

Chaptr 5

CAPITL LETRS & APOSTROFES

The significant features of a writing system based on the Roman alphabet are not confined to the choice of letters used in the spelling of words. While considering how spellings may be simplified, it is therefore worth also looking at non-alphabetic features, to see if they too could be helpfully simplified. We shall here consider those features that can be seen as part of the spelling system, inasmuch as they belong to the written forms of individual words: firstly capital letters, and secondly apostrophes. Both are found difficult to master by learners and are frequently misused in TO. We shall not be considering any simplifications to those non-alphabetic features of the English writing system that relate to larger segments of written language, namely capitalization at the beginning of sentences and quotations, nor punctuation marks indicating the structure of sentences.

1 Capital letters

1.1 Forms and conventions The Roman alphabet has two separate forms for each of its letters, a smaller, lower case form and a larger, upper case form. These are sometimes just smaller and larger versions of the same letter shape (for instance c/C, o/O), but they sometimes differ markedly (for instance f/F, m/M), and sometimes they do not have any obvious resemblance to each other at all (for instance a/A, g/G). Their importance for the orthography is that there are often strict conventions or rules for the use of the smaller or larger forms in formal writing in any particular language. Languages that use the Roman alphabet normally begin sentences with capital letters, but vary in their conventions for using them in headings and particular types of word. A peculiarity in English is the use of upper case for the first person singular pronoun, *I* (never *i*), and it would perhaps be a useful simplification (especially for keyboard operators) to write it as *i* instead. However, the use of upper case *I* causes little confusion, and CS considers that the disturbance of the change would outweigh its advantages and so does not recommend it.

1.2 Capitals for proper names It is a near-universal convention that proper names, notably the names of individual places, people and organizations, should be written with capital letters in the Roman alphabet. Some organizations, however, prefer to use small letters for their names, usually to give themselves a more distinctive graphic image in the public eye (*British Home Stores* has for instance adopted the acronym *BhS*), or for other reasons (the Initial Teaching

Alphabet uses th acronym *i.t.a.* rather than *I.T.A.*, because that alfabet itself laks distinctiv shapes for upr case lettrs). No chanje in this aplication of capitl lettrs to propr names is proposed for CS, partly because propr names wud somtimes othrwis hav th same spelng as ordnry words and it is probbly useful to maintain a clear visul distinction.

1.3 Uncertnty in use of capitls: *North/north* It is th othr uses of capitl lettrs in English wich cause dificlty. They ar conventionly used in TO for languajs (*English, French, German*, etc) and nativs of cuntris and places (*American, Englishwoman, Mancunian, Scotsman, Spaniard*, etc), for certn points or periods in time such as days of th week (*Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday*, etc), months (*January, February, March*, etc) and festivls (*Easter, Whitsun, Christmas*, etc). Capitls ar also somtimes used for seasns (*Spring, Summer, Autumn/Fall, Winter* or *spring, summer, autumn, winter*) and for points of th compass (*North, East, South, West* or *north, east, south, west*). Particulr uncertnty arises wen such words ar used in subsidiry senses: shud we rite *recent presidents* or *recent Presidents of th USA*, *York* or *york ham*, *eau de cologne* or *Cologne*, *French* or *french windows*, a *Dutch* or *dutch auction*, an *April* or *april fool*, *Summer* or *summer holidays*, a *North* or *north wind*, th *Western* or *western world*, a *Southerly* or *southerly direction*? In titles of books, etc, usaj is notably inconsistnt in English: shud we rite *The Origin Of Species* or *The Origin of Species*, or *The Origin of species*, or *The origin of species* — or even *the origin of species*? Som versions of that title may look mor acceptbly familir than othrs, but we canot say categoricly that only one of them is corect.

1.4 Capitlization in othr languajs Not merely is usaj uncertn in many such cases in English, but foren languaj lernrs soon discover that practis varis from one languaj to anothr: French and Jerman distinguish ajectivs of nationality and languajs (ritn with loer case) from persns havng a givn nationality (ritn with upr case): *français/un Français, deutsch/ein Deutscher*; wile Italian and Spanish use only smal lettrs for al these expressions (*italiano, español*); and conventions for capitlization in book titles ar distinctly difrnt in French and Jerman from English. Th romance languajs rite days of th week, months and seasons with smal lettrs (*lundi, lunedì, lunes; janvier, gennaio, enero; printemps, primavera*), wile Jerman givs them al capitls like any othr noun (*Montag, Januar, Frühling*). Not merely dos th riter therfor face uncertnty in English, but familiarity with othr languajs increses th danjer of confusion.

1.5 Capitlization unergnomic As wel as being ofn uncertn in English usaj and prone to confusion thru th influence of othr languajs, th use of capitl letrs entails certn practicl, ergnomic disadvantages. Blok capitls ar not desynd to link with th foloing letr in handriting, th pen havng to be liftd from th paje between each letr; and in creating text by kebord, a shift ke has to be presd specialy in ordr to produce an upr case letr. Not merely do capitls therfor take longr to rite, but th opration of creating them is mor complex and so mor prone to misriting and especialy miskeing.

1.6 Recmendation for CS: capitls only in propr nouns It wud therfor be helpful if th use of capitl letrs in English wer reduced to a minmm, as in som of th romance languajs, and CS proposes they be confined to propr nouns and to titles of office as preferd by th office holdr, and in titles of works of art to th first word and to content words. CS wil then rite th exampls givn in 1.3 abov as folos: *recent presidnts of th USA, Bill Clinton, Presidnt of th USA, english, french, jermn, americon, englishman, mancunian, scotsman, spanird, monday, tuesday, wensday, janury, febry, march, east, witsn, cristmas, spring, sumr, autm/fal, wintr, north, east, south, west, york ham, au de colone, french leve, a duch auction, an april fool, sumr holidays, a north wind, th westrn world, a suthrly direction, Th Orijn of Speces.*

2 Apostrofes

2.1 Punctuation marks Riting in languajs that use th roman alfabet involvs punctuation marks, especialy to sho th structur of sentnces. In english ther ar quite strict and fairly clear rules for ful stops, question marks and quotation marks (wich may be singl or dubl); but th use of commas, colons, semicolons, dashes and exclmation marks is left larjly to th discretion of th riter. Since CS is concernd almost entirely with individul words, it makes no recmendations for th simplifyd use of th abov punctuation marks.

2.2 Non-alfabetic marks on words Individul words in TO also somtimes require certn marks in adition to th letrs that constitute ther basic spelng. One categry, found especialy in foren loan words as in *élite, mêlée, façade*, ar th diacritics or accents wich serv to mark individul letrs; CS jenrly prefers to omit them insofar as they ar not esential indicators of pronunciation in english; but they wil not be furthr discusd here. Of mor

immediat concern is a secnd categry: that of hyfns and apostrofes wich mark hole words rathr than singl lettrs. Since neithr hyfns nor apostrofes relate to pronounciation, ther corect use involvs mor sofisticated analysis of linguistic structurrs than do th sound-symbll corespondnces of a good spelng systm, and it is therfor not surprising that they shud be surroundd by much uncertnty and err. In jenrl terms, CS wud try to discouraj ther use, as both hyfns and apostrofes complicate th riting process, and al complication is undesirebl. Th hyfn has only ocasionly been referd to in previus chaptrs, notebly in conection with its role in seprating repeatd lettrs on eithr side of morfeme boundris (se Rule 3, §5.2.1.LL, for *sleepless/steepless*, *preen/pre-empt*), and it wil not be furthr discusd here, as its aplication is fairly flexibl, and its misuse rarely attracts th severe disfavor comnly ocasiond by th rong use of lettrs.

2.3 Apostrofes redundnt because problmatic? Th apostrofe on th othr hand has in theory been subject to strict rules in th twentieth century, and its misuse is usuly regardd by skild riters as a serius mistake demnstrating shameful ignrnce of gramaticl structurrs. Yet in practis its use ofn deviates in varius ways from wat th rules apear to require. Individul riters ofn fail to aply th rules proprly: they may omit an apostrofe wen it shud be presnt (**shouldnt*, **womans*), or else insert it wen it shud be absnt (**8 apple's*, **8 apples'*), or else rite it in th rong position (**Johns'*, **childrens'*, **should'nt*). Furthrmor, th apostrofe is incresingly omitd with aparent authority in public contexts wher it myt hav been expectd, as in names of businesses (*Barclays Bank*), and misused on public notices (eg, th so-cald 'greengrocer's apostrofe' employd as a plural markr) much as it is in privat riting. It is also ofn unclear wen th rules require an apostrofe and wen not: thus it is in many cases posbl to anlyz a word eithr as an ajectiv not requiring an apostrofe (we may rite *boys room* by analojoy with *livng room*) or as a posessiv wich requires one (we may rite *boy's room* by analojoy with *John's room*). We may even perceve a difrnce of meanng between *the boys' home* (stress on *home*, meanng wher certn boys hav ther home) and *the boys home* (stress on *boys*, meanng an institution wher boys liv seprately from ther parents). Finaly, ther ar certn fixd expressions, such as *for pity's sake*, wher th user may be unaware of th posessiv sense, and rite *for pities sake* or even *for pity sake*.

In vew of al these difictis, it is somtimes sujstjd that th apostrofe wud be betr abandnd altogethr in english: jenrly, it may be felt to cause mor trubl than it is worth; syclojicly, it may be thot that, if so many people make

mistakes over it, it must be superfluous; and semantically, it may be claimed that, since we understand speech which has no apostrophes, it must ipso facto be redundant in writing too. Although redundancy in speech (which has certain communicative powers such as intonation and gesture which are absent in writing) cannot be simply equated with redundancy in writing, CS is naturally sympathetic to calls for the apostrophe to be omitted, though cautious about recommending its complete abolition. The criterion for deciding whether an apostrophe is redundant in writing must be whether the resulting form gives rise to misleading ambiguity (ambiguity is not always misleading), and the various uses of the apostrophe must be examined in that light.

2.4 Apostrophes indicating omission The use of the apostrophe to indicate omission has the longest pedigree, going back to the practice of so marking the many abbreviations in medieval scribal writing. The apostrophe can be used fairly freely in modern English for this purpose, indicating missing letters (*bo's'n* for *boatswain*, though this can also be written *bosun*), or missing syllables (*'bus*, *'phone* for *omnibus*, *telephone*, though the forms *bus*, *phone* without apostrophe have by the second half of the 20th century effectively achieved the status of full, standard spellings; inconsistently, the form *pram*, short for *perambulator*, has never been written with apostrophes). It can also be used to show defective pronunciation (as in infant speech *'bout* for *about*), and in a paradoxical sense one may perhaps say that in those cases the apostrophe *is* reflected in the pronunciation. Altogether these apostrophes may be judged to serve a useful purpose, and CS sees no reason why their free use in this way should cease.

Elsewhere the use of the omission-apostrophe has become fossilized as a rigid convention, although modern users are mostly unaware that an omission has taken place, as is the case with the everyday TO form *o'clock* (originally *'of the clock*'). Since it serves no purpose in modern English, it is omitted in CS, which writes *oclock*. A good analogy for this dropped apostrophe is the TO form *goodbye*, which has no apostrophes, although historically it is a contracted form of *God be with ye*. We may perhaps generalize from this and say that apostrophes should not be written if they are only historical.

2.4.1 Confusing patterns of apostrophe: *hadn't*, *he'd* In addition to these individual abbreviations with (sometimes optional) apostrophes, there are two important word-patterns which are correctly always written with apostrophes in TO, and which create confusion because their graphotactic patterns differ in a rather subtle way. One pattern is the negative contraction of the type ending in TO N'T, such as *hadn't*, and the other is the pronoun-verb contraction of the type TO *he'd*. Both patterns involve the joining of two separate words (*had* + *not*, *he* + *had*, or alternatively *he* + *would*) as well as the omission of one or more

letrs (O from *hadnot*, HA from *hehad*, WOUL from *hewould*). In both patrns th apostrofe stands for th omitd letr(s), but in th *he'd* patrnr, it also marks th word boundry (between *he* and [*ha*]/*d* or [*woul*]/*d*), wheras in th negativ contractions it dos not, and th word-boundry lies unmarkd befor th N of *hadn't*. Rriters then ofn make th mistake of regardng th apostrofe as only a word-boundry markr and aply it in that function to TO *hadn't* to produce th form **had'nt*. Such confusion is no dout encourajd by th fact that in *can't*, *shan't* th furthr omission of NN, LL from *cannot*, *shall not* is not indicated by an apostrofe.

2.4.2 Cutng apostrofe from th *hadn't* patrnr If words of th TO *hadn't* patrnr containd no apostrofe, not merely wud th spelng be mor economicl, but such confusion wud not ocur. George Bernard Shaw pointd th way by omitng th apostrofe from that patrnr on principl (riting *hadnt*). Most *hadn't* typ contractions ar in no way ambiguus without ther apostrofe, and CS can therfor rite *arnt*, *cudnt* (from TO *couldn't*), *darent*, *didnt*, *dont*, *dosnt* (from TO *doesn't*), *hadnt*, *hasnt*, *havnt* (from TO *haven't*), *maynt*, *mynt* (from TO *mighnt*), *neednt*, *otnt* (from TO *oughtn't*), *shant*, *shudnt* (from TO *shouldn't*), *wasnt*, *wernt*, *wudnt* (from TO *wouldn't*). Ther ar in addition two cases wher omission of th apostrofe givs rise to som ambiguity. TO *won't* is a homofone of TO *wont* (meanng 'custm'), but removing th apostrofe creates no mor ambiguity than arises in speech, and th context clarifys th distinct meanngs even in such a fabricated sentnce as th foloing: *it's not my wont, so I wont*. Marjnly mor awkwrdr is TO *can't*, CS *cant*, since in a suthrn english accent TO *can't* is pronounced difrntly from TO *cant*; but even for speakrs of that accent th danjer of misundrstandng is slyt (again, th context clarifys such a statemnt as *I cant stand cant*). CS therfor also omits th apostrofe from both these words, riting *cant*, *wont*. Incidentally, *won't* (as wel as *can't*, *shan't*) dos mor than just omit th letr O from *not* (*withnøt*), and these forms can therfor be taken as modls to justify furthr cutng th silent medial T from TO *mustn't* to giv CS *musnt*.

2.4.3 Joind pronoun + verb keep apostrofe (*he'd*) Th secnd importnt group of letr omissions indicated by apostrofes in TO consists of th pronoun-verb contractions of th typ *he'd*. Th main exampls ar: *I'm*, *he's*, *she's*, *it's*, *who's*, *there's*, *we're*, *you're*, *they're*, *who're*, *I've*, *we've*, *you've*, *they've*, *I'll*, *he'll*, *she'll*, *we'll*, *you'll*, *they'll*, *who'll*, *I'd*, *he'd*, *she'd*, *we'd*, *you'd*, *they'd*, *who'd*. It wil be noticed that in forms endng in -'D (*I'd*, *he'd*, *you'd*, etc) th apostrofe may stand for eithr th HA in *had* or for th WOUL in *would*; and in forms endng in -'S (*he's*, *it's*, *there's*, etc) th apostrofe may stand for eithr th I in *is* or for th HA in *has*. A somwat difrnt structur is th contraction *let's*, wich consists of th reverse sequence, verb + pronoun (ie, *let us*), but th foloing remarks aply equaly to al cases listd in this section. In th pronoun + verb contractions a pronoun is joind to th truncated end of a foloing auxiliary verb, th truncation (and word-boundry) being indicated by th apostrofe. Som of these forms ar ofn confused in TO with a homofone wich dos not hav an apostrofe, TO *whose*,

their/there for instnce being ritn for *who's, they're*; confusion of *it's/its* is particulrly comn. Howevr, norml CS procedurs canot overcom these problms of homofone-confusion, and indeed removal of th apostrofes in these forms, especialy if combined with disapearance of any space between th two elemnts, wud produce even mor serius ambiguity. It myt not matr if *it's/its* wer ritn identicly since they ar homofones (se §2.4.4 belo for discussion of this posibility), but merjd spelngs for th othrs (listd belo) cud hardly be acceptbl, since they wud represent two difrntly pronounced words and so conflict with th basic principl of good spelng, that sounds and symbls shud relate predictbly to each othr. Such unacceptbl merjrs wud arise as folos: TO *who're/whore* as **hor*; TO *he'll/hell* as **hel*; TO *she'll/shell* as **shel*; TO *we'll/well* as **wel*; TO *he'd/head* as **hed*; TO *she'd/shed* as **shed*; TO *we'd/wed* as **wed*; TO *who'd/hod* as **hod*. Th simplst solution in these cases is for CS to leve th apostrofe uncut in such contractions.

2.4.4 Shud TO *it's* be cut to CS *its*? An exeption cud posbly be made in th case of *it's*, wich myt lose its apostrofe to merj with th possessiv ajectiv or pronoun *its*. A numbr of considrations need to be taken into acount. First, ther ar som argumnts in favor of keepng th apostrofe:

1 Th two forms *it's/its* indicate a significant distinction of meanng and structur, wich it is perhaps useful to indicate by difrnt ritn forms.

2 If th contractions *he's, she's* keep ther apostrofe in CS, and th possessivs *hers, ours,* etc do not hav one, then th respectiv paralel forms of th contraction *it's* and th possessiv *its* shud perhaps folo those patrn for th sake of morfemic consistncy.

3 If (as proposed in §2.5.2 belo) most possessivs ar ritn without an apostrofe in CS, th use of apostrofes jenrly wil be gretly simplfyd, and users wil then be less likely to confuse th forms *it's/its*.

But th foloing argumnts may be brot against retention of th apostrofe in *it's*:

1 Since riters so frequently confuse *it's/its*, th distinction between them can hav no deep syclojicl reality, and a user-frendly riting systm shud then feel no need to spel them difrntly.

2 Th distinction is undrstood in speech from th context, and th context must therfor be suficient in riting to prevent misundrstandng.

3 TO has no compunction in concealng th difrnt meanngs of *it has/it is* in *it's* (*it is* in *it's raining*, but *it has* in *it's stopped raining*), and therfor CS need hav no compunction about concealng th difrnt meanngs of *it's/its*.

Altho these argumnts ar numericly evenly balanced, it is felt that CS shud continu to sho th difrnce of meanng and word structur indicated by th apostrofe in TO.

2.5 Th possessiv apostrofe

In gramatiel terms, TO may be said to indicate singulr possessivs by insertng an apostrofe befor th possessiv S (*the dog's kennel*), and plural possessivs by adng an apostrofe aftr th plural S (*the dogs' kennels*), but with complications wen th base-word alredy ends in S. Posbly simplr is th non-

gramaticl definition, wich merely says: to indicate possession, ad 'S, unless th word alredy ends in S (that covrs plural S and othr S endngs), in wich case just ad apostrofe.

2.5.1 Confusion over th possessiv apostrofe Confusion over th use of th possessiv apostrofe is endemic. Firstly, since no difrnce is herd between th pronunciation of *dog's*, *dogs'*, and th non-possessiv plural *dogs*, pronunciation is no gide to th need for an apostrofe in th ritn form, or to its position. Th use of possessiv apostrofe is furthr complicated by variations in position that do not acord with th norml rule; for exampl, irregulr plurals not endng in S form ther possessivs by adng 'S (eg, *men's*, *women's*, *children's*; in othr words, these plurals behave like singulrs); and conversly, singulrs hos base form ends in S may form ther possessivs by adng ' aftr th S (*Achilles'*, *Erasmus'*; in othr words, these singulrs behave like plurals; but such possessivs ar ofn also ritn with apostrofe + S: *Erasmus's*). Possessiv pronouns behave even mor inconsistntly: most do not use apostrofe at al (*hers*, *its*, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*), but *one's* dos so, wile *whose* ads a final E insted (wich is cut by CS Rule 1, E.1.1.13, givng th final CS form *hos*). Th ultmat complication ocurs wen a title endng in S requires both quotation marks and an apostrofe: Fowler's *Modern English Usage* spends a paragraf reslng with th best position for th apostrofe in th frase "*in the 'Times's opinion*", but virtuly confesses itself defeatd.

A furthr complication arises from a tendncy, wich was mor prevlnt in erlir centuris, to insert an apostrofe befor a plural S. It is stil comn, and indeed not adversely comentd on, for abreviations and numerals such as *MP's*, *the 1960's* to apear in TO with th apostrofe efectivly servng as a plural markr. On th othr hand, th analogous 'greengrocer's apostrofe', used indiscrimnatly as a jenrl markr of plurals as in *apple's*, *pears'* (or *apples'*, *pear's*) is considrd strictly ungramaticl.

In vew of th jenrl complexity of th rules and patrn for th possessiv apostrofe in TO, it is not at al surprising that it shud be frequently misused.

2.5.2 Cutng th possessiv apostrofe Clearly, if no possessiv apostrofes wer used, they cud nevr be misused. How far can CS then remove them without introducing unacceptbl ambiguity? As alredy observd, it is somtimes argud that since apostrofes ar not reflectd in pronunciation, they cannot be needd in riting eithr. CS deals with th specific patrn as folos:

1) Th simplst cut, wich CS can imediatly make, is to alyn *one's* with th othr pronouns, givng *ones*, *hers*, *ours*, *yrs*, *thers*, *hos*.

2) CS can cut th apostrofe from irregulr plurals, since ther ar no othr -S forms with wich such plurals cud be confused: CS *childrens*, *mens*, *womens* can only be possessiv.

3) If possessivs ad -S without apostrofe in CS, they wil normly be distinguishd from ordnry plural S-forms by th context. Thus, in th frase *th dogs kenl*, th sequence of two nouns, *dogs* + *kenl*, th first with final S, can only be construd as indicating possession. Nevrtless, potential minor

ambiguitis may arise. One is no mor than th ambiguity inherent in speech, wen CS *th dogs kenl* dos not indicate wethr one dog or mor is involvd (contrast TO *the dog's kennel, the dogs' kennel*, wich ar explicit on this point). Anothr ambiguity can theoreticly arise wen th form of th foloing noun coincides with that of a verb. Thus if th apostrofe is removed from TO *we saw the ship's sail* to giv *we saw th ships sail*; only th brodr context can tel us wethr we saw *th sail of th ship* or *th ships sailng*. Th frase *th parents reply* even harbrs a tripl ambiguity, as between *th parents ar replyng, th reply of th parent* and *th reply of th parents*, tho even in these cases we may expect th wider context to clarify th intendd meanng (ther is no ambiguity between *th parents reply was imediat* and *evry year th parents reply imediatly*). Altogethr, it apears that CS can unproblmaticly abandn th apostrofe at least for singlr possessivs, th complications of its abandnmnt from th plural possessiv -S' too being furthr discusd undr §5 belo.

4) With no singlr possessiv apostrofe, uncertnty about th possessiv forms of words with a base form endng in S is also removed: they ar simply ritn as pronounced. CS can rite *Achiles heel, Erasmus works, in 'Th Times' opinion*; but -ES can be add if th riter wshs th word to be so pronounced: *Achileses, Erasmuses, 'Th Times'es*. No ambiguity arises with th form *th bosses dautr* (TO *the boss's daughter*), but, as discusd next, *th bosses dautrs* cud represent eithr *the boss's daughters* or *the bosses' daughters* in TO.

5) Th loss of grafic distinctions between th TO singlr possessiv suffix -'S and th TO plural possessiv -S' wud admtdly make CS marjnly less explicit than TO. If we rite *th dogs kenls*, it is unclear wethr one dog with mor than one kenl, or mor than one dog, each with its own kenl(s), is ment (TO dos not, of corse, provide th ultmat in gramaticl infrmation by indicating how many kenls each dog has, and we may conclude that precision about how many dogs ar involvd is equally superfluous). Since th ambiguity between singlr and plural possessivs is also presnt in speech, we may say that it is to that extent inherent in th gramr of english. A conservativ aproach myt say that, altho singlr possessiv apostrofes ar redundnt in CS, an apostrofe may be placed aftr th plural inflection -S in possessivs wher th riter wshs to ensure ther is no confusion between singlr and plural. We cud then normly asume from th context that *th dogs kenl* implys one dog, and *th dogs kenls* implys mor than one dog, but th apostrofe in *th dogs' kenl* wud imply a singl kenl shared by mor than one dog (we myt fancifuly anlyz th apostrofe as standng for an omitd possessiv -ES, as tho ther wer a ful, explicit plural possessiv form *dogses!*). Howevr, since such a device wud be needd so rarely, it myt wel lead to as much confusion as exists in TO. Lawyrs tend to be particulrly worrid about th danjers of ambiguity (tho ther dislike of commas belies such fears), warnng of disputes that myt arise if a wil, for instnce, did not distinguish *her grandson's inheritance* from *her grandsons' inheritance*. (Incidently, we may note that no ambiguity between singlr and plural possessivs arises even in CS with nouns endng in Y, pronounced as in *pity*: *th cuntrys bordrs* ar th bordrs of one cuntry, wile *th cuntris bordrs* ar th bordrs of mor than one

cuntry.) Howevr, much clearr than bothrng with apostrofes in these cases wud be to reword th statemnt to make th singulr or plural explicit by insertng *of*. So, in rare cases wher th distinction was esential, we myt say: *th kenls of th dog(s)*, *th dautrs of th boss(es)*, *th inheritnce of th grandson(s)*; furthr clarification cud be ached by insertng *each*, thus *th kenl of each dog*, *th dautr(s) of each boss*, *th inheritnce of each grandson*. Such formulations wud be unambiguous both in speech and in riting. (We may note that th romance languajs hav resortd to precisely this device, foloing th loss of th orijnl latn possessiv endngs: thus latn *filius*, *filii* [= son, sons] merj as *fil*s in french, and wher latn had *filii*, *filiorum* [= son's, sons'], french has to say *du fils*, *des fils* [= of th son, of th sons]). In most cases abslute non-ambiguity wud be as unecesry in riting as in speech, and ther shud be no real problm about acceptng som marjnl ambiguity of singulr and plural possessivs.

- Insofar as th possessiv apostrofe has been shown to be redundnt, it can therfor be dispensd with in CS.

Table 5 outlines difrnt patrn of apostrofe omission in CS.

Table 5: Cutng apostrofes in CS

Category	TO	CS
Historicl apostrofe	o'clock, 'bus, 'phone	oclok, bus, fone
Alternativ without apostrofe	bo's'n	bosun
Pronouns	hers, its, one's, whose	hers, its, ones, hos
Negativ contraction	shouldn't, mustn't	shudnt, musnt
Joind pronoun + verb	<i>he'd, she'll, they're, you've, let's, it's</i>	<i>he'd, she'l, they'r, u'v, let's, it's</i>
Plural apostrofe	MP's, 1960's, *apple's	MPs, 1960s, apls
Singulr possessiv	<i>John's, dog's, grandson's, country's</i>	<i>Jons, dogs, grandsons, cuntrys</i>
Singulr endng in -S	<i>Achilles', Achilles's, Erasmus', Erasmus's, 'The Times's' opinion, boss's</i>	<i>Achiles, Achileses, Erasmus, Erasmuses, 'Th Times' opinion, bosses</i>
Iregulr plural possessiv	<i>children's, men's, women's, countries'</i>	<i>childrens, mens, womens, cuntris</i>
Regulr plural possessiv	<i>the dogs' kennel(s), the grandsons' inheritance, the bosses' daughters</i>	<i>th kenl(s) of th dogs, th inheritnce of th grandsons, th dautrs of th bosses</i>

3 Riting numbrs as numerals

Amongst th most aberant of TO spelngs ar th numbrs *one*, *two*, *four*. It is felt that, in vew of th importnce of th corect undrstandng of numbrs for purposes of practicl comunication, no risk shud be taken of causing confusion by cutng, say, *two*, *four* to th form of th comn prepositions, *to* and *for* (this point was discusd undr Rule 1, U.3.3 and W.2; TO *fourteen*, howevr, alyns with *forty* as CS *forteen*.) On th othr hand, th aberant spelngs cud be avoidd by normly riting such words numericly as *1*, *2*, *3*, *4*, etc, rathr than alfabeticly; and for th sake of consistncy and econmy, this practis cud be adoptd for al numerals. A problm dos, howevr, then arise with special alfabetic or gramaticl uses of numerals: shud th pronoun *one* be ritn as a numeral? shud TO *twosome* be ritn as CS *2-sm*? CS prefers to er on th side of caution in these cases, and keeps to th TO forms. Se Chapter 6 §1.5 for discussion of th posbility of respelng *one*, *two* as **wn*, **tw*.