English • Spelling • Society

Personal View



The self-expression medium for Society members

The views expressed here are the author's and are not necessarily shared by the Society, or a majority of its members.

The Author

Zé do Rock was born a long long time ago in Porto Alegre, Brazil, didnt studdy anything but made the film NO ELEPHANTS (coz thair wor no ellefents in it) and rote the boox FOM WINDE FERFEELT (in Brazil ZÉ DO ROCK - o erói sem nem um agá) and UFO IN DER KÜCHE - ein autobiografischer seiens-fikschen (UFO IN THE KICHEN - an autobyograffical siens-fiction). He's stil alive, livving between Munich, Germany and Sao Paulo, Brazil

The Simplified Spelling Society

The aim of the Society is to bring about a reform of the spelling of English in the interests of case of learning and economy in writing.

To this end, it:

- encourages the idea that reform is possible;
- fosters debate on reform methods;
- devises, publishes and promotes potential reform schemes;
- persuades and campaigns;
- has a role as an expert organisation on the subject;
- aims to be of benefit to future generations by introducing a consistent spelling.

Zinglish (1999)

by Zé do Rock

Nue Speling is a logical, comprehensiv but hardly legible spelling system. Cut Spelling is a natural, esily legible system, but not comprehensiv, ie stil with a lot of iregularitis. Zinglish is both, comprehensiv and legible. U mite ask how i managed to create this wonder-scheme. It's not that hard, just the price is hy: there ar quite a few rules to lern. But wat should i do?

Contents

Start with cut spelling Stage 1 Stage 2 Stage 3 Stage 4 Stage 5 Stage 6 Stage 7 Stage 8 Stage 9 Stage 10 Wat ar sillables? **Stres exersize** Wy I did this and that The fonim word-list The Star Britten wen yung

Start with cut spelling, end with Zinglish.

I rote a book about my trip around the world, that took me 13 years thru 105 cuntris, and the problems with robbers, police and women, especially with women. The book was ritten in ultradoitsh (ultra-german), and later in brazilian, it became a great media success and a little bestseller (could hav been a big one if the publisher didnt went bankrupt - a big publisher baut the rites, but the media had stopd to talk about it). It started with normal german and evry chapter had a change in spelling. Many peple complaind that the last 50 or 100 pages wer guite hard to read, quite a few didnt finish it. I'm looking for a publisher in english, and I'd like that peple read my books and dont complain. On the other hand, legibility cant be the only factor. because if it was, the best scheme would be Traditional Orthography (TO). As a forener, i hav the same problems as many foreners: we no a lot of words only by reding, and we'd love to no how they ar pronounced. Even nativ spekers hav problems sometimes - a frend of mine says day-ty for the word deity, another says *die*-ty, and the dictionry says *dee-ity*. They come all from the same region, so it's not dialect, peple just dont no it. Anyway: after we'v lernd this century that logical systems dont sel, because of their legibility, we started with the natural systems, wich didnt sel either. Zinglish probably wil hav the same destiny, unless an angel (or a world-Ataturk) comes down and solvs the problem.

In zinglish there ar rules and sub-rules (that contradict in part the general rules), but at least there ar no exeptions in singal words, apart from *hotel, taxi, only, dont* and *wont*, Even here, pepal hu hate exeptions can spel *hotell, taxy, onely/oenly, dont* and *wont*, wich ar the logical zinglish forms. Nine pages of rules ar a lot, altho not too many if compared with some european langueges. English doesnt hav many rules, but as there is no regularity, the lerner has to lern most of the dirtionry by hart. The zinglish rules ar the absurd english rules without exeptions. For instence we could say that mor than 2/3 of the long vowals ar spelt using the magic e, and zinglish uses the magic *e* wherever possible (ralerode).

Zinglish has two grate advantages: it's probably the system with the "most english face" (not counting the very soft nattural systems that only chainge 3 or 4 things in spelling), almost nothing loox,"uninglish" (perhaps the only ixeption being the final j's - e. g, juj.) The other grate advantage is that the stress is cleer. Stress is a big problem for foreners and pupals in primary scool. Even a nue speling word like *antisipaet* or *reguelariti* dont giv us eny clues wair the stress is.

The scheem is based on oficial british and american pronunciations, as thay ar given by most dictionris. If one of thees 2 "general-accents" drops a ritten leter wich is conserved in the other one, it wont be dropd in zinglish. So an *r* wich is not folloed by a vowal is treeted as pronounced, ie we ignor that most inglish peepal dont pronounce it. The same for the american dropping of *t* after *n* (twenny, niny). In other cases wair british and american pronunciation ar different and this difference is reflected in zinglish speling, both variations ar aloud (allowed) (*shedule* and *skedule*, *lesur* and *leesur*. Another general differents is the *a* in words like *dancing*, but this difference isnt spelt in zinglish, cos zinglish spels both a's with a simpal *a*.

It is independent of a nolege of TO, ixcepting for a few cases like shwas that ar not in the last sillable. But no scheem can solv that problem in a satisfactory way, i guess.

Homophones ar spelt the same way. Unless wun is a baseword, anuther wun a baseword + ending (*my noze, he noes*). But: in Germany and in Brazil i'v been organizing referendums in my performences, and found out that thair is a majority wich wudd suport an optional diferenciation. So peepal wudd spel *dear* and *deer* as *dear*, but if thay felt that misunderstandings cudd arise and thay wornt making a joke, thay cudd spel them in the old way.

The sistem can be used in computers az thair is no diacrittix and no special sines.

If we want a speling reform to be introdused, we think of to wais: eether we convinns authoritis to introduse it or we convinns normal peepal to spel the way we'd like. Authoritis ar quite rezerved

about teling peepal how tu rite, thay preferr tu wate for peepal tu chainge, and peepal wate for the authoritis tu chainge. In Brazil and in Germany i no a lot of peepal hu inthuziastically aproov of my skeems, but very few uze it in thair daly uzege (ixepting wen thay rite tu me). Stil, wun of the tu posabilitis cudd sum time becum reality.

The reforms made til now in meny cuntris ar usualy disided by govverments, that giv the job tu academmix. But jeneraly academmix clont hav a grate need for reform, az thay belong tu the few hu can reed and rite propperly Peepal hu ar the moest likely tu welcum a speling reform ar not older than 10, and thairfor thay hav eeven les influens than a voter.

Zinglish dusnt differ tu much from TO, but tu lern all the rools at wuns wudd be tu much. It wudd be possable, but i sujesst that we divide it in 10 stajes, wich shudd follo thearetticaly evry 5 or 10 yeers. We wudd fite ferst for the ferst staje, wich wudd be a kynd of Soft Cut Speling. 5 yeers later we wudd diclair the sekend staje "oficial" and fite for it tu be implemented. At the end we wudd rite *make meet mite bote cute*.

If we make the reform by stajes, we cudd az wel rite nue speling (in my opinnion with slite chainjes, like maik meet miet boet cuet).

And here are the rules (God be with you):

Stage 1: Soft Cut Spelling.

The differences to "traditional" CS would be:

- 1. *I* would be spelt *i*.
- 2. Coloquial expressions become as oficial as the old oficial ones. *i wanna do it* becomes as oficial as *i want to do it*.
- 3. Shwas wouldnt disapear (later most of them would be replaced).
- 4. Double consonants after stressd syllables wouldnt disapear. Nor the double II in one-syllable words after *a* with *au*-sound, after short *o* in a word like *doll*, and after *u* in a word like *pull*.
- 5. If we cut off a letter, the result should hav mor than 50% of chances of being pronounced as it actualy is, ie most letters in this situation in other words should be pronounced as they ar. So *comb* stays, because if we spel *com*, we can chek all combinations o + consonant, and we'l se that the *o* in this case is almost always short. The same aplies for a word like *money*: if we spel *mony*, we can chek and we'l se that o + consonant + vowel is usualy (mor than 50% of the cases) long, so the word would be "rong". Of corse, *money* is rong as wel, but at least we no it since long time. If somebody complains that thats not much, we can say: in *stage 9* we'l spel *munny*. Help us to get there quikly.
- 6. PH's and soft G's stay, only GH's disapear, and the words ar "corected" with the statisticaly most likely form (long vowals with magic e): *right rite, eight ate, bought baut, enough enuf* (the most likely form would be *enuff*, but we dont need this double at all). So G and PH ar treated later.
- 7. Just an orientation rule: usualy we use *y* and *w*, only befor consonants we use *i* and *u* insted, Now i'm just talking about the *y* with semivowel-function, ie together with another vowel.

Stage 2: C/K/Q/S/T/X/Z.

K-sound. The k-sound is usually spelt with c (*car, cozy, lectur*), but befor e, i, y and at the end of a baseword we'l use k (*kind, bak*). Befor u (w-sound)+another vowel we'l use qu (frequent). The dubling of k is ck (*jacket*), the dubling of q is cq (later we'l spel licquid - wun of the very few cases).

Words with mor than 1 syllable ending with an -ik-sound keep thair c: basic, plastic.

S/Z. The voiceless *ss*-sound wil be spelt *s* (*sad*, *nise*). The *z*-sound is spelt *z* (*zebra*, *ezy*). Inflection-*s* (mostly pronounsd *z* and used in the plural, conjugation and genitiv, like *boys*, *he noes* and *Toms*) is spelt *s*. Wen a verb in the third person has an *s* at the end and this *s* dusnt exist in the infinitiv we consider it an inflection-*s*: has (the infinitiv *to hav* doesnt hav an *s*), *is* (*be*), *was* (*be*).

Later we'l hav another problem, in cases of dout, we spel later s/z az in TO: *hues (whose), thees (these).* By now whoze and theze.

X. The sounds ks and gz ar spelt x, and we dont double it (the preseding vowel is usualy, if not alwais, short), This also aplies wen we ad an inflection-s to an end-k (or c):1 duk, 2 dux, 1 book, 2 boox, aquattix, he coox.

CH. The sound of *ch* wil be spelt *ch* (*ich, swich*). Wen it is spelt with *tu* in TO, u'r free to deside wether u uze the mor conservativ pronunsiation and speling or not: *Sentury* or *senchury, fortunat* or *forchunet.* I pronouns something inbetween, so i uze the mor conservativ spelling to stay near to TO.

CIA. The sound-combination *short shi+vowel* wil be spelt *ci+vowel*: apreciate, negociate, concientius (in the last syllable there is no *shi + vowel*, only *sh + vowel*).

ZH. The sounds *zhån*, *zhår* and *zhuål* (*å* = *shwa*) ar spelt *sion*, *sur*, *sual* (*vision*, *pleasure*, *casual*). But other *zh*'s wil be spelt *zh*. On the other hand, az this *zh* doesnt look very english, we can leve the origginal, if it is an origginal french word. U ran rite *burzhwazee* and *razheem*, but az thees words hav such an un-inglish pronunsiation, u can spel *bourgeousie* and *regime* too. Or talk about something els.

-ED (no change). The ending for the past (missed, wanted) is sometimes pronounsd d, sometimes t, but it's hard work to think all the time wich pronunsiation we uze in every word. Thats wy we'l leve the d. The t is only used in TO wen the root of the word changes: *kep-t* (because it's not *keeped*) and thats the same in zinglish.

Stage 3.

PH - F. The sound of f wil alwais be speft f. Dolfin, filosofy.

Stage 4.

G - **J**. The *g* wil be used for the sound of *good*. The *j*-sound of *general* wil be spelt j: the intellijent jeneral gave a gift to the jentle jiant. Of cors after this chanje there is no reazon to keep gue's: gest, tung. but, the unstresd -*ij*-ending (-age, -ege, -ige, -idge) is spelt -ege, - advantege, college, manneged, porrege.

R (no chanje). The *r* wich is not folloed by a vowel isnt pronounsd in most of England, but thats not a reazon not to rite it, i mean, many english speking cuntris pronouns it, including most of America, Canada and Ireland.

Stage 5: Shwa.

We'l only "treat" shwa, the obscure vowel, in the last syllable of a baseword. It wil be spelt *e* (*callender, cheaper, marter, docter, even, butten*) - This *e* stais even if the word gets an aditional suffix (*arrogent - arrogently, persen - persenal*). And there is some confusion wat a shwa actualy is: some peple would say the second *e* in *brethless* is a shwa, others that it's a short i. Anyway: the *e*'s stay *e*. *l*/*y* just become an *e* befor an *r* (*marter*), in the endings *-ige, -iage* (*porrege, carrege*), it becomes an *a* befor an *I* (*deval, pupal*) or befor *-ble* (*terrable, horrable*).

Shwa in one-syllable-words. Wun-syllable-words dont hav a last syllable, so they dont chanje, usualy they hav a clear and a "sloppy" pronunsiation with shwa, and we'l spel them considering the clear pronunsiation: *The, of, from, for, tu*, etc stay the way they ar. The word *of* is mostly pronounsd with *v*, but in some cases with *f*, so we'l keep it that way. Off should become of, but it wil remain an *off.*

Exeptions for shwa. Some suffixes (suffixes ar endings used for derivativs, like *inform-ation, probab-ly*) ar very wel nown and dont chanje, ie they ar exertions for the shwa-rule (i'l uze å for shwa):

-åbål - able (*capable*)
-ayåbål - ieble (*relieble*)
-ås (except for the suffixes -les and -nes) - us (*famus*)
-chår - tur, ttur (*natur, nattural*)
-izzåm - ism (*communism*)
-jår - dur (proseedur)
-shå - after short voul cia (*special*)
-shån after short voul-(not for peepal) ssion(*mission*)
-shån - (fbr peepal) cian (*musician*)
-shås - normally tius (*audatius*)
-yå - io (*union*)
-zhån - sion (*vision*) -zhuål - sual (casual)
-åbli - ably (probbably, terably)
-ål- al (nassional)
-chån - (after s) - tion (question)
-fål - ful (butiful)
-jån - gion (reegion)
-shå - normally tia (fatial, confidential)
-shån - (not for peepal) normally tion (starvation, election)
-shår - ssur (pressur)
-shås - after short voul cius (vicius)
-yåm - iurn (stadium)
-zhår - sur (lesur, leesur)

Every baseword with shwa wil be spelt az in the list, even if it is not a suffix (thats wy we spel *otion* for *ocean*, instead of *oeshen*). A suffix can also be inside the word, if another suffix or ending is added: we spel *passion*, so we also spel *passionate* (and not *pashonate*). There is at least one mor complicated case: *nation* is all rite, but *national* would be misleading, the *a* would be pronounsd long (*naishanal*). After a short vowal we spel *ssion*, thus *nassionl*. On the other hand, in the word *nationality* we don't uze the doubal s, because there is no doubal consonent after an unstresd vowal. If we speld *nassionality*, we had to stres the first syllable NASsionality.

Words put together. Some words hav their vowals chanjed to a shwa wen put together with other words: boat*man*, Thai*land*, faith*full*, no*body*. Sometimes one part of the word isnt a word anymor: *En*gland, *wo*man (we dont hav words like *eng* or *wo*). If we considerd them az one word, we'd hav to spel *boatmen*, *Thailend*, *faithfal*, *nobedy*, *Englend*, *women* (for *woman* too). But we try to stay as near as posable to the TO, so we keep the vowals: *boetman*, *Thailand*, *England*, *woman*. The only thing we do is cutting the doubal consonent after the shwa: *faithful*, *nobody* (wich should be spelt *noboddy* later).

sion/sur. In *-sion, -sur, -sual* we cant doubal the *s* even if the preseding vowal is short: no *vission* for *vision*, because it chanjes the s-pronunsiation. But we can doubal the t: *nature nattural*.

Butcher/buttur - If we hav a baseword + suffix *er*, we spel it like that, not *ur*: we spel *teacher* (later *teecher*), *strecher*, not *teatur* and *stretur* Also *bucher*, not *buttur*, even if nowadais there is no word bu(t)*ch* anymor.

Unstresd vowals, not in the last syllable. Usualy the shwas ar left the way they ar, and we dont sho the length of an unstresd syllable, if it's not the last one - alone, adm*i*ral, philosophy. But: if a word has a consonant + shwa + I or r + voul, we can cut the shwa-letter: *travvaling* or *travling*, *every* or *evry*, *dictionary* or *dictionry*. We only cant do it if the first consonent is an I or r: *contemporary*, not *contemporry*. And we shouldnt do it if we hav to chanje other letters: u mite not pronouns the *e* in *bakery*, but u cant spel *bakry*, u could only spel *baikry* (later *baicry*). And thats quite far from the root *bake* - and not shorter, after all.

Stage 6: A.

Some important things to no befor we start: we just "corect" (exept a few cases) vowels in the stresd, in the lonely (one-syllable-word) and in the last syllable.

Bad-A. To spel the short *a* of *bad* we just hav to take care that the folloing consonent is not folloed by a vowel. In one-syllable-words its simpal: *bad, bag, bat, bak, bash.* In a word with mor than one syllable where the folloing consonent is folloed by a vowel, we hav to doubal the consonent to

avoid that the next consonant is folloed by a vowel. *addict, adding, aggony, appetite, attic.* The doubling of *k* is not *kk*, it's *ck*: *pak-packing*.

Ar + vowal. Only befor an *r* we dont hav to doubal the *r*, because there is no long *a* befor an *r* baren, cary, clarity, garet, mary (also for marry), paradise. Of cors, wen i say long *a* i mean /ei/ of take, not /a:/ of father.

A + **Consonent** + **ity**. This combination, az wel az *itis* insted of *ity*, makes the *a* short and stresd. That happens with the other vowals too, exept *u*: *nationality*, *brevity*, *mobility*, *majority*, but *imunity*. So we dont need to doubal the folloing consonent in this case.

Father-A. The *a* of *father* is regarded as a unimportant variation of the *a* in *bad*, we wont spel it differntly because quite a few words differ from british to american english. Usualy the *a* at the end of a one-syllable-word or befor an *r* wich is not folloed by a vowel has the *father*-sound too: *ar, bar, car, bra, spa.*

Bake-A. To spel the long *a* of *bake* we rite *a* + *consonent* + *vowal* or *a* + *vowal*. If there is no vowal, we uze the majjic e, wich is not pronounsd but makes the preseding vowal long: *make, bake, wate.* If there ar 2 consonents folloing, we hav to uze the *ritten long vowal, ai: waist* (for *waist* and *waste*), *taist, paint, aipral.* At the end of a word we spel *ay: bay, day, gay, gray, way* (for *way* and *weigh*), *thay, pay, play.* If the word gets an ending, of cors the *y* cant stay there, because there shouldnt be a semivowal *y* befor a consonent. Thus *bais, dais, gais, wais, pais, plais, paid, plaid.*

Maybe. And how should we spel *maybe*? If we consider it one word, we should spel it *mabee* or *maby*. But we consider it 2 words put together, *may-be*. Now, wen should we consider it 2 words, wen one word? As we cant make a good rule to solv this problem, we'l at least make it esy for "alredy-noers" (literet peple): we consider it the way it is nerer to TO, we spel *maybe*, not *mabee* or *maby*.

A pronounsd az another vowal. If an *a* is representing another vowal, we spel acordingly. *any* = *eny*, *many* = *meny*, *he* said = *he* sed.

AIR. the *air*-sound is spelt *air*: *air* (for *air* and *heir*), *bair*, *dair*, *pair* (for *pair* and *pear*), *hair* for *hair* and *hare*. My hair has been groing a lot, maybe I'I eat it tomorro. Now u can make the "joke" in the ritten langwege too.

AU/AW. The *aw/au*-sound of *law*, *caught* wil be normaly spelt *aw*, but *au* befor a consonant (alwais the same story): *draw*, *draus*, *claw*, *claus*, *jaw*, *jaus*, *abraud*, *apaul*, *aplaud*, *auction*.

ALL/WA. The sound-combinations *ol/aul* and *wo/wau* (*o* being short) in one-syllable-words and thair derivativs ar spelt with *all* or *al+* consonant and wa. Thus *all*, *ball*, *bals*, *call*, *fall*, *falt* (=*falt*) *wat*, *war* (also for *wore*), *wart*, *want*, *wall*, *walk* (later *wak*), *warn* (also for *worn*). If we want a short *a*, we spel with one *l* (*pal*, *shal*), befor *l+consonent* we spel *ael* (*scaelp*) and for *w+short a* we spel *wae*: *waeg the dog*. Theze cases ar quite rair, tho. In words with mor than one consonant we spel the *au/aw-sound* acording to the normal rule: the *water* (=*waiter*) and the *waitres braut wauter insted of wisky*.

EA. We no alredy how we should spel *ea* in most cases: the long *e* with *ee*, eg *cheep*, short *e* with *e*, eg *bred*, long *a* with *a* + *consonent* + *vowal*, eg *stake* (also for *steak*), *er* like in *verb* with *er*: *lern*. *Ea* only stands for the combination *ee* + *shwa: theater, theary (theory)*. It's actualy the same sound az the *ee* befor an *l* or *r*, stil we'l ignor that and spel the sound *ee* befor *l* and *r* with *ee*. Thus *feel, eer* and *beer*, insted of *feal, ear* and *bear* (for the drink).

REAL. And thair is a mor complicated case: *real* and *feel* ryme perfectly, but in my opinion, the *ea* of *realy* is not exactly the same az the *ee* of *feeling*. On the other hand, quite a few pepal would say it's the same. So i'l spel them *real* and *realy*, but anyone can spel *reel* and *reely*. Or even *reel* and *realy*.

Stage 7. E.

Short E. The *e* is the blak sheep among the vowals, no maggic *e* can chanje its pronunsiation. Usualy it's short, and we usualy dont need a consonant doubling afterwerds: *swet, sweter, swel, sweling, telefone, temper, ten, never.*

Long E. If we want the long e in a pozission other than at the end of a one-syllable-word (*be, fe, he, ke, ne, me, te, we*), we hav to spel *ee*: *sweet, sweep, supreem, teech, teem, teer, theem*. Also derivative of words with one e get a doubal *e*: *fees, kees, nees*.

ER. The er-sound in verb, bird, turn is spelt with er: verb, berd, tern, term, terminal, verdict, vertical, adversity.

Stresd E in the last syllable: after a stresd e in the last syllable we doubal the consonant: *colecct, direcct, infecct, instedd, ahedd, compell, fortell.* Now we can distinguish between *present (gift)* and *presennt (to hand over), object (thing)* and *objecct (to speak agennst)*. And after a stresd syllable beginning with *be-, pre-, re-* wair thair mite be a "colision" with a word pronounced differently, we doubal too: *bellow* (not *below*) later *bello* and *belo*).

WOR. The sound-combination wer/wur is not spelt wer, but wor: we littal worms wor in the world and new that if we sed a word, it would get worse.

E - *I*. Stresd *e*'s with short-*i*-pronunsiation become *i: inglish*.

EI. The sound-combinations *ee+i*, *i+ee* or *i + i* in all pozissions ar spelt *ei*: *aitheist, veical* (vehicle), *deity*.

Unstresd EE/I. A long *e* is eezily confuzed with a short *i*, americans and brittens tend tu pronouns it another way, so we'l say a long unstresd *e* is the same az a short *i* and spel *y* (*coffy*) or *i* (*automobil*).

Stage 8. I.

With this letter the same happens az with *a*: *shit, bite, shitting, biting.* At the end of a one-syllable-word: *by* (for *buy* and *by*), *dy*, *dry.*

IRE. The *ire*-sound of *fire* stais like that. Only wen a baseword ending in *y* gets an *er*-ending we uze *ier* (*drier, lier*, not *drire* and *lire*). It's all exactly the same az in TO, but i stil hav to explane it.

I/Y. Befor a consonent we uze *i*, not *y*: *sistem*, *tipe*, unless thair is a reezen for it:

LONG I befor 2 or mor consonents. To giv the long sound befor 2 or mor consonents, we uze the long ritten vowal., *fynd, blynd*, (to) *wynd* to distingwish from *wind*).

Words ending in Y and thair derivvativs. For the derivvativof one-sillable-words ending with *y* we keep the *y*: *i by, he bys, i dy, he dys, i dry, he drys, one gy, two gys, one py, two pys, one ty, two tys.*

Long stresd *i* in the last sillable. It is spelt *ie*, *aplie*, *complie*, *dinie*.

The words I and eye. The word for *I* is *i*, the word for eye is *y*, the plural *y*s,

I/Y in the last unstresd sillable:

At the very end: short: *y* (*candy*) long: *i* (*simplifi*) Not at the very end: short: *i* (*candis*) long: *y* (*simplifys*). This meens that at the end of unstresd sillables we invert the situation, *y* becomes *i* and *i* becomes *y*.

U mite shout now, wat the hel is he doing? But short *i*'s in the last sillable apeer quite often in inglish, so thay hav commen, "normal" endings (*candy/candis*), wile long ones ar rellativly rair, and thay get almoost inexistent endings (*simplifi/simplifys*).

Stresd I in the last sillable - in this case we hav to doubal the consonant after the *i*, otherwize it is unstresd.

I/EE/E in the ferst sillable. The short unstresd *i*- or *ee*-sounds in the ferst sillable wi1 be spelt *i*, but the preefixes *be-*, *pre*, *- and re-* wil be kept that way. Some peepal wil complane about words like *ixampal*, but this *ex-* has definitly another pronunsiation than the *ex* in *expedission*. The dictionris say it's a short *i*. So now we hav *desperation* and *dispach*. Thair is no *despatch*, and we cant misspel *disapeer* az *desapeer*.

Long unstresd I, not in the last sillable. Heer we uze y: dylute, sycolojy, ydea.

Stage 9. O/OO/U.

1 - One-sillable-words:

O is like the other vowals ixeppt e:

If it is short, the following consonent shouldnt be folloed by a vowal: *bob, bom, dog, drop, dot.* If it is long, the consonent must be folloed by a vowal: *oke, open, bloted, bote, bode, bone.* Befor 2 consonents, for the long vowal we need the ritten long vowal: poest, boeth, moest. At the end of a word it is long-. *bo, blo, do (=doe, dough), go, glo, gro, po,* One-sillable-words plus consonant ending ask for the riften long oe: *boes, bloes, does, goes.* Words with mor sillables plus consonent-ending dont need the e: *potatos, pianos, windos,* Basewords ending with o + ending ing dont need the *e* eether: *bloing, going, groing.* Basewords ending with o + other vowal ending need it: bloey, shaddoey.

The sounds oo/u:

Long *oo* at the end of a word: u - *blu, bru, du, dru, glu, gru, tu*. Yoo at the end of a word - ew - dew, kew, vew, few, stew, hew, new. Short *u* befor a consonant, u + consonant - *blud, flud, bug, cup, up, but, cut*. Short *oo*: u + doubal consonent - *pull, bull, gudd, studd, putt*. Yoo befor consonent - u + consonant + maggic e or other vowel - *tube, puke, huje, use*. Long *oo* befor consonant: - *oo* - *groop, soop, boot, broot, shoot, froot, groov*.

book/look - Wen a word is supozed to be spelt with u + doubal consonent and the word reeds like another ixistent word, we keep speling *oo*: *book*, *look* instead of *buck*, *luck*. If u wanna no wy i du this ixeption in this case, se chapter "Wy I did this and that".

Dirivvativs - The dirivvatives ar treeted as the stem: *brootal* (from *broot*), *groovy* (from *groov*). Eeven in words with mor than wun sillable: *shampooing*, not shampuing. After a word ending with *u* we uze the ritten long vowal: *blues*, *shues* (for *shoes*), he *brues*. The *ew* cant keep the *w* befor a consonent: *veus*, *neus*. From *cut* we make *cutting*, from *putt* we make *putting*.

2. In words with mor than one sillable:

- in final sillables with a long stresd oo, ixept for ood: oo - taboo, baloon, saloon, shampoo.

- other long oo's ar spelt oo if thair is a word colision: buty (beauty), booty (booty)

- in other cases we uze *u*: *utter, include, conclude, absolute, lunatic.*

OR. An *o* befor a singal *r* is alwais the same, no matter wether the *r* is follod by a vowal or not, so we dont need an *e* after an *r* bor, boring, stor, stores.

one. The word *one* wi1 be spelt *wun* or *wan* (i spel *wun*, wich is the oficial pronunsiation). *One* now stands for *own: i one tu houzes and wun car, but thay ar in Kosovo.*

roil oil. Oi/ou dont need a shwa-e befor an I or an r. Thus oil, roil (for royal), toil, loir (for lawyer),

our - (for our and hour), tour (for tower - the "old" word tour has been replased by toor).

your - The word for your can be yor or ure, of cors i'l spel yor, coz it's much neerer tu TO - your.

So, lets say i had 3 ys (eyes) and u just wun, and i lent u wun of my ys, wich is quite small. Then u can say tu me: I O U A WE Y. No real consonants!

only/dont/wont. The lojical form of the words *only, dont* and *wont* ar *oenly/onely, do'nt* and *wo'nt,* and we can spel them like that. But thay ar 3 of the 5 aloud ixeptions in zinglish, and we can spel them *only, dont and wont.* If u wanna no wy, se chapter "wy i did this and that".

OLE/OL. The *ole*-combination wil be spelt *ol*, coz the *o* befor *l* is almoest alwais long (thair is only the ixeption with *doll* wich remanes with 2 L's). Thus *bol*, *gol*, *pol*, *tol*, *col*, *fol*, *hol* (for boeth *hole* and *whole*).

OI/OY. Thats ixactly the same az in TO - *point, boy, bois*.

OU/OW. It shudd be cleer tu, now ou/ow has only wun sound: bound, broun, brow,

Staje 10. Stres (optional rool).

And now tu make the sistem perfect we'l make it a bit mor complicated. This is only an optional rool, it has tu be aproovd by the majority. Az dus eyrything els. Tu rite a word the sistem wudd be perfect alredy, but tu pronouns an unnoen word we hav tu no wair the stres is, and az we dont no the unnoen word, this cudd becum a stresful matter. With the zinglish sistem az it is, the reeder wil hav problems in les than 1 % of the words in a normal text, considdering that he noes that a dubbal consonent meens stres in the preceeding sillable, that an *e* in the last sillable is only stresd if it is follod by a dubbal consonant. But still how can a forener, a chyld no wether u pronouns CONsonent or con-SO-nent? So, tu make it perfect ... az an option... it is ispecialy gudd for foreners like me: i no the sens of meny words in inglish with latin orrijin, but then i'v never herd them or i herd them wuns and forgot the stres, Now, my visual memory helps me tu remember the stres. And i ges eeven nativ speekers sumtimes hav problems with words of greek orrijin. And heer we go:

1. a dubbal consonant meens that the preseeding voul is stresd.

2. E's, I's and Y's in the last sillable wich ar not follod by a dubbal consonant nor by an e, ar not stresd. And the special shwa-cases in the last sillable of a baseword ar not stresd eether: -ful, -dur, -sur, -tur, - us (the uther cases ar cuvverd by uther rools enyway).

3. spisiffic rools.

3a: the endings -astic (+astix) and -istic (+istix) hav the stres on the ferst voul of this ending (AStic or Istic)

3b: *ie* (+*ied*, *ies*) is stresd.

3c: words ending with majjic e (+ thair dirivvativs) that hav mor than 2 sillables hav the stres 2 sillables befor the sillable with majjic e (*elevate*). The combination *iate* meens that the preseeding sillable is stresd (*apreeciate*).

3d: wair u se the leter combinations *able, ia, io, iu, ual* and *ity*, u can asume the sillable befor is stresd. If thair ar mor such cases in wun word, the last wun is the wun that tels us evrything. 3e: words beginning with the folloing letter combinations ar not stresd: *be, co, di, i, mis, pre, pro, re, un*.

- 4. The stresd sillable is wair 2 vouls ar tugether.
- 5. The longest sillable is the stresd wun.
- 6. The ferst sillable is the stresd wun.

Sum rools seem to contradict other rools, and thay du sumtimes, indeed. The rool cumming befor has the pryority.

Solutions:

If the sillable chozen by the rools is not realy the stresd sillable, the riter has 2 wais tu corecct it: if the voul is short, he dubbals the connsonent. We dont dubbal the x tu sho the preseeding short voul, but we du dubbal it tu sho an unixpeocted stresd sillable: *oxxide*. The dubling of ch is tch: *batcheler*.

If the voul is long we uze the ritten long voul (*aicorn* instedd of *acorn*). If a sillable with majic *e* is givving a rong ydea of the stres, we uze a ritten long voul instedd: *introdues*, *asertain*. The ritten long voul for a *father-a* is *ah: hurah*! The ritten long voul for *i*, tu sho the stresd sillable, is *ey*.

We dont dubbal connsonent-groops that stand for wun sound: we rite *afresh* (not *afreshsh*). This meens that a cuppal of words stay "rong", but thay'r very few.

Wat ar sillables

Sum peepal mite not no wat a sillable is, and in zinglish sillables au slitely difrent than in TO, becoz the definission must be simpler. In prinsipal we can say that in inglish, az in uther langweges, sillables ar the blox we speek at wuns inside a word. But then thair ar meny difrent opinnions of wat is spoken at wuns, so the gramarions had tu make lots of rools. Enyway, heer the mane rool in zinglish:

1. The ferst sillable must hav at leest wun voul.

2. Uther sillab@es start with wun consonent + wun voul.

Seckendry rools:

1.Majjic e's dont make an extra sillable: dy-LUTE, not dy-LU-te.

2. Connsonent groops reprezenting wun sound ar considderd wun connsonent in this case: AU-THO-RY-TY, not AUT-HO-RY-TY, CEN-SOR-SHIP, not CEN-SORS-HIP.

3. The suffix -*able* shud, by all thees rools, be seprated *ab-le*, but az the shwa is in the "rong" plase (it shud be a-bel), we seprate *a-ble*: *sil-la-ble*.

I'l rite doun the words in the last 2 paragrafs seprating thair sillables (the cappitals ar tu sho that the ferst sillable alwais has a voul, and that the uthers start with 1connsonent + 1 voul): mAj-Jlc, SIL-LA-ble, cOnn-SO-NEnt, rEp-RE-ZEn-ting, cOn-SId-DErd, sEp-RA-Ted/sEpp-RAte, sE-PA-Rate, TO-GE-THEr, THEM-SElvs, MAY-BE, BE-COz, sE-KEnd.

Sumtimes thees rools dont work with the inglish feeling for seprating sillables. But the fact is that, az i told u, if we forgett about the rools and just leev it tu the instinct, thair wudd be a lot of difrens from persen tu persen. U mite separate *re-sponsable*- but *rest-ing*, coz u no the ferst *re*- is a latin preefix, but *resting* actualy cums from latin *re-stare*, so actual we shudd separate *re-sting*. In a language like portuguese thay try tu discribe all thees "feeling-rools", but thay need 2 pajes for that. And it is stil contradictory. I need 7 lines.

A "lonesem" voul is wun that is not ajasent tu anuther voul.

For the sillable rool, *y* and *w* ar vouls, unless between vouls.

Stres exersize

I took a few words from the last chapter. Of cors the wun-sillable-words dont hav tu be annalized.

Cum-ming - the riter sees rool nr. 1, the voul befor a dubbal connsenent is stresd, and thats the case, so the word is all rite.

Be-for - rool 1 dusnt work, thair is no connsonent dubling. Rool 2? Thair is an *e*, but it is in the ferst sillable, so it dusnt work eether. But we cum tu rool number 3 and thair we hav: *be*- at the beginning of a word is not stresd. So the stres must be in *for*, and that's rite, so we can go tu the next word.

Pryo-ri-ty - rool 3 (ending *ity*) solvs the problem.

Re-la-tion - rool 1 dusnt work, rool 2 neether, rool 3 ses that *re* isnt stresd, and the sillable in the end with *ia* tels us that the stresd sillable is the preseeding wun. Is that rite? Du we say reLAtion? Yes! So we can go on.

Im-por-tent - rool 1 dusnt help us, rool 2 ses that the *e* in the last sillable is not stresd, so -tent is not stresd. We stil hav *im* and *por*. Rool 3 tels us that an *i* at the beginning of a word is not stresd, now *por* has tu be the stresd wun, and thats rite. Next word, pleez.

Se-kend - rool 1 dusnt help, rool 2 tels us that the *e* in *kend* (last sillable, not follod by a dubbal consonant) is not stresd. Rite.

Sil-la-ble - rool 1 solvs the problem.

Al-wais - hear we se 2 words put tugether, eech word has only wun sillable, so we dont cair about them.

Wy i did this and that

Proper names - I wudd incurrege peepal tu "zinglishize" thair one names, Prins Charls, Queen Ilizzabeth, Bil Clinten, Jorg Bush, Jerald Ford, Richard Nixen, Jun F. Kenedy (but thats tu late enyway), etc. But i wuddnt "zinglishize" thair names without thair permission. Sum peepal wil ask me wy i dont zinglishize my name, but my name is not zinglishizable. The *e* in Zé is short, az if u started pronounsing the word *zest* and stopd befor pronounsing *st*. Thair is no way i cudd rite this in inglish or in zinglish. The neerest we cudd get wudd be zay, but thats not very neer. Zay du Rok, but i'm brazilian, so i shudd brazillianize it: zé du roc. But i had problems inuf with the sales becoz of my difficalt name, and i dont wanna looz mor clients chainjing it now.

Inglish usualy respects the orijjinal jeagraffic names in the speling. The pronunsiation is usualy quite far from the orijjinal, coz the inglish fonettic sistem is so difrent from all other sistems. And the way the anglo-saxens speak the foren jeagraffic names is very ireguler tu. We wudd hav tu spel *aljeeria*, aljeerion, arjenteena, arjentinion, beljem, beljen, parragwi, etc. Inglish jeagraffic names, on the uther hand, can be eezily fitted intu the sistem. Thats wy thay ar "corected".

We cudd az wel spel the foren jeagraffic names the way the nativ speekers spel it. And then thair pronunsiation wudd be vallid, but az nobody can no haw 190 peepal in the wodd call thair one cuntris, the inglish pronunsiation wudd be vallid tu, we wudd spel Italia and say /ita:lya/ (orijinal) or /iteylia/I (the lojjical zinglish pronunsiation). For the langweges uzing anuther riting sistem, we'd take the name of the langwege with wich the cuntry was colonized, if thair was a colonization If not, we'd take the inglish word. I'm not for colonyzation, but usualy thees cuntris tend tu rite the name of thair cuntry in the way the old collonizers did it, wen thay rite with latin leters, and very offen thay hav quite difficalt pronunsiations.

Father, laf. Thair is no problem with riting it, only with reeding, wen u dont no the word. Wun advantage of this feetur is that the brittish and the american inglish dont hav tu split intu *laaf* and *laf*, *daans* and *dans*. It shuddnt be tu difficalt, az the words with an *a* az in *father* ar few and wel noen. And *aa* duent look very inglish.

buck/luck. Eeven if the old *buck* and *luck* ar now spelt *buk* and *luk*, it's a bit shocking tu spel *buck* and *luck* for *book* and *look*, coz the short *oo*-sound is just a seckendry sound of *u*, moest peepal wi1 shout at this point: wat??? He wants tu spel *buck* and *luck* for *book* and *look*, and he's trying tu convinns us that he wants tu simplifi the sistem? U'r kidding me! Later, 10 or 20 yeers after the reform has been implemented, we cudd start speling *buck* and *luck*, wen peepal got used tu the ydea that a dubbal connsonent at the end of a word makes a short *oo* of an *u*. U can spel *deer* for *dear*, evrybody wil pronouns it the rite way. Or *hair* for *hare*. But nobody wil pronouns *book* and *look* and *look*.

bull/putt. The sistem isnt perfect, it works in moest cases but not in all of them: we can distingwish *cut* and *putt*, but we cant distingwish *cutting* from *putting*. We cudd trippal the connsonent (*puttting*), but i'm quite shor thats not very poppuler and not very inglish. And if the reeder noes the baseword (putt), he noes this word has a short *oo*, not a short *u*.

Shwa. Unfortunetly we cant solv the shwa-problem entirely. The reeder shudd no that almoest all unstresd *a*'s and *o*'s ar shwas, *e*'s and *i*'s ar usualy sumthing between a shwa and a short *i*. Not eeven the dictionris can agree wether we say intålectual or intilectual. The riter shudd spel *a* or *o* wen he heers a plane shwa, and rite an *e* or *i* wen he heard a short *i* or a "shwa with 'i-culler'". Offen u can diduse it from dirivvativs: u dont no wat tu spel if u heer *orthogr*åfy or *filoss*åfy, but then u hav *orthograffic* and *filosoffic*, wair the *a* and the *o* ar cleer.

H. The *h* after *w* is pronounsd by sum peepal in Scotland and uther peepal spred around the world, but it's not nesesary that wun billion peepal spel *what* just becoz 5 million scots pronouns the *h*. We also dont rite *kirk* for *church* (now *cherch*) becoz the scots say it that way. If thay want they can keep riting it, the scots. Thay'r differnt enyway, the men thair wair skerts and we dont du that eether (at leest i dont du it, i dont no about u).

boox, dux. That dusnt hav eny tradission in inglish, but in reesent yeers u se it quite offen, ispecialy in ads and "underground-orthografy". If we can organize a referendem and fynd out that this is not poppuler, we dont hav tu du it.

We cudd spel *gz* wen we pronouns *gz*, on the uther hand the *x* for boeth sounds is eezy: the riter noes that *gz* is spelt *x*, and the reeder noes that usualy the *x* is pronounsd *gz* betwen 2 vouls wair the ferst voul is unstresd (*ixampal*, *ixaust*), and *ks* in uther cases,

only dont wont. The logical way tu spel *only* wudd be *oenly* or onely, depending on wether we se it az a baseword or a dirivvativ from one (*wun*). I dont like boeth options. The apostrofy is used tu sho the omission of the o, but actualy also tu sho that tu words wor putt tugether. *Don't* and *won't* shudd rime with *bond*, short *o*, so the solution wudd be *do'nt* and *wont*, now that *do* is pronouned like in *dough/doe*, *wo* like in *woe*, But thats not TO, all the uther *n't's* dont need the apostrofy, and tu rite *dont* u hav tu pres 4 kees on the kebord, tu rite do'nt u need 7. So we can uze thoes optional spelings only, *dont* and *wont*.

The fonim word-list

pen, coppy, happen, bak, bubbal, job, te, tite, butten, sitty, beter, day, ladder, od, ke, cok, scool, get, giggal, goest, cherch, mach, natur, jul, aje, soldur, fat, coffy, ruf, fizzix, vew, hevy, moov, thing, auther, path, this, uther, smooth, soon, sees, sister, zeero, zone, rozes, buz, ship, shor/shoor, station, plesur, vision, hot, hol, behynd, mor, hammer, sum, nise, no, funny, sun, ring, long, thanx, sung, lite, vally, feel, rite, sorry, arainj, yet, uze, buty, wet, wun, wen, queen, kit, bid, him, dres, bed, trap, bad, lot, od, wash, strut, bud, luv, futt, gudd, putt, flees, se, masheen, fase, day, streek (stake?), prise, hy, try, chois, boy, goos, tu, blu, gote, sho, no, cold, mouth, now, neer, heer, seerius, squair, fair, vairius, start, father, lot, od, thaut, law, north, war, fors, for, cure, por/poor, jury, ners, ster, currege, happy, radiation, glorius, about, comma, commen, innfluens, situation, annual, intennd, basic, stimmulus, educate.

The Star

It was on the ferst day of the new yeer that the anounsment was made, almoest simultaneusly from thre obzervatris, that the motion of the plannet Neptune, the outermoest of all the plannets that weel about the sun, had becum very irattic. A retardation in its vilosity had been suspeccted in disember. Then a faint, remote spek of lite was discuvverd in the reegion of the perterrbd plannet. At ferst this didnt cauz eny very grate ixitement. Syentiffic peepal, however, found the intellijens remarcable inuf, eeven befor it became noen that the new boddy was rappidly groing larjer and briter, and that its motion was quite difrent from the orderly proegres of the plannets...

Britten wen yung

We may nowadais be chairy about uzing the word "jeenius", but we stil hav a gudd ydea wat is ment by. For ixampal, thair ar grate numbers of very gifted musicians hu ar admired but not cald jeeniuses. But thair ar uthers, mannifestly prodijjus, performing offen at ixtrordinrily erly ajes, a variety of feets so complex that the laiman cudd hardly imajjin, eeven with the moest desprate laber, acomplishing eny of them, wile eeven muzicians ar astonnishd: and we then reech for the gudd, handy, vage inlitenment word and call them jeeniuses. The list includes Mozart and Mendelsssohn; and, dispite all the limmiting jujments, it includes Benjamin Britten.

Ode tu a nitingale

My hart akes, and a drouzy numnes panes My sens, az tho of hemlok i had drunk, Or emtid sum dul opiot tu the dranes Wun minnet past, and Lethe-werds had sunk,. "Tis not thru envy of thy happy lot, But being tu happy in thine happiness That thow, lite-wingd Dryad of the trees, In sum milodius plot Of beechen green, and shaddos numbedes, Singest of summer in full-throted eez.

Fuzzy-opake orthograffical vision

Thair was a por boy cuddnt spel Haf the words in our langwege tu wel. His teechers thaut: "Brane-sik!" Mum and Dad hoped: "Dislexic?" Yet the chyld rashly jeerd: "Wat the hel!"

I wish all the reeders happy eester, crismus or watever is neer wen this PV is publishd.

©The author and the Simplified Spelling Society.