! Solve them, as in recommend / commitment / well / spill / shall.

Misleading vowel pairs as in friend / pearl / heart / touch / glorious.

Misleading consonants as in taught / chasm / fascinate / snow / straight / should / daughter / through/ though.

Surplus spelling that cannot be cut yet — when the rest of the word is too badly spelt to stand alone — eg. laughter / once / psychology / beautiful / fatigue.

THE ADVANTAGE OF A SPELLING THAT CONSIDERS THE MEANING OF WORDS, AS
A *SECOND-STAGE REFORM* rather than a pure 'spelling as you speak'

1. It will be faster to read (I think experiments will prove this).
2. It will be closer to present spelling, as much of it will be just a 'cleaning up'.

3. It will be more suited to children's linguistic abilities — as shown for example, in how they learn to speak, and their 'natural spelling' when they first write. Pure phonemic spelling can be difficult for young children.
4. It will be more valuable to learners, children and foreigners, because it can help them to extend their vocabulary through reading, since it is easier to see the meaning and grammar of words, and word relationships.
5. It will not be as clumsy as a pure phonemic spelling, since it is more streamlined.
6. Problems of homographs, dialects, etc. are more easily avoided.
7. Closer to international spelling — a linguistic advantage for 'us' and 'them' too. What is the biggest hang-up for 'traditional' 'spell-as-you-speak' reformers?

I think probably the concept that silent e can be used to show a preceding long vowel and its absence shows a short vowel — because they have not thought about the teaching of vowel digraphs v. the J.H. Martin approach for children, nor about how a spelling should take account of the special features of a language and try to match them — e.g. in English it is quite common for the same word-stem to appear with both 'long' and 'short' vowel pronunciation,

e.g. fli / flies / flite or other vowel-sound variation, speke / speche / spoke, prosede / prosession, repete / repetision (or repetission, to sho acsent) divide / dividend, apele / apellant, resume / resumpsion, reduse / reducsion.

Valerie Yule

Present spelling

1. ON THE SPACE SHIP

Ted Long looked at the video dials and tried to get a picture. It was lousy. He turned the dials clock-wise and then counter-clock-wise.

Mario Rio knew it would stay bad. They were too far from Earth and were facing the Sun. But Long did not know that — it was his first trip on the space ship. Long said, "I think I'll see if I can get Hilder of Earth on the screen." "It's a power waste," said Rio. "We can't afford it." Their eyes met. Rio had the long body and gaunt, cheek-sunken face of a real Martian Scavenger; he was one of those Spacers who haunted the Space routes between Earth and Mars. Pale blue eyes

Cut spelling

A Stage 1?

1. ON TH SPACE SHIP

Ted Long lookd at th video dials and tried to get a picture. It was lousy. He turnd th dials klok-wise and then counter-clok-wise.

Mario Rio knew it woud stay bad. They wer too far from Erth and wer fasing th Sun. But Long did not noe that — it was his first trip on th space ship. Long said, "I think I'll see if I can get Hilder of Erth on th screen." "It's a power waste," said Rio. "We can't aford it." Their eyes met. Rio had th long body and gaunt, cheek-sunken fase of a real Martian Scavenger; he was one of those Spacers who haunted th Space rutes between Erth and Mars. Pale blu eyes

Morfo-fonemic Rule-based spelling. A stage 2?

1. ON TH SPASE SHIP

Ted Long lookd at th vidio dials and tried to get a picture. It was lousy. He turnd th dials klok-wise and then countir-clok-wise.

Mario Rio nue it woud stay bad. Thay wer too far from Erth and wer fasing th Sun. But Long did not noe that — it was his first trip on th spase ship. Long sed, "I think I'll see if I can get Hilder of Erth on th screen." "It's a powir waste," sed Rio. "We can't aford it." Thair iyes met. Rio had th long body and gaunt, cheek-sunkin fase of a real Marsian Scavinjor; he was 1 of those Spasers who hauntid th Spase rutes between Erth and Mars. Pale blu eyes

[John Beech: see [Bulletins](#), [Quarterly](#), [Journal](#), [Newsletter](#)]

15. Part of a letter written by John Beech to the Editor on June 15th 1984.

Psychology Department,
New University of Ulster,
COLERANE.

In 1983 I described an experiment on university students in which I gave them concentrated practice in learning "Regular Spelling". This is a spelling system I devised which, if adopted, would change an average 3 words in every ten of traditionally spelt English. A central criterion in this system is the adoption of the most frequent spelling rule for a particular word position. Of course, students were slow at reading the text to begin with. Eventually however, after reading about 6000 words of a novel, on average, they were reading at their normal rate when reading text in traditional spelling. I even found that the typist, typing up the materials, reverted to her normal typing speed when typing in Regular Spelling! By contrast, when trying to read in the World English Spelling System, which is a phonetically based spelling system, students were still reading at about half their normal rate after 6000 words. The typist was slower at typing the text in WES as well.

More recently, I have a paper coming out in the Spelling Progress Quarterly, describing how students get on learning to write in Regular Spelling. The experiment was broken into 6 trials in which students wrote out 50-word passages of normal text into Regular Spelling. On the first trial, subjects were over twice as slow as their normal writing speed, but they improved to 176% of writing speed by the sixth trial. Spelling accuracy was about 80% of normal. The results indicated that *writing* in Regular Spelling is going to take longer to learn. I have also shown (Beech and Black, 1984) that poor spellers take longer to learn new spellings.

My conclusions were as follows:

". . . there is a triumvirate of major criteria that have to be satisfied by any spelling system that takes the place of normal spelling. These are in order of importance:

- (a) That it makes learning to read for children, substantially easier.
- (b) That adults can adapt to read in it within a fairly short period of time.
- (c) That adults can learn to write in the system.

The present paper has addressed criterion (c). It has been shown that writing in Regular Spelling will take a period of adjustment which will be at least longer than one- three- or four-hour intensive sessions. It has already been shown that as far as criterion (b) is concerned, it takes a fairly short period to adapt to reading in Regular Spelling. The major criterion (a), that is, that children find it substantially easier to read in, has yet to be tested. Intuitively, they should learn to read faster in the medium."

I end my paper by inviting any teacher who is interested to do an experiment on (a) with me, to get in contact. For instance, if someone is using the "Breakthrough" scheme, this could be adapted to Regular Spelling.

Best wishes, John Beech.

References:

- Beech, J.R. (1980) Some proposed principles for simplifying English orthography. [Spelling Progress Bulletin, 20](#), Item 5.
- Beech, J.R. (1983) The effects of spelling change on the adult reader. *Spelling Progress Bulletin*, 13, 1 1 -1 B. Also in: *Resource in Education*, Apr. '82
- Beech, J.R. (in press) Experiments on spelling reform: the writing problem. *Spelling Progress Quarterly*.
- Beech, J.R. and Black, C. (1984) Cognitive and personality factors in the spelling of adults. [Spelling Progress Quarterly, 1](#), Item 3.

From the Editor:

I hope a teacher will accept the invitation expressed in the last paragraph. M. C.

[Chris Upward: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#), [Pamphlet](#), [Leaflets](#), [Media](#), [Book and Papers](#).]

16. Th Shortr th Sweetr?

by Christopher Upward

Department of Modern Languages, University of Aston in Birmingham

This description of a spelling reform by radical omission of redundant letters also illustrates the system by using it. It should be judged not merely by its logic and consistency, but by how easy it is to read. You are therefore urged to try and read fluently, and not let yourself be distracted by unfamiliar spellings.

1. Reform by omisn

Valerie Yules experimnts (New Scientist 9.12.82) shoing how her shortnd spelings ment fastr reading made me wondr just how radicl a shortning of English speling is posbl. For if she can rase reading-eficncy so much by a 5% cut in traditnl orthografy (t.o.), maybe a larger reductn wud rase it even mor. Furthrmor, if u use fewr letrs, u obviusly save time, space and materils wen riting. So I experimentd with maximm omisns, and hav tentativly arived at th systm u se here. Th ful words in this paragraf contain 471 letrs, whereas t.o. wud use 540, or 14.65% mor.

2. Acceptbilty of reform by omisn

Valerie Yules basic rule, wich is to omit redundnt letrs, has gret practicl advantages over many othr speling-reform scemes. It is very simpl to aply, unlike systmatic fonetic reforms (one only has to ask oneself wen riting "wich letrs ar not soundd?"); and by keeping th familir, fonetic skeletn of letrs in each word, it minimises th brek between old and new, and shud ensure that peple educated in t.o. cud use th new systm with litl instructn, wile those educated in th new systm cud stil read t.o. And abov al: it largely includes th Simplifyd Speling Societys curnt proposals.

3. An overall concept

If reform is to be not just a foneticns hoby, but a serius atemt to improve a basic tool of daily life, then as wel as letr-by-letr analysis of words, clear overall objectivs ar needd, such as: to make th systm as esy as posbl to lern, to read and to rite; to make script as economicl as is convenint; and to base th systm on a few simpl rules to gide th lernr and asist th user. This systm of radicl omisns is based on such rules.

4. Sound and script

One principl must concern th relatnship between sound and script. Peple ofn asume that becaus letrs represent sounds, speling must represent pronuniatn as closely as posibl. But varius reform-proposals based on this idea faild becaus they changed th speling of most words, and becaus our Roman alfabet is too crude for exact fonetic representatn. We shudnt think of script as a sound-recording systm, but as a medium for representing words so that they can be recognised ('red'). Its method is that of aproximat sound-letr corespondnce, wich is in fact qite cumbrsm, so that we ofn resort to numerls, symbls and abreviatns, '1984', '%' and 'USA' being handir than their ful alfabetic countrparts. Th snag with such devices is that, like Chinese caractrs, they hav to be lernt individuly, whereas alfabetic letrs constitute a smal, qikly lernt systm, wich sugests th sounds of words, hos spelng neednt individuly memrised. Th best alfabetic riting-systm wil be clear and economicl; t.o. is neithr, being befogd with inconsistncis and extravagnt with letrs. A thoroging reform by omisn removes many inconsistncis and is by definitn mor economicl. In such a sceme, letrs wil as a rule represent sounds, but that dosnt mean that evry slihtst sound must be representd by a letr.

5. Exeptions to th rule?

Shud there be exeptions to th omisn of al foneticly redundnt letrs? With a few comn words there is a danger of confusn from homografs, especly wen they ar difrntly pronounced (heterofones). One miht therefor prefer to keep 'two' and 'too' (tho not necesrly 'toe' and 'tow') distinct from 'to'; 'one' distinct from 'on' (Russell Hoban in his novl "Riddley Walker" rites even non-numericl 'one' as '1', thus 'any1', 'evry1'); 'four' distinct from 'for'; and 'off' distinct from 'of' (th speling "ov" wud involv a changed letr, not omisn, and therefor dosnt com within this systm). With les comn words, especly difrnt parts of speech, th advantage of concise, fonetic speling may outwei th danger of confusn. Admitdly one can invent ambiguus sentnces ("th heroin finishd th heroin"), but in th unlikely event of them arising in real life, th context wud clarify th meaning. One miht also argu that new homografs shud be alowd, provided they ar not heterofones, since, if we dont confuse them wen we hear them, we shant do so wen we read them. But heterofones shud be speld difrntly, and indeed by omiting letrs one can distinguish.pairs like liv/live, presnt/present, bo/bow.

6. Silent letrs

So, wat kinds of omisn ar feasbl? Th most obvius is th one that evry speling-reformr sezes on: silent letrs. This category is centrl to Valerie Yules systm, as wel as to th Big Four proposals (th substitutn of F for PH and GH gos furthr than simpl omisn, but is desirabl becaus it also shortns speling). Th foloing exampls ilustrate patrn of omisn for silent use of 18 letrs:

A bred, ern, beuty, brethe; B det, thum; C asend, sythe, adolesnt, disern; D Wensday; E ar, hav, hart, articl, theatr, edg, definit, imaculat, twelv, bor, imagin, infinitiv; F hapeny; G flem, nome, foren, campain; H onest, rym, exhaust, sheprd, Birmingham, scool, wich, gost; I seze, hefr, frend; K nife; L cud, samn; N condem; O colnel, leprd, peple; P pseudo, syco-, receit, atemt, cubrd; S iland; T fech, wisl; U qite, bild; W rona, ansr.

7. No dubld consonnts

A secnd large category of omisns is based on an eqaly simpl principl: consonnts ar nevr dubld (exept posbly 'off'). I here giv th simplifyd form of som comn patrn of consonnts dubld in t.o. (16 consonnts):

BB eb rubr abreviate; CC/CK dok, pikl, aclaim (but 'accept'); DD od padl adict; FF snif bail aford; GG eg dagr agravate; (JJ=)DJ ajust ajectiv; LL bel folo milr aleviate; MM hamr imediat; NN in winr anul; PP hapn apl aply; (QQ=)CQ aqit aqire; RR er wory iradiate; SS fus tasl asembl; TT butr atemt; (XX=)XC exept; ZZ buz, puzl.

There ar thre main reasns for nevr dubling consonnts

1. T.o. is so inconsistnt in its use of singl and dubl consonnts that speling mistakes inevitbly abound ('acomodatn' must be spelt rong mor ofn than riht in t.o.).

2. English fonology suggests a major ratnlisatn of speling on this point: at least 2/3 of th vowl-sounds in a typicl pece of English ar short, so simpl economy suggests th rule that al vowl-letrs be presumed to represent a short sound, unles othrwis indicated. T.o. ofn dubls consonnts to indicate a short preceding vowl ('catty', 'jetty', 'bitty', 'knotty', 'nutty'): these ar then al simplifid to conform with th existing t.o. form 'pity'. Th resulting gains in regularity and brevity gretly outwei th consequent los of certn distinctns, such as between voiced S and unvoiced SS (tho t.o. aplis this distinctn so eraticly, as in words like 'a house', 'houses', 'to house', 'horses', 'advise', 'practise' and 'possess', that one may positivly welcom bringing S into line with TH, wich dosnt distinguish voiced and unvoiced pronunciatns — compare 'thy' and 'thigh'). But one wud hav to rite "hopeing" to distinguish it from th -ing form of "to hop".

3. The third reason for banning doubled consonants is that it opens the way for an attack on one of the greatest problems of t.o., the representation of shwa, that indeterminate vowel-sound which is so very common in English but lacks a letter to represent it consistently in writing.

8. Shwa

Most English speakers pronounce the final syllable in the following groups of words with an identical shwa vowel:

1. burglar lecturer error neighbour martyr centre lecture
2. consonant different
3. radical article novel fossil petrol useful
4. curtain hidden raisin common caution
5. madam system fathom maximum opossum spasm.

The fact that no two words from each group use the same vowel-letter to represent the shwa shows why the sound is so prone to misspelling. But the last example, spasm, suggests a solution: it makes no attempt to spell the shwa — yet there is no danger of mispronunciation. If we apply this pattern to the other words above and omit the vowel-letter from the last syllable, at a stroke we substitute regularity for disorder. The asterisked words show why the ban on doubled consonants was a prerequisite for this category of omission.

1. burglar lectr* err* neighbour martr centr lectr
2. consonnt* diffrnt
3. radicl articl novl fosl petrol usefl
4. curtn hidn raisn comn cautn
5. madm systm fathm maxim* oposm spasm

9. Suffixes and inflections

In all these words, the shwa occurs in a trailing syllable after the main stress. Such trailing syllables not merely receive least emphasis in speech, but also attract less attention in reading than do the beginnings of words. Many words end in a common suffix, or in a standard inflection to a verb, noun, or adjective, and such endings can often be reduced to a formula whose primary purpose is brevity and regularity rather than comprehensive representation of sound. The suffixes -ABLE and -IBLE can be homogenised to -BL, and -ANCE and -ENCE to -NCE; verbs can form their past tenses with -D, not -ED, and their third person singular present with -S, not -ES, as can nouns their plurals; and the comparative and superlative inflections of adjectives can be -R and -ST. Again, the non-doubling of consonants is a prerequisite for these forms, so that 'add' is unambiguously the past tense of 'to ad', 'hiss' the third person present of 'to his', 'mass' the plural of 'mas', and 'loosst' the superlative of 'loos'. One can argue about the phonetic status of the shwa, but the gain in regularity and brevity compensates for some loss of fine phonetic detail.

10. Conclusion

In addition to the main, interlinked patterns of omission described above, readers will have noticed others in the course of this article which there has not been space to discuss. I have not tried to give an exhaustive account of either the detailed operation or the wider implications of the system, but to outline its basic principles and illustrate how it could work. I hope readers will feel that, even if its appearance was new to them, it was much less difficult to read than a strictly phonetic approach — and that it has other major actual or potential advantages too. Above all, anyone can try it out without detailed knowledge of orthographic theory or phonetics. From my own experience I can say it is well worth the little effort it takes to learn for the savings made in time and space (and hence, in principle money). So let me close with a slogan:

TRY IT OUT (I do) — U HAV NOTHING TO LOSE BUT REDUNDANT LETTERS. CU 29.5.84

[Edgar Gregersen: see [Journals](#), [News5](#)]

17. SIMPLIFIED' IS NOT ALWAYS SIMPLER

Edgar A. Gregersen
New York
U.S.A.

'Reformers who assign [the first sound in *thy*, as opposed to the first sound in *thigh*] a special spelling ought not to be in a simplified but in a complicated spelling society.'

So writes Richard Lung in a recent SSS newsletter (1983 p.11). His logic probably echoes that of the members of the society who decided in 1971 to abandon the established SSS distinction between *th* and *dh*, and to write both as *th*.

Since θ and δ are not used to distinguish many words (technically they have a low 'functional load'), and since traditional English spelling does not regularly distinguish the two sounds, there is something to be said for the decision.

But not much.

It is true that no special form normally occurs for δ in the traditional spellings but it is not always spelt *th*. Sometimes *dh* actually occurs. The name of the letter δ used in older English and in modern phonetics is written *edh*. In foreign words from modern Greek and Arabic, *dh* is regularly used to indicate δ (eg *dhimotikí*; *dhal*, *Dhu'l-Hijja*) and has officially been adopted in place names by the Royal Geographical Society (Ródhos, Levádhia; Riyadh, Dhahrah, Hadhramawt). In words from Welsh, it is written *dd*, eg *eisteddfod*. All these forms are admittedly few in number but they exist. (Interestingly, *dh* with the value δ occurs in the official orthographies of Albanian and Swahili.) English-speaking people are in many instances familiar with this use of *dh* from the pronunciation guide used by Fowler in *Modern English usage* and various dictionaries published by Oxford University Press.

What is more important is that for ordinary English, whenever two words differ only with regard to θ/δ , they are virtually always spelt differently in some other way, thus *thy* — *thigh*, *sheath* — *sheathe*, *wreath* — *wreathe* and *either* — *ether* (for those who pronounce the *ei-* and *e-* alike). I know of only 2 exceptions: *mouth* (noun with θ , verb δ) and *south* (same pattern), where the verb forms — with δ — are rare.

Once the other peculiarities of spelling are given up, all these words would be written alike. This is certainly in violation of all recognized goals in rational spelling. There are no reputable linguists who do not list θ and δ as separate and fundamental items in the English sound system — including Chomsky and Halle in their *Sound pattern of English* (p.223).

Recently, Valerie Yule has said ([Newsletter July '83](#)) that 'introducing written distinctions between the two *th* sounds is unnecessary except for foreigners learning English without oral lessons...' (Item 10).

But if the distinction is not observed in writing, the SSS can no longer claim — as it does in the introduction to one of its publications (*A specimen of new spelling*) — that it will 'preserve the purity of our spoken language' and that it will help foreigners to speak English 'as it should be spoken and not as the old spelling misleads them'. In my experience, *anyone* who learns a new word from the printed page is liable to use untraditional spellings. And I'm not only referring to foreigners, like the

older educated Germans who could be heard saying *fa*ther for *father* because *th* spellings were formerly always taut as *θ* in German schools.

No. Problems exist even for native speakers. At present, when native speakers confront a new word with ritten *th*, they might decide it has *ð* in the middle of a word because it sounds everyday like *father*, *northern*, or that it has *θ* because it comes across as vaguely learned, like *author*, *sympathy*. But there is no hard and fast rule. The word *logarithm*, which puristically should have *θ* and which the OED gives with only that pronunciation, is listed in Jones's EPD with both *θ* and *ð*, *ð* being the more usual. In America, a pronunciation with *θ* almost never occurs. Recently, I heard the word *smithereens* pronounced with *θ* by an actor on American television.

In the same issue of [Newsletter](#), Item 7, Newel Tune seems to agree that a distinction should be shown but he is against using *dh*. He argues that since *ð* occurs 4 times as frequently as *θ*, the spelling *th* should be preserved for *ð*. He argues that *θ* should be represented by either *fh* or *thh*. These symbols are acceptable but I can't see that they are desirable. For example, *thh* seems to me simply too long and confusing: do we really want to write *aethhh* for *eighth* or *withhhoeld* for *withhold*? (— for those who pronounce with as /wiθ/).

Since *c*, *q*, and *x* will not be used in SS (*c* only in *ch*) it would make more sense to reassign them than to use *fh* — as Reg Deans suggests (*x*), or as is done in Fijian (*c*). But they together with *fh* have several drawbacks: (1) they go against international and native conventions; (2) they interfere with the tradition of pronouncing Latin and Greek *th* as *θ*.

Tune says that *dh* would suggest an incorrect sound. Does *fh* do any better seeing that several dialects in fact pronounce *θ* as *f*? He also suggests that since 'a digraph represents a totally different sound than its component letters' using *dh* is not so reasonable as its inventors thought. But if *th* were kept for *ð*, it would go against the rule that a sound represented by a digraph is voiced or voiceless according to its first letter e.g. *sh*, *zh*, *kh* (as in *lokh*) — even (historically) *ch*: a logical parallelism would be destroyed.

Much has been made of how disturbing the use of *dh* would be because of its frequency on the printed page. Anyone who thinks that any reform is not going to disturb is kidding himself. The very fact that *dh* occurs in common words suggests that it will probably be easiest of all the changes to learn.

In short, not writing *th* and *dh* separately may cause confusion and will undoubtedly generate untraditional pronunciations. Hardly a simplification in any profound sense.

If one were to take the 1971 SSS logic further, one could say that *ng* and *ngg* should be collapsed, and also *sh* and *zh*. There are fewer contrasts between these pairs than between *th* and *dh*. But why stop here? *S* and *z* seldom contrast (almost never initially). Therefore, write both as *s* and get rid of *z* altogether. But why not write every consonant as *C* and every vowel as *V*? Even this may not be simple enough.

Write every word as *X*.

Learning to write would become incredibly simple. But the writing system would be ridiculous.

It is time to go back to fundamental principles for a decent orthography: an essential speech sound (phoneme) should have a special symbol, and words with different pronunciations should be written differently.

So, bring back *dh*!

18. ANOTHER INTERESTING APPROACH to a reformed spelling system.

N C 8 3 is based on a statistical analysis of English. Thus, the sound of 'sh' which occurs commonly in English is represented the single letter x, but the less common sound 'ch' is represented by the digraf tx, and so on; common sounds having a single letter, less common a digraf.

I do not see N C 8 3 as the last word, but I do think it is a new approach which might stimulate fruitful debate.

I also feel that the economy of N C 8 3 would appeal to the printing industry.

Yours sincerely,
Robert Craig, Weston-Super-Mare, Avon.

NIU CPELIG 83

Kan ia rimember zat fytful dy, perhapc meni ijrs aghw, huen iu firtc bighan tu cqcpekt zat pjpel lybeld as ekcperc uer not nececyrili infalibel? Hu dqs not nw ov at ljct uqn kyc in his wn famili in huitx uqn doktor rekomended a certin operyxon and anqzer arghiud aghenct it, huail a third cqdxdected an entairli diferent procjdiur? Hu has not red ov ze meni-caided dibytc about niukljar cyfti, ze ctyt ov zi ekonomi, zi efekt ov pecticaids and yricol cprys and zi influenc ov ryc on intelidxenc? Tu, thrj, faiv and jven mor vius arais in cctx dibytc, and caientifik cqporters kan bj faund for ol ov zem. Uqn olawct fjils inklaind tu cy, "Zyr ar olawct as meni wpinions as zyr ar caientictc."

c = s

s = z

z = th (voiced)

g = ng

x = sh

tx = ch

dx = j

th = the (voiceless)

sh = zh

gh = g

i = i, y

o = o, aw

y = ay

j = ee

q = u

w = oe

u = oo, w

ai = ie

au = ow

19. From Raymond Elser of the U.S.A.

He follows Professor Vassilyev of Moscow's reformed spelling.

Eet, dringk, and bi merry, for tomorrow wi diet.

A 6 year oeld girl woz asked vot shi learned in school. "Not inuf. Ie got to goe back again tomorrow."

SECTION FOUR

Special Articles from China, Japan and India

20. From Mr. Peh-ling Lee of Gangou, China.

People all over the world are trying to reform English Spelling so that we can use it internationally — and here is a scholar from Communist China, who is working on the problem, and has sent us his ideas on the subject, for which we thank him warmly.

Mr. Peh-ling Lee's contribution deserves serious study — particularly by those who think that the solution to the spelling problem is pure "Spelling as you speak". Mr. Lee has a good phonetician's ear for how a Chinese hears English, and speaks it himself. If you read Mr. Reg. Dean's BRITIC you can hear a man from Leeds, and among American reformers, there can be a difference between Boston and the Middle West. A Swedish friend tells me that my own efforts are recognizably Australian. So when it comes to designing an international English spelling, if we go by 'spelling as you speak' we should remember that most of the people of the world are Chinese, Indian or Hispanic. A rule-based conventionalised spelling may then seem more practicable.

Valerie Yule.

EXTRACT

from Mr Peh-ling Lee, Gangou, Jiang-xi Province, CHINA 16 November 1983

This Package Scheme is my persistent effort to do something for the more rapid progress of English-spelling reform after a score years arduous research into the most fundamental phonetics through a peculiar approach strange to Western scholars. I am going to write an article on the topic — Spelling reform and the struggle of a moderately-stressed syllable against its over-stressed partner in English pronunciation..

PACKAGE SCHEME OF A SORT OF UNIVERSAL ENGLISH SPELLING FOR ADVICES AND EVALUATION

A. Three Tables

1. How vowel letters and groups of letters are pronounced in the New Spelling.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|----|----|-----|---|----|---|-----|-----|----|----|-----|----|------|
| letter(s) | a | ai | e | ee | i | ii | o | oo | uu | w* | ww | aa | oa | ouu |
| pronounced in the | æ | ei | e+ | i:+ | i | ai | ɔ | ou+ | ju: | u | u: | a:+ | ɔ: | ɔju: |
| intern. alphabet | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*The newly erected vowel letter named /u:/ as convention has already done implicitly for it in the diphthong /aw/ and in the German= alphabet.

+ Pronounced depressedly in harmony with an unaccentuation as convention has already done for the long sound /ay/ in /always/, /ow/ in /window/ etc.

2. How consonant letters and groups of letters are pronounced in the New Spelling

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| letter(s)+ | b | d | f | g | h | j | k | l | m | n | p | r |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| pron. in | b | d | f | g | h | dʒ | k | ʒ | əm | ən | p | a: |
| the intern | s | t | v | y | jh | sh | hv | kv | gv | ts | ds | |
| alph. | s | t | w | j | tʃ | hw | hw | kw | gw | ts | ds | |

*Actually little difference is heard from the consonant /w/

+/c/,/g/,/x/ and /z/ are cleared of the conventional alphabet, and English pronunciation as well as spelling is simplified.

3. How conventional letters and groups of letters are replaced in the New Spelling.

| <i>Letter or group</i> | <i>Replaced by</i> |
|---------------------------------|--|
| consonant /w/ (as well as /u/) | v |
| consonant /i/ | y (as /oeillade/by/oeyard/) |
| vowel /y/ | i (as/physics/ by /physics/) |
| ph and gh | f when so pronounced) |
| g *1 | j when pronounced /d / or / / |
| q | k |
| z *2 | s |
| /g/ of /ing/ | dropped, for it's seldom heard in the popular speaking |
| th*3 | s |
| tz | ds |
| c | k or s as the way that's pronounced |
| ci (as well as si and ti) | sh (tiby jh when it's so pronounced) |
| x | ks or ksh as the way that's pronounced |
| ir (as well as ur) (accented) | er |
| er (ir, or ur) (unacc.) | el (for // represents the actual right phoneme) |
| il (ol, or ul) (unacc.) | el, when that's so pronounced |
| u (unacc. or shortly acc.) | i, when that's so pronounced |
| u (o, or oo) (accented) | ww, when that's so pronounced |
| u (o, or oo) (accented) | w, when that's so pronounced |
| u (or ou) (accented) | a, when that's so pronounced |
| a (o, ou or u) (unaccented) | e (in a closed end.syll. or ensued with m,n,l or r, or a (else situated) |
| a (unacc. end opened syll.) | aa |
| au (ou*4 or) (in long sound) | oa |
| i (unacc. end. closed syll.) | e or ee, when that's so pronounced |
| o (or ow) unacc. at the ending) | oo |
| etc. | Their respective equivalents of the new spelling |

*1 Academically, the last /g/ of /garage/ should be pronounced as /d/ instead of // or //.

2. Practically as in /is/, /s/ is seldom heard as /z/. This popular tendency, which has the background of adopting a milder pronunciation in English speaking, is imperative, and should be taken into serious consideration. And it's always advisable for one to keep fit by being cured or operated thoroughly with a disease.

3. It's in an artificially twisted state of /s/ or /z/ and seldom heard in popular practical speaking.

4. Actual sounds of the three spellings are transformed into one another by automatic phonemataical shiftings in their specific spelling environments.

B. Two Suppositions

1. It's supposed that a conventionally weak beginning syllable is now universally pronounced as a secondary accent in the broad popular practices.

2. It's supposed that the standard one of the variant pronunciations, if any, of a conventional syllable, is to be adopted upon a reasonable scientific basis, and that dissensions on delicate concerns, needless to say some minute obstacles, can be settled through patient consolations or personal interviews.

C. Contrast with the World English Spelling.

(I have not included the World English spelling in this re-typing, since it is available elsewhere.)

*Lincoln's *1 Gettysburg Address* (Lincoln's Gettysburg Address)

Foarskoo and seven *2 years ago oar faasels broat foas on sis
(Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this

kontinent a nuu naishen *1, konseevd in libelte.. dediketed tww si*3
(continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, dedicated to the

propasishen sat *4 oal mens *5 aa kriaited eekvel. Noa wee .. ingaijd
(proposition that all men are created, equal. Now we engaged

..gret sivel *1 Woa testin hvesel *6 ... or ene ..soo ... kan lon induur..
great civil war testing whether or any so can long endure

met.. batelfeeld of ..hav kom *7 ... poashen ..as ... fiinel *6 restin-plais
(met ..battlefield of..have come.. portion as final resting-place

foar soos hvww heer gaiv sair liivs ..miit liv. It is oaltagesel fitin..
for those who here gave their lives might live. It is altogether fitting..

propel *6..shwd dww.. Bat*1.. laajel sens..kanot ..haloo..grond..faa
proper should do But larger sense cannot hallow ground far

aberv *7..pwwr poael..ditrakt..werld *1 wil..rimembel ... raasel..
above poor power detract world will remember rather

*1. The vowel falls upon the right phoneme /e/.

2. It's significant not to spare a vowel letter but to hold that every syllable consists of a vowel.

3. Its pleasantly mild tongue justifies the replacement of /th/ by /s/ in (/the/ which is always weakly pronounced due to intonation, thus justifying the replacement in the new spelling in general.

4. /satt/ for the past tense of /sit/ to be distinguished from /that/.

5. /men/ for /man/ with regular plural for several reasons.

6. The consonant falls upon the right phoneme //.

7. A milder-tongued pronunciation is preferred.

EDITOR'S NOTE: For reasons of space, the full passage from the Gettysburg address has been shortened, omitting spelling that is not affected.

[Thomas Hoffman: see [Bulletin Summer 1978](#). Items 3 & 4. and [Journals](#)]

21. Thomas R. Hofmann.

English Dept/Fac of Humanities University of Toyama, Softiku, TOYAMA, JAPAN
1984.2.06

Mona CROSS & Members of the SSS Committee

Dear Mona & others, especially George O'H.,

Newsletter of 83.11 just arrived & was enjoyed; good job & keep up the good work. You asked for comments, so here they are:

Frist, Gibbs's statement of SR-3 is wonderful! I am a solid convertee, & will try to follow it (may even make a program for this computer to convert automatically to it, when I don't catch them myself). It has a number of virtues, some of which I have never realized were to be sought, so let me list what I see in it, & why each aspect seems good.

First Gibbs's statement: "D.U.E. Drop useless E on the end of short vowel syllables"

(1) This is vague enough to be interpreted by each person to his own liking. This is important, as SRers (spelling reformers & potential spelling reformers) seldom agree on overall plans, nor even the details. For example, me, I am not so sure that the -e in -able & -ible suffixes is not useful, so as you can see, I am not dropping it. Others will have other reservations. As with any successful political statement, there is enough vagueness to allow different people to interpret & practice it in their own way.

(2) It is easy to apply in practice; it doesn't take a computer or an expert's knowledge of English to decide whether or not some particular word ought to lose its -e. You can do it as the spirit moves you, & maybe defend the uselessness of some -e you dropped.

(3) It saves enough, I think, to be rationally defensible, in terms of ink & paper, for those who might be influenced by such thoughts. (Speaking as a linguist, I note that languages are seldom if ever influenced by such considerations, but some people might be, & every person counts, who can be motivated to change, or even just to tolerate.)

(4) It saves the system underlying English spelling, rather than thwarting it, as Lindgren's statement of SR-1 did. That made *already* become *alredy*, which ought to be pronounced as *alreedy* — I would prefer a more systematic *alreddy*. But Gibbs's statement of SR-1 avoids this problem, having Virtue (1), a certain vagueness. Bravo, Mr Gibbs.

Rather it improves the system, making it more easily discovered & learned by children. Words like *hav* & *liv* which must be learned early, & when "misspelled" as they are in standard orthography, lead some children (myself included) to distrust the whole concept of letters indicating pronunciation.

(5) Its use is obvious. These spellings will not be taken to be typographical errors, as SR-1 spellings may be, or my own reform (SR-101), spelling *another* as *an other*. A reform that does not have this virtue cannot be used by a non-native speaker of English, as he will be corrected & be thought to be rather stupid.

(6) Its user can never be thought to be illiterate, as it affects only the most common words. The writer can still show his education & qualifications to speak & write by spelling the difficult words

correctly. Many reforms lack this virtue (SR-1 & -2 included) & thus can never be used by the native speaker of English for he will appear illiterate; having read no books & lacking an elementary education, he is hardly qualified to comment on any aspect of life. What is said in such a reform is sure to be ignored. I would include N. Tune's reform here (call it SR-5, as a memorial to his work): "spell any, many as eny, meny". Altho this has much virtue, my naiv reaction is that it marks its user as an out & out illiterate! I don't know why, but ther it is.

(7) It is obvious to the most naiv & the most disinterested reader that it is an improvement. This virtue is perhaps as important as (6) & (4), as it will make tolerant readers & avoid inane criticism or bad humor.

By contrast, I find SR-4 detestable, & would follow it only if most SRers wer following it (for the sake of a united front) — & they ar not. It is good for making English look like Spanish or Italian, but many would not like that comparison. It saves too little ink & paper for that to be a rational motivation, & it seems to me to be good for little else than showing that one is a rabid SRer, a person that most people like to avoid.

Sorry to get carried away giving comments, but perhaps you might print it as a letter (which it is), or I can add a conclusion to make a short article. In the latter case, indicate wher you find it unclear or unconvincing, & I will rewrite it.

You ar quite right, Mona. SRs do not get adopted by mere use. To cite a good example, take G. Dewey's reform, SR-0 if I may presume to give it a number: "spell the suffix -ive as -iv" (actually a part of SR-3). Altho proposed many years ago by a major name in education in America, & used in his reference book of word-frequencies, it has been totally ignored by English. It has even been ignored by us SRers, which is a shame. What we don't learn from past errors we are bound to repeat.

Of course if the language of power (or money) uses a SR, then people will follow it, for in all nations, people imitate the language of power: the King's English in a slightly older England, & the language of the government, bankers, & especially the granting agencies today.

On the other hand, he who advocates what he doesn't practice himself may not be listened to for that reason alone. We should practice what we preach, but as you note, practice alone is not sufficient. For example, I have been publishing articles in linguistics for som 15 years in SR-101 (above) & SR-102 ("use the international pasigraphs like &, 2, 3, 4, ... wherever possible", as they avoid the "misspellings" of *two*, *eight*, and & make English a more international — less parochial? — language at the same time). So far, I havn't seen anyone else following my lead.

Thus, altho you ar right, I would support the SSS board for printing the newsletter in whatever system is advocated. Indeed ther ar 2 move good reasons to do so: It allows us (or at least the editor) to find difficulties with the proposals. You really ought to report 1ce (once) a year on the difficulties encountered, whether in applying the system, getting printers to accept it, training typists, or whatever. Also, it shows others that SRs ar easy to liv with.

But we must strongly support your feeling that the execution of SRs in the SSS Newsletter — or anywher els we may do — is virtually nothing in the way of support for a reform. That needs political & social action.

Thomas R. Hofmann.

[Madhukar Gogate: see [Journals](#), [Newsletters](#)]

22. Stage I Spelling ROMAN LIPI PARISHAD

from: Shri M. N. Gogate, Bombay, India.

I can send you a photostat of the papers on 'Roman Lipi Parishad' if you send an S.A.E. Mr. Gogate would be delighted to hear from you of course. In his papers he says that altho English is used for governmental purposes, it has to be put into 15 different scripts in order that the people can read them. This greatly increases costs. He has therefore called a Conference to discuss the use of the Roman alphabet.

I have quoted a paragraph which encourages the Society to carry on with its work:

The external handicap of Roman script is that it has been totally misused by English language. Many English words have entered our languages, and are written in respective scripts as per our perception of pronunciation. But when we go for romanization, current English spellings will create chaos in our languages.

23. From Jacob Nettikkatt of Calcutta.

He has written a book called "Inventions Galore", which gives details of his ideas and how to teach languages quickly thereby.

The Hon. Secretary, Simplified Spelling Society. 1st May, 1984.

Dear Sir,

I owe thanks to the British Council, Calcutta, for your name and address. I also understand that your Organisation is for simplifying the spelling of English so as to make the reading easier, and I sincerely hope you will be interested in my research efforts.

I am happy to inform you that my personal efforts for over 18 years have culminated in the evolution of a scientific and logical NEW LANGUAGE FORMULA. Part of the new language formula is AN ABSOLUTELY PHONETIC and SELF GUIDING ALPHABET, to eliminate the need for learning spellings and pronunciations of individual words, now being suffered by the learners and practisers of most languages, particularly English and French. But for this defect, English should have been much easier to learn and practise and it would have served greater cause of a UNIVERSAL LINK LANGUAGE.

In the new alphabet formula devised by me, there are 23 of the existing English letters, one newly formed letter and dots and dashes, totalling 29 species of types. The letters are a mixture of small and capital styles of existing letters which are easy to write, as there will be no small and capital distinction in the new order. This will entail learning of only 29 species of letters in place of the conventional $26 \times 4 = 104$ species of letters (one each in small and capital type for printing and hand-written styles). A total saving from learning spellings and pronunciations of individual words for the learners and practisers of the language may be considered by all modern thinking people, who value time, as a LIBERATION FROM ETERNAL BONDAGE OF LANGUAGE.

The economic effect of this new alphabet formula may be a revolution, as a printing press will need only 29 types of letters and the cost of printing will be considerably reduced; abundant quantity of printing materials will be saved. Above all, the size of the typewriter can be reduced to nearly half and cost brought down considerably.

EDITOR: I will forward the rest of this letter to anyone sending an S.A.E.

SECTION FIVE

Miscellaneous

24. Two Recommended Magazines

One of the consequences of the rapidly increasing international role of English is that the language is ceasing to be the private possession of the peoples who speak and write it as a first language. If Koreans and Brazilians, or Indonesians and Italians for example, want to communicate, they often must do so in English. That is why the teaching of English as a foreign language is the fastest growing profession in the language world today. But English spelling is still one of the major stumbling blocks to acquiring an understanding of the language, both for English children, immigrant children in England, and foreign learners of English.

So the question is again being raised, is it time to reform English spelling? Reformers, some of them, like Bernard Shaw, prominent and articulate, have tried before but have failed to make any impact.

Most English-speaking adults, having already obtained their language knowledge, have naturally been hostile to the proposal. But new circumstances may create new solutions. Valerie Yule at Aberdeen University has been doing a lot of work in this field, and she has contributed this special article for LANGUAGE MONTHLY.

The fact that the topic is now in the air is shown by the fact that LANGUAGE MONTHLY has received independently a contribution by Christopher Upward on the same theme.

There is a special introductory offer for a copy of "Spelling Progress Quarterly". The paper is an excellent follow-up of Spelling Progress Bulletin. Price: \$5. Address: Columbus, OH. U.S.A. The Quarterly is edited by Dr. Walter Barbe of Honesdale, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. He is also Chief Editor of 'Highlights for Children'.

25. FIRST ROMAN LIPI SAMMELAN

1. It is due to meet on Sunday 9 December 1984, between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. in Chowpatty, Bombay. Details will be announced, and sent to delegates in November.
2. All correspondence should be made with Roman Lipi Parishad, Bombay.
3. The Parishad is not in a position to assist in respect of accomodation and travel.
4. The Sammelan will be a get-together of like-minded persons. It will discuss some papers and finalize a scheme for Romanization.
5. Delegate fee is Rs.25 (for Members of Parishad), Rs.50 (for Non-Members). Please send it by cash or cheque, in favour of Roman Lipi Parishad. Institution Members of Parishad may nominate as many delegates as they like, at a fee of Rs25 per delegate.
6. Papers are invited on following themes (a) Past Romanization attempts in India (b) Suitable scheme for Romanization, (c) How Roman script may be popularized.

7. Papers should be in English, limited to 2000 words. Non-Roman symbols, if required, may be referred with numbers on separate black ink diagrams, and not included in the main text. This would facilitate printing.
8. The Parishad reserves rights to accept and edit papers. Select papers will be discussed in the Sammelan.
9. The Parishad intends to send papers, for advance study, to all delegates in November. So Please send papers and register as delegate before 15 October 1984. Please co-operate. Sammelan proceedings will be published and mailed in January 1985. Those who cannot attend Sammelan, and yet desire papers and proceedings, are requested to book order by registering as delegates. Limited number of copies will be printed, so please take early action.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please use application form at back, or its xerox copy, or replica on plain paper. You can thus advise your friends to apply.
2. Age, Sex, Mother tongue: These particulars are not required for Institution members.
3. Name: Full name, with surname last, for individuals. Institution name, in case of Institutions. Signatory may record his/her name and designation below signature, in case of Institutions.
4. Please write postal PIN code number (applicants in India).
5. This is a joint application form for membership and delegateship. Strike out words not needed.
6. Cheques to be drawn in favour of ROMAN LIPI PARISHAD.
7. Please apply preferably before 15 October 1984.
8. Membership Subscription: Rs.200 (individual), Rs.1000 (institution) Sammelan Delegate fee: Rs.25 (Members), Rs.50 (Non Members). Subscription will be increased by 50% after 31 December 1984.