

Chaptr 6

GOING BEYOND CS — AND STOPNG SHORT

1 GOING BEYOND CS

1.1 Historicl evlution

All languajs chanje in th corse of time, most obviusly in ther pronunciation and vocablry, but also in ther gramr. If th riting system one is most familiar with shos litl syn of chanjing, it may be less obvius that riting systems also do so. Som systems, howevr, hav actuly becom extinct because they cesed to be fitd to ther purpos (eg, hiroglyphics and cuniform), and th alfabet itself has stedily evolvd thru th milenia, adaptng to difrnt languajs, adng and losing letrs and diacritics, and chanjing letr shapes to suit new tecnolojis, from th quill pen to th computer. Simlrly, evlution takes place within th riting systems of individul languajs, somtimes pland and far-reachng, but somtimes, as in th case of english, haphazrd and inconsequential. Failur to modrnize over a long period inevitbly leads to difictis for lernrs and users. If, as in english today, ther is dissatisfaction with a riting system, th idea may arise that a singl reform cud permnntly and totaly rectify its defects. This must ultmatly be an ilusion, both because futur chanje in th languaj wil one day rendr even th best desynd reform obsolete, and because, especialy in english, th alfabet is such a crude system that it canot posbly do ful justice to th representation of all th sutltis of th spoken languaj and its many rejonl variations. And so CS is to be seen not as a permnnt cure for all th ils of TO, but merely as a tidying up excrcise apropriat to th end of th 20th century, and a stajc in th unendng process of natrl chanje that in ritn english has been blokd for too long.

1.2 Lookng beyond CS

CS has impermnnce bilt into it. It is a concept for th practical improvemnt of ritn english within th self-imposed limit of mainly just removing letrs, few letrs not alrely containd in th TO form of words being substituted. This limit is imposed because to go beyond it wud entail problms (such as determng a standrd pronunciation) wich ar far mor complex than th simpl process of eliminating redundnt letrs, and because a mor far-reachng reform wud take CS beyond wat is likely to be publicly acceptbl. But implicit in these limits to CS is also th recognition that ther ar many confusing featur of TO wich idealy need rationlizing and wich th rules of CS do not tuch. Th first part of this chaptr examns furthr simplifications wich cud folo lojicly on from CS as proposed in th preceding chaptrs, in othr words furthr

reforms that myt subsequently be envisajd aftr CS had becom establishd. It wil be observd that som of th chanjes discussd begin with modest substitutions to remove notorius bugbers of TO, but then go furthr to sujet much mor sweepng, revlutionry chanjes that afect th apearance of ritn english far mor profoundly. Chanjes of th latr kind, it is presumed, ar too radicl to be considrd for erly introduction.

We may here mention a new reform proposal, *LOJIKON* (Deodhekar, 1995), wich, as a first-staje reform, confines itself to th regulrization of consnnt-splngs, because th consnnts of english ar far esir to regulrize than th vowls. Many of its chanjes coincide with those of CS (eg, silent consnnts ar dropd, GH/PH becom F, DG becoms J), but it gos on to takl it th ‘siblnt syndrome’ and related problms, as discussd in §1.3.1, §1.3.2, & §1.4 belo.

1.3 Substitutions that save letrs

As mentiond in sevrl contexts in Chaptrs 3 and 4, ther ar som letr-substitutions wich cud be made to TO wich both regulrize and shortn th splng of words, but ar excluded from CS partly because, unlike th thre substitutions discussd in Chaptr 4, ther efect on th apearance of words is rathr radicl and partly because they involv aditionl complications.

1.3.1 CH > K: *chemist* > *kemist* As determnd by CS Rule 1, H.2.1, ‘greek’ CH as in TO *chaos* loses th silent H, leving CS *caos*. Howevr, since th letr C is normly soft in english befor th front vowls E, I, Y, this CH (pronounced /k/) canot lose its H in CS if it is folod by any of those vowl letrs. Therfor *chemist*, *architect*, *monrchy*, for instnce, keep ther H in CS to indicate th hard valu of th C (altho TO *monarch* is cut to CS *monrc*). Simlr considrations aply to italian loans, as in, for instnce, *chianti*, *chiaroscuro*, wher th H also indicates a preceding hard C. This disparity between a CH that can be cut in CS, and one that canot altho it has th same pronunciation, is unsatisfactory and cud be resolvd by riting K for this CH befor E, I, Y. This wud giv *kemist* (cf swedish *kemist*), *arkitect* (cf danish, norwejan, swedish *arkitekt*), *monrky*, *kiascuro*, *kianti*, wich ar incidently also mor economi splngs. Lojicly th C in CS *monrc* shud then also becom K, in ord to mach *monrky*, tho removal of this C/K discrepncy myt seem to hav lo priority wen seen beside such C/K discrepncis in TO as *joke/jocular*, *provoke/provocation*, *panic/panicking*, *autarchy/autarky*, etc. As wel as regulrizing such words of greek and italian derivation, th abov CH > K substitutions cud also remove th modrn anomly of *ache*, by restornng th erlir form *ake* (as used in erly editions of Shakespear).

Such CH > K substitutions ar not made in CS, because th splngs *kemist*, *kianti*, *ake*, etc ar thot to apear too difrnt from TO for th jenrly cautius first staje reform wich CS trys to be. Furthrmor, th cirmstnces in wich th substitution wud be made ar not entirely simpl to identify: it is far from

evry CH that wud be chanjed to K, and far from evry ocurence of th sound /k/ that wud be respelt as K (contrast th simplicity of th CS substitution of G > J, wich aplys evrywher that G is pronounced soft).

If one looks beyond this limitd CH > K substitution, one can imajn th ideal, ultmat solution for th confusion of symbols used for th sound /k/ in TO, wich can rite it with C or K or CK or Q or contain it within X, as in *tic, trek, tack, plaque, fox*. That ideal solution wud be always to spel th sound /k/ as K, wherevr it ocurs, so givng *tik, trek, tak, plak, foks* and overcoming th discrepnky between TO *cat/kitten* by riting *kat/kitn*. Such a procedur wud then fre th letr C to represent perhaps th sound of SH in *conciencie, suspicion*, etc (se undr Rule 1, C.7 for furthr discussion of this posibility). Such developmnts, howevr, must surely lie beyond th stajc aftr CS.

1.3.2 Yod-asimlacion: -TION > -SHN, etc This topic is discusd here, undr th hedng §1.3 “Substitutions that save letrs”, because th most typicl substitution involvd (-TION > -SHN) produces a mor economicl spelng. Howevr, in many of th words afectd an extra letr is also required to indicate vowl length, in wich case ther may not be any econmy.

Ther ar many words in english wher th consnnts D, S, T, X, Z as wel as soft C, G wer orijnly folod by th semi-vowl sound of Y (cald ‘yod’). In TO this yod is spelt most ofn with an I, but somtimes with U (th yod then being th first elemnt of its sound valu as ‘yoo’) and ocasionally with E. In th corse of time th yod has usuly falen silent, in th process ofn being asimlato with th preceding consnt, hos pronounciation was therby chanjed. Yod-asimlacion is alredy exploitd in CS, wher J is substituted for soft G folod by yod-asimlato E or I, as in *pageant, pigeon, dudgeon, religion*; in CS these ar straitforwrdly reduced by G > J substitution to *pajnt, pijn, dujn, relijn*. In ordr to minimize substitution patrn, CS did not aply this J to yod-asimlacion with D, as in *soldier, verdure*, wich wer simply cut to CS *soldir, verdur*, altho ther is an argumnt for respelng them with J too, as **soljr, *verjrr*.

Howevr, by far th larjst area of yod-asimlacion in TO was not tuchd by CS at al, partly because th necesry letr-substitutions wud hav afectd th apearance of text too radicly, and partly because of problms that wud hav arisen in consequence. This is th area involvng th letrs C, S, SS, T, wher th posibility of substituting SH for th strings CI, CE, SI, SSI, TI wil now be explord. Asociato with these patrn of yod-asimlacion ar also strings involvng SU, TU, XI, XU, ZU, altho in these cases simpl substitution by SH wud not be apropiat.

We se yod-asimlacion with I in th foloing widespred TO patrn aftr a short vowl: with C + I in words like CS *financial, special, comercial, coercion, ofical, suspicion, conciencie, concius, delicias*; with a consnt befor S + I in words like *compulsion, pension, version*; with SS + I in *passion, session, fission, concussion*; and with T + I in words like *ration, discretion, inertia, initial, ignition, vitiato*. Th SH substitution wich cud regulrize th spelng of these words with a preceding short vowl (ofn aplyng CS Rule 2 to giv *speshl, rashn*, etc) can also aply aftr a long vowl, but ther

ar consequences for th spelng of th long vowl wich wil be discusd later; exampls of words displayng yod-asimlacion aftr a long vowl ar CS *facial*, *spatial*, *ancient*, *patient*, *nation*, *completion*, *specius*, *ocen*, *comotion*, *atrocious*, *crucial*, *ablution*.

CS Rule 2 created forms such as *bushl*, *fashn*, *freshr*, but it cud not alyn th rymng yod-asimlacion words with these patrn because of th extra letr-changes required. If SH wer now substituted in words of th typ *special*, *pension*, *inertia*, etc, such words cud be alynd, not merely with th abov CS forms, but with each othr, so removing th hyly confusing, non-fonografic and hence err-prone variations between CI, SI, SSI, TI. A massiv harmnization wud be acheved by riting for instnce *finanshl*, *speshl*, *comershl*, *coershn*, *ofishl*, *suspishn*, *conshnce*, *conshus*, *delishus*, *compulshn*, *penshn*, *vershn*, *pashn*, *seshn*, *fishn*, *concushn*, *rashn*, *discreshn*, *inersha*, *inishl*, *ignishn*.

Such spelngs apaar quite disturbng by comparisn with TO, not only because of th letr-substitutions themselvs, but perhaps also because of an unconcius sense that th grafeme SH is mainly apropiat in words of jermanic derivation, but rathr rarely so in french and virtuly nevr in latn derivations; so we ar used to SH in TO *ship*, *fish* and (from french) *fashion*, but it apaaars alien even in words that rym with CS *fashn*, such as *rashn*, *pashn*. Anothr considration wich may inhibit us from making this substitution is that th presnt -ION endngs ar comn to many european languajs, as wen english *ration* apaaars with th same lettrs in french and danish (*ration*) and as *Ration* in jermn, and with only slyt modifications in italian (*razione*) and spanish (*ración*). To substitute *rashn* in english wud therfor tend to undrmne such orthografic harmny as exists between european languajs. We may furthr hesitate to use SH mor jenrly, if, as sujestd at th end of §1.3.1 abov, ther is theoreticly th posibility that th letr C myt eventually becom availbl to represent th sound of SH mor economicly, and, by producing forms like *specl*, *suspicn*, *delicus*, less disturbngly too: it wud scarcely be sensibl first to change TO *special* to *speshl*, only for th C to be restord in a subsequent reform to giv *specl*. We may lastly note that it is not th -ION endng as such that causes problms in english, but rathr th preceding consnt and th vowl befor that, wich giv difrnt spelngs to *ration/passion* and difrnt pronunciations to *ration/nation*.

Th form *nation* exemplifys th furthr problm, previusly mentiond, that wen such endngs hav a preceding long vowl, aditionl complications arise wich, if th necesry fonografic substitutions wer made, wud change th apaaarance of words even mor radicly. If th exampls givn in an erlir paragraf of words containng a preceding long vowl simply hav SH substituted for th asimlaced yod, then th spelng stil fails to sho, as it fails in TO, that th valu of that preceding vowl is not short. For instnce, non-indication, so confusing for foren lernrs, of th difrnt vowl-length in TO/CS *ration/nation*, *nation/nationl*, *discretion/completion* wud not merely be preservd in *rashn/*nashn*, **nashn/nashnl*, *discreshn/*compleshn*, but othr pairs too, hos difrnt vowl-valus ar shown in TO and CS, wud merj: thus

discussion/ablution wud alyn as *discushn*/**ablushn*. Abov al, th 1,000+ words rymng with *nation* wud stil not be distinguishd from *ration* with its short A. (A short-term solution cud howevr be to retain th O aftr a long vowl, so distinguishng *nashon/rashn*.) As explaind in §1.5 belo, th posbl regulrization of long vowls jenrly must be hyly speculativ, but if for th sake of th presnt discussion we asume that long A wud at som futur date be spelt AE, then *nation* and al rymng words wud becom, aftr SH substitution, *naeshn*, and so be clearly distinguishd from *rashn* (or, using C, *naecn/racn*).

An isolated problm is th word *anxious*, wher th yod-asimilation involvs XI. Substituting SH is hardly adequat, as **anshus* dos not convey th ful valu of th X, but a fulr representation such as **ankshus* wud be an even mor disturbng form. How or wethr to retain a paralel spelng with TO *anxiety* is anothr question without an obvius ansr.

Som othr patrn of yod-asimilation ar likewise not adequatly representd by SH. Th strings SU, TU (wher th U was formrly pronounced with an initial yod) may hav a ranje of valu. Typicly, U is pronounced with a preceding yod in english words derived from french, wher it represents an anglicized pronunciation of french frontd U (compare initial yod in english *utilize* with th yodless but frontd valu of U in french *utiliser*, wile th U in jermanic *utter* has a quite difrnt, yodless valu). With a preceding initial S, we find TO *sugar*, *sure* (cf french *sucre*, *sûr*), wich expectionly myt, if we ar prepared to accept th extra lettrs, be ritn *shugr*, *shure*. Elsewher, as in *lesur*, *mesur*, *plesur*, *tresur*, english has retaind th orijnl french voicing of th medial S in th yod-asimilated pronunciation; but SH, being voiceless, wud not represent this. If th disturbnce wer thot acceptbl, th inovatory ‘russian’ grafeme ZH cud com into play here, givng *lezhr* (tho this form dos not represent th long american E), *mezhr*, *plezhr*, *trezhr*. Anothr instnce is th word *casul*, wich myt then be reduced to *cazhl*.

Th fonlojicl efect of yod-asimilation in othr letr strings difrs again. Unlike SU, th string TU is voiceless, but SH wud stil be an inapropriat grafeme to represent th sound: in *fractur*, *lectur*, *pictur*, *ruptur*, etc th digraf wud need to be CH, givng th disturbng form **fracchr* (or **frakchr*), etc. With XU, in *luxury*, *luxurius*, th efect varis once mor; as with *anxious*, th pronunciation chalenjs alfabetic definition: is th XU voiced in both words, or only in one, or in neithr? shud eithr or both of these words be spelt *luksh-* or *lugzh-*?

Over and abov such specific questions of how idealy to spel these yod-asimilations, ther is a mor jenrl uncertnty. As was noted abov, th yod-asimilations hav arisn thru gradul chanjes in pronunciation over a long period of time. Howevr, chanjes of this kind ar stil in progress, and it is not always clear wen they can be regardd as complete. For instnce, th word *negotiate* is comnly herd with yod-asimilation of th TI, but is also somtimes stil pronounced as with /si/ (cf french *négociier*); and in th case of *asume*, we may juj th process of asimilation of th SU to hav just begun, it being only ocasionly pronounced as tho spelt **ashume*. It is thus somtimes unclear wich letr strings myt be betr replaced by SH, CH, ZH, etc, and for wich such a

substitution wud be premature.

Altogethr it can be seen that, howevr problmatic th spelng of th yod-asimilated sounds may be in TO, so many problms atend ther regulrization that a first-staje reform such as CS dos wel not to atemt respelng. It is a caracristic advantaj of CS that, by concentrating on omitng letrs rather than on substitutions, it is able to leve those problms reasuringly unresolvd, for futur jenrations to resl with, if they shud feel it importnt to do so.

1.3.3 I > Y: *climb* > *clym* As noted undr Rule 1, ocasionally a silent letr othr than ‘majic’ E had to be kept in CS because it efectivly also had ‘majic’ function, indicating th long valu of th preceding vowl. Exampls included th B in *climb* (se Rule 1, §B.3) and th C in *indict* (se Rule 1, §C.11), both preceded by an I hos long valu was shown by th silent letr (**clim*, **indit* wud be pronounced with short I). Alredy in Chaptr 4, §5, we saw how th long valu of I in sevr TO patrns was clarifyd by I > Y substitution in CS, as wen TO *high*, *height*, *sign*, *simplified* became CS *hy*, *hyt*, *syn*, *simplifyd*, and th same substitution was considrd for *climb*, *indict* as exeptionl cases. Ful respelng of evry long I by Y has in fact proved th extension to CS wich users hav most strongly cald for. If CS did not go so far as to include th forms *clym*, *indyt*, those spelngs wud undoutdly be erly candidats for th staje afr CS.

This patrn of regulrization cud also be used to sort out th anomly of th dubld consnts wich ar exeptionly retaind in CS *chilld*, *milld*, *willd*, *binnd*, *finnd*, *grinnd* to prevent ambiguity with *child*, *mild*, *wild*, *bind*, *find*, *grind*. As explaind undr Rule 3, §3.1, these dubld consnts can only be simplifyd by th norml CS procedur afr I > Y substitutions hav becom fuly establishd in TO *child*, *mild*, etc, givng *chyld*, *myld*, *wyld*, *bynd*, *fynd*, *grynd*. If these substitutions wer not included in CS itself, ther is a strong case for them to hav priority in watevr reform myt folo CS.

As alredy explaind undr Rule 1, Y.3, and in Chaptr 4, §5, these prolifrating I > Y substitutions representng long I mark a strong trend towards standrdization of that sound-symbll corespondnce in english. This is very much to be welcmd, as th represntation of long vowels is one of th most problmatic aspects of TO left larjly untuchd by CS. Long I is th most comnly ocurng of th long vowl valus in english, and it is fortunat that th letr Y is availbl to represent it. In th longr term, we myt look forwr to a time wen th presnt tripl ambiguity of I and Y (se Rule 1, Y.3: both can represent short I, or long I, or th semi-vowl yod-glide of initial Y in TO) cud be larjly resolvd. Th letr I wud normly represent th short vowl, wile th letr Y wud normly represent eithr th long vowl or th yod-glide — th latr distinction being usuly indicated by th letrs position in a word (normly yod in initial position as in *yes*, and with long valu in final position or befor a consnt as in *hy*, *hyr*, *hyt*).

This use of Y for th long I-sound has a long tradition in english (cf William Blakes poem *The Tyger*) and wud ofr sevr systemic advantajs if introduced as standrd.

- A singl letr for a singl foneme is always less ambiguus than a digraf (considr th ambiguity of IE in *die/diet/alien/brief/friend/sieve*).
- A jenrl I > Y substitution wud enable th ‘majic’ E long-vowl indicator to be removed aftr long I without entailng any furthr substitution, so allowng TO *tribe, side, life, like, pile, lime, line, ripe, fire, site, drive, prize* to be reduced to *tryb, syd, lyf, lyk, pyl, lym, lyn, ryp, fyr, syt, dryv, pryz*.
- That substitution wud also allow words with long I endng in L, M, N, R such as TO/CS *idle, title, item, ripen, trident, tiger* to alyn with norml CS Rule 2 patrn as *ydl, tytl, ytm, rypn, trydnt, tygr*.
- Th inconsistncy of monosylabls such as *die/try/rye* wud be resolvd by spelng al thre words with just Y as *dy/try/ry* (CS *ry* was alrely introduced by Rule 1, E.1.2.5).

Th total substitution of Y for long I wud, howevr, cause such numerus and far-reachng chanjes to th apearance of ritn english as to be considrd too radicl for imediat inclusion in CS. It wud also entail som minor dilemas, such as wich I-vowls shud be deemd long and wich short (wud it be *dilema* or *dylema*, for instnce?), and how to treat th rare cases of pre-vocalic long I (how wud TO *yon/ion* be distinguishd, for instnce?).

1.4 Th siblnt syndrome

As was repeatdly pointd out undr Rule 1, C and S, and undr Rule 3, §2.3 for SS, th represntation and difrentiation of voiceless and voiced siblnts constitute a serius dificlty in TO, wich is furthr compoundd by th asociated patrn of yod-asimlation discusd in §1.3.2 abov. In this section we ar concernd only with th two sounds /s/ and /z/, yet between them they ar comnly spelt in at least five difrnt ways in TO, as C or S or Z or SC or SS, without any of these spelngs relybly indicatng any one pronunciation. Th letr C may stand for th sounds of K and SH, as wel as voiceless /s/. Th letr S may stand for voiceless /s/, or voiced /z/, or SH, or th voiced equivlnt of th latr (ie, ZH). Th letr Z is normly voiced as /z/, but in som foren loans it may stand for /s/ or /ts/ (*blitz, pizza*). Th dubld SS may be voiceless, or voiced, or stand for SH. And SC may stand for /s/, or /sk/, or SH. These ar merely som of th mor comn uses of these lettrs in TO, rarer ocurences such as th C in TO *cello* or Z in TO *Czech* being ignord here.

Th practicl problms these inconsistncis cause ar wel ilustrated by a series of difrnt patrn found in words wich can function eithr as nouns or as verbs. Th pair *advice/advise* chanjes its spelng to indicate th chanje in pronunciation that ocurs acordng to wethr th noun or th verb is being used (as in TO *I advise you to seek advice*); th only dificlty here is that th user must no that th S in *advise* is voiced, and not voiceless as in *precise* (let alone pronounced on th modl of TO *practise*). Th same C > S noun-verb swich ocurs, but with no pronunciation chanje, in TO *practice/practise*, undrstandbly with frequent confusion of th two forms (in american usaj th two ar intrchanjebl). TO *promise* keeps th same spelng and same pronunciation for both noun and verb, and is therfor less prone to misspelng than *advic/se, practic/se*. And th words *close, excuse, house, use* hav th same

spelng for ther functions on th one hand as ajectiv (*close*) or noun (*excuse, house, use*) and on th othr as verb (*to close, to excuse, to house, to use*), but they giv th readr no hint that th S is voiced in th verbs and in th plural of *house*, tho not othrwis.

CS is only able to regulrize th spelng of /s, z/ to a limitd extnt: Rule 1 reduces SC to S in many words wher it stands only for /s/ (eg, TO *scythe* > CS *sythe*) and alyns TO *practice/practise* and *promise* with th endng of *tennis*, etc as *practis, promis*; Rule 2 simplifys th -SCE endng wher a consnt folos (CS *aquiesce* with -SCE, but *aquiesd, aquiesng* with S); Rule 3 (in conjunction with Rule 2) simlrly simplifys many ocurences of SS (eg, TO *possessed* > CS *posed*); and wher alternativ spelngs with S or Z ar availbl, CS prefers Z for th voiced sound (eg, *cozy, orgnize*).

If a subsequent reform wer to make mor letr-substitutions, such regulrizations cud be taken at least a litl furthr. Amongst th most trublsm forms in both TO and CS ar th many words endng in -CE and -SE (beside th *advice/advise*-typ pairs discusd abov), wich ar ofn confused and/or mispronounced. CS Rule 1, A, E and I, alyns th vowl spelngs in sets such as TO *peace/cease/geese/piece, please/cheese/freeze/seize/frieze* by omitng one of th medial vowls (givng CS *pece/cese/gese/pece* and *plese/chese/freze* (x2)/*seze*); but without C > S and S > Z letr-substitutions no regulrization of final CE, SE, ZE is posbl in such words. In consequence, CS leves notorius traps unresolvd, like th ajectiv/verb distinction in *loose/lose*, and it givs no mor help than TO in shoing that th S in singulr *th house*, etc, is voiceless, tho voiced in *houses, to house*, etc.

A reslution of these ambiguitis wud be quite esy if final SE wer always used for th voiceless endng, and ZE for its voiced equivlnt. This wud giv th foloing forms for th words listd abov: *advise* > *advize, pese/cese/gese/pese, pleze/cheze/freze/seze, loose/loze, close/to cloze, an excuse/to excuze, th house/to house, th use/to uze*. Visuly, such substitutions ar not very disturbng, as final ZE is alredy fairly comn in TO (*graze, freeze, organize, doze*), and it cud be implmntd with few complications (tho a simltaneous swich of *advice* > *advise* and *advise* > *advize* myt cause transitionl confusion). Presumably any regulrization of this sort wud keep *precise*, but chanje TO *expertise* to *exprtize*.

Th substitution of S for siblnt C, as alredy introduced by th merjr of TO *practice/practise* as CS *practis*, and as alredy prefigrd by th loss of E from a few words like TO *promise* (CS *promis*), cud harmnize these with th endngs of over 30 rymng -ICE words. Thus TO *office, service, notice, justice* cud be simplfyd to *ofis, servis, notis, justis*. Ther ar only about 10 exampls of th unstresd TO endng -ACE, but such as *surface, palace, terrace, menace* cud redily alyn with *atlas* to giv *surfas, palas, teras, menas*. Simlrly, th one exampl of TO -UCE, *lettuce*, cud becom *letus* (tho th false paralel of *fetus* wud idealy need attention).

Wile such spelngs wud improve on TO, they stil do not resolv al th siblnt ambiguitis by any means. Rule 1, A.2.2.2 and Rule 3, §1.7.SS also discusd wethr, in ordr to remedy othr such ambiguitis, SS myt be mor widely used

to represent final voiceless /s/. It wud then be posbl to rite *aquiess* without a confusing final CE, and final E aftr S wud hav a purely ‘majic’ function, as in *precise, morose, debase*. (*Erase* wud probbly then be deemd to hav voiced S, alyngng with *raze*, rathr than voiceless S as in american speech, rymng with *race*.) Such substitutions, howevr, incresingly disturb th apearance of text, final SS in polysyllabic words being not very comn in TO (*compass* is unusul), and they myt therfor be delayd for sevrl stajes aftr CS.

Th remainng C, S, Z ambiguitis in TO include al th words containng C pronounced /s/, wich, in th intrests of totaly predictbl sound-symbbl corespondnce, shud be chanjed to S. We wud then se initial C in CS *cement, centrl, circl, cycl*, etc, becomng S to giv *sement, sentrl, sircl, sycl* (cf norwejan *sement, sentral, sirkel, syklus*), and TO *cymbal/symbol* wud merj perhaps as *simbl*; but th degree of visul disturbnce entaild in such initial-lettr chanjes is clearly hy. In medial position, th chanjes wud be less obtrusiv: S cud quite unobtrusivly replace C to giv forms like *nesesry, prosess, desision, sinsere, spesies, polisy, democracy, fasade* (cf jermn *Fassade*).

If final CE wer evrywher convertd to S(E), questions of overlap with inflectional -S wud becom mor acute (TO *fence* can presumebly not be alowd to alyn with TO *fens* — se Rule 1, E.1.1.13 for discussion of this point). To remove this danjer entirely, one wud probbly need to chanje most (or perhaps al) -S inflections to -Z, with TO *fens* becomng *fenz*, to enable TO *fence* to becom *fens*. Ther wud be two possibilitis: eithr evry inflectionl S cud be ritn Z regardless of voicing (*catz and dogz*), or else voiceless inflectionl S, wich nevr clashes with difrntly pronounced -CE, -SE endngs in TO, cud remain, givng *cats, but dogs*. Such far-reachng spelng chanjes, if they wer evr thot worth introducing, wud presumebly only be considrd sevrl stajes aftr CS.

1.5 Regulrizng long vowls beside I > Y

§1.3.3 abov discusd th wider use of Y in place of long I, a useful and fairly unproblmatic substitution. Ther has always been demand for th othr long vowls to be simlrlly regulrizd, but they hav mor varid TO spelngs than dos long I, and ther regulrization wud be much mor complex.

We se this gretr variety of sound-symbbl corespondnces in such sets as TO *vain/vane/vein* for th long A-sound, *air/care/prayer/bear* for long A folod by R, *beat/greet/deceit/these/field* for long E, *roll/hope/coat* for long O, and *food/soup/truth/fruit/rule/queue/new* for th long U-sound. Even if one did decide that al those spelngs for each long vowl shud be alynd, it is not at al obvius wat th new standrdized grafemes shud be. Wile th lettr Y sugestd itself as a straitforwr, alredy existng, economicl standrd for long I, th othr long vowls present us at th outset with th dilema of wethr to choose an existng spelng, or to invent a new one — both aproachs hav advantajs and disadvantajs. Purely by way of ilustration, one myt nevrtheless sugest that, if unfamiliarity wer no obstacl, th foloing myt be considrd (ther is not th space to set out th ful systemic and fonografic reasnng behind them here): for long A, th digraf AE wud giv *vaen, aer, caer, praer, baer*; IE for long E

wud giv *biet*, *griet*, *deciet*, *thiese* (or *thiez*), *field*; OH for long O wud giv *rohl*, *hohp*, *coht*; and UH for long U wud giv *fuhd*, *suhp*, *truhth*, *fruht*, *ruhl*, and asuming they rym with *you* rathr than just with *too*, with an insertd I befor th UH, *qiuH* (or *kiuh*), *niuH*.

Beside th dificlty of choosng apropriat grafemes, ther is th furthr problm that in TO variant spelngs constitute over 600 sets of homofones, such as *vain/vane/vein* or *pair/pare/pear*. It is tru that TO alrely givs numerus sets of difrnt words identicl spelngs (th noun, verb and ajectiv *tender*, for instnce), but that dos not mean that adng anothr 600+ sets to th languaj wud not cause som confusion. (One notices, for instnce, that jermn, hos spelngs othrwise relate fairly predictbly to th pronunciation, makes a point of givng most homofones difrnt spelngs, as in th pair *Lärche/Lerche* for ‘larch/lark’, or *ist/ißt* for ‘is/eats’.) Even CS may be open to criticism for merjng th spelngs of such pairs as TO *peace/piece* (CS *pece*) and *place/plaice* (TO *place*), as discusd in §2.4.2 & §2.4.3 belo.

A third posbl objection to regulrizing long vowls myt be that, othr than those alrely regulrized by CS, ther difrnt spelngs do not apear to cause jenrl users especial dificlty, howevr irationl ther variety and use may apear. Forms such as **hoap*, **sope* ar for instnce not very promnt among th misspelngs that bedevl th riting of th less litrat.

Altogethr, it wud seem that ther ar sevrل quite good reasns for givng relatively lo priority to th regulrization of long vowel spelngs in english.

Ther ar, howevr, a few long-vowl spelngs in TO wich wud survive th CS cuts and wich so blatantly defy th alfabetic principl that som regulrization myt seem desirebl at a fairly erly staj, if mainly for tidiness sake. They wud include, for instnce, th remainng words endng in silent B, such as *comb*, *tomb*, *womb*, for wich th least controversial forms myt be *coam*, *toom*, *woom*, since these at least conform to comm TO patrn of sound-symbll corespondnce (eg, *roam*, *zoom*). Likewise th ‘majic’ L in th TO patrn *calm*, *talk*, *folk* cud usefuly be regulrized, perhaps givng *caam*, *tauk*, *foak*.

We must finaly mention a long-term posibility for reducing th confusion surroundng th letr U, its main sound-corespondnces (as in *but*, *put*, *truth*, *music*, *fur*), and th alternativ TO spelngs for those sounds (as in *to*, *too*, *two*, *truth*, *through*, *grew*, *her*, *sir*). Wat is needd is first at least one, and perhaps even thre, othr standrd spelngs for th sounds in question, and secnd a reduction in th numbr of spelngs availbl to represent those sounds in TO. Surprisingly, as alrely mentiond undr Rule 1, E.2.1.7 (-EW > -*W: *brew* > **brw*), and O.8 (*two* > **tw*), th letr W, now jenrly thot of as a consnt, cud lend itself to som of these purposes rathr wel.

Th letr W orijated as a dubl U-vowl (hence its name) centuris ago befor U and V wer distinguishd in riting, indeed it functions as a vowel to this day in welsh, wich spels english *curriculum*, for instnce, as *cwricwlwm*. A mor radicl reform of english spelng than CS myt considr using W as a standrd vowel letr, as a means to reducing th multipl ambiguitis of U in TO (W is also so used in th *Agilitype* kebord shorthand system, from

wich this idea derives). Th introduction of vowel-W wud in most cases require letr substitution, but ocasionly it cud arise from simpl omission of redundnt letrs (TO *two*, *grew* > *tw*, *grw*?). Just as with Y, positionl distinctions wud ensure minml ambiguity between th presnt consnt W and th new vowel W; thus in *tw* final W can only be a vowel, wile in *twın*, befor a vowel, it can only be a consnt). Th abov exampls ar not ment to sugest that vowel-W need necesrly only represent th long U sound: it myt also lend itself to th spelng of certn notoriously iregulr TO forms, eg, *one* > *wn*, *who(m)* > *hw(m)*, *whose* > *hwz*, *could* > *cwd* (cf welsh *cwm*), and most weirdly, with successiv consnt-W and vowel-W, *wwd*, *wwm* for TO *would*, *womb*.

In th longr term, th potential for expandng th role of W myt be worth explornng; but for th imediat purposes of CS its extreme stranjeness excludes it from considration.

2 STOPNG SHORT OF CS

2.1 Acomodating public reactions

Any proposal for spelng reform is likely to arouse oposition, at least from a minority unwilng to countnncce any chanje to existng riting conventions, regardless of its merits. But jently, th mor radicl th chanje from existng spelngs that is proposed, th gretr th unese that is likely to be felt by al litrat peple. As explaind in Chaptr 1, th basic principl of CS — th omission of redundnt letrs — has th efect of minmizing th apearence of chanje, wile maxmizing th regulrization of forms that cause most dificlty in TO. Altho th concentration on cutng redundnt letrs, along with th thre substitutions explaind in Chaptr 4, sets firm limits to th amount of chanje brot about by CS, in a sense th amount of chanje is arbitrary. Th balance between minmizing chanje and maxmizing regulrization cud be shiftd in eithr direction, with eithr less chanje and less regulrization, or else mor of both. Section 1 of this chaptr has sugestd furthr chanjes, som straitforwrd, othrs hyly problmatic, even esoteric, wich cud be introduced, eithr undr th auspices of a mor ambitius CS (ie, with mor than 3 substitution rules), or as subsequent, sepat stajes. Therfor, if ther wer a public cal for a reform to go furthr than CS as outlined in Chaptrs 3-5, a selection of those aditionl chanjes cud redily be incorprated in an expandd CS.

But if, as is mor probl, even a positiv public response to th CS proposal was acompnid by resrvations, then it wud be necesry to say wich of th cuts sugestd cud be dispensd with in ordr to make CS mor acceptbl, without at th same time fundmently undrmining th most importnt of th new regularitis acheved. Previus chaptrs repeatdly comentd with regard to one cut or

anothr that th cut concernd was recmendd in th last analysis because th gains in econmy wer felt to outwei certn posbl objections; and elswher th much improved fonografic regularity of a particulr cut was taken to justify it, altho its visul impact myt be quite disturbng. This presnt section wil describe those elemnts in th overall CS proposal wich myt be sacrificed, for instnce by givng loer priority to econmy or to fonografic regularity than to familr apearence of text, but without at th same time abandngg th esential systemic qualitis of CS.

2.2 Jujng wat is esential

Of th 3 cutng rules, it may be said that only Rule 1 is oprtunistic, as it cuts letrs here and ther within certn limitd spelng patrns or even in isolated words, wherevr they serv no purpos. Rule 1 rationalizes countless minor ‘silly’ spelngs (for instnce, th B in *debt*, *doubt*), but if public atachmnt to certn of them proved very strong, most such letrs or patrns cud be kept. Rule 1 also perhaps affects th apearence of text mor radicly than Rules 2 and 3, as it cuts som words by ther most promnt letrs, and is therfor likely to cause most initial hesitation in readng. So if concessions wer required in ordr to reduce th disturbnce factr of CS, of th thre cutng Rules th most imediatly promisng candidat for dilution wud be Rule 1.

By contrast, Rule 2 (cutng vowl letrs in unstresd endngs) wud be much less esy to dilute, as, mor than th othr two rules, it establishes patrns and principls that covr th hole of th english languaj. If, for instnce, it wer agreed that TO *centre* shud lose its final E by Rule 1, then to insist on not cutng th secnd E in TO *enter* by Rule 2 wud be to undrmne th lojic and regularity of th systm; and it is abov al th lak of lojic, regularity and systm in TO wich is its basic deficiency and wich any reform must be desynd first and formost to rectify. Furthrmor, many of th cuts proposed by Rule 2 ar a prerequisite for Rule 3: *dinner* canot simplify its dubld N by Rule 3, unless Rule 2 also removes th E; and *hopping* canot simplify its dubld P, unless Rule 2 also removes th I. Th efects of Rule 2 ar probbly rathr less noticebl in fluent readng of CS — for one thing, only vowl letrs ar removed, wich, havng neithr asendrs nor desendrs, contribute less to th global shape or distinctiv ‘coastline’ of a word than do many consnnts, and for anothr thing, Rule 2 cuts tend to fal in less promnt positions towards th ends of words; but most Rule 2 cuts ar systemicly fundmentl to CS as a hole.

Rule 3 lies somwher between Rules 1 and 2 in that regard: like Rule 1 it cud be aplyd selectivly (indeed, CS dos aply it selectivly), but like Rule 2 it embraces th hole languaj. It ataks a problm of TO that causes riters a gret

deal of trubl and affects larj areas of vocablry, words of jermanic, french and latn derivation alike, in ther roots, afixs and inflections equaly. Yet som typs of words, or som positions within words, or som letrs, cud be declared exemt from this cut. Rule 3 dos not gretly affect th apearance of som words (eg, *acomodate, paralel*), but aplyd togethr with Rules 1 and 3 it can somtimes agravate profoundly disturbng effects.

Th relativ impact of each rule may be ilustrated from th TO form *written*, wich is first decapitated by Rule 1 (*ritten*), then amputated from within by Rule 2 (*rittn*), and finally dismbowld by Rule 3 (*ritn*). Yet th fonografic simplicity and rationality of that final form is beyond question. If it wer nevtrless decided that CS *ritn* is too savaj an reduction, but that som cuts wer justifyd, then as a first concession CS cud accept *writn*, and as a secnd concession *writtn*. Howevr, it wud then hav to be apreciated that keepng th W in TO *written* implys keepng it in al othr WR- words too (eg, *rangl, rench, rinkl, rong*), and refusing to simplify th TT in *written* implys keepng TT in *bitn, kitn* and by extension keepng dubld consnnts in countless othr such words too.

Th thre substitution rules (GH, PH > F, soft G > I, IG > Y) cause considrbl visul disturbnce, and cud be deferd until a later reform, but with som damaj to th CS systm as a hole, for instnce implyng th retention of GH in many words such as *rough* and *high*. On th othr hand, th loss of certn capitl letrs and apostrofes (as described in Chaptr 5) has less impact, is unconnectd with patrn of letr-use as such, wich ar at th root of th problms of TO, and so is perhaps th least esential part of th hole CS proposal.

2.3 Reducing visul disturbnce

Th CS forms wich ar visuly most disturbng ar those wich lose ther most promnt letrs (especialy initial letrs), or wich lose a hy proportion of letrs from ther TO form, or wich introduce new letrs. Cut letrs wich myt be retaind specifcly to reduce visul disturbnce include th foloing categris:

2.3.1 Initial letrs Th first letr of a word is its most promnt identifyng featur, so if CS removes it, th apearance of th word is radicly chanjed. Rule 1 cuts th foloing silent initial letrs as blatantly floutng th alfabetic principl that letrs shud represent sounds: E as in TO *eye*, G as in *gnaw*, H as in *honest*, K in *kneel*, M in *mnemonic*, P in *psychology*, and W as in *who, whole, write*. These initial letrs cud be kept without othwise undrmining th CS systm. As wel as making words mor imediatly recognizebl to uninitiated readrs, keepng these letrs wud hav less effect on th alfabetic position of such words in dictionris (indeed, ther position myt in som cases then not be affectd at al).

2.3.2 Multipl cuts Wen a word (especialy a short word) loses mor than one letr, its apearance can chanje substantially. Sevrl words wich lose ther initial letr also lose othr letrs (eg, CS *y*, *onr*, *ritn* for TO *eye*, *honour*, *written*); but just restorning th initial letr significantly improves recognizebilty in these cases (*ey*, *honr*, *writn*), and th remainng cuts can then be considrd as part of brodr patrns (*ey* in th context of al words endng in redundnt E, *honr* in th context of al -OUR, -OR endngs, etc). As a longr word, *sycology* probbly retains suficient featur from its TO form for it stil to be esily recognized, despite its loss of medial H and its G > J substitution, but th form *psycology* with silent P retaind, apears a good deal less stranje than final CS *sycology* (th mor so in th case of th ajectiv *psyclojicl* for CS *syclojicl*, with its four cuts and one substitution). Th holesale GH cuts can seriously disturb th apearance particulrly of shortr words; forms such as *tho*, *thru*, *thoro* ar familr as existng abreviations, and a longr word like *straitforwrd* retains plenty of familr featur; but with ther additionl GH > F substitutions, CS *tuf*, *trof* cause a visul shok despite ther fonografic transparency, and cutng TO *eight*, *weight* to CS *eit*, *weit* is also quite disconcertng. Undoutdly, som or al GHs cud be kept in CS, since they do not hav many serius consequences for th systm as a hole; but th retention of this prize specimn of TO irrationality wud be a signl moral defeat for th alfabetic principl.

2.3.3 Doutful corespondnces It wil be remembrd that Rule 1 sujetd a few simplifications of vowl digrafs wich produced fonograficly doutful sound-symbll corespondnces. Such wer th reduction of EA to E in CS *brek*, *gret*, *stek*, th reduction of OA to O in *brod*, and th reduction of -OUGHT to -OT in *ot*, *brot*, *thot*, etc. TO *break*, *great*, *steak*, *broad* cud esily be left uncut in a diluted CS orthografy, without damajng side effects for th systm as a hole, but, as discusd undr Rule 1, G.2.5.4, th -OUGHT words pose a mor serius dificlty, with substitution of -AUT th best alternativ (tho wethr *aut*, *thaut* ar less disturbng than CS *ot*, *thot* must be doutful).

2.3.4 Reduplicated consnnts Rule 2 produces sevrl patrns of reduplicated consnnts, that is, dubld consnnt letrs each pronounced sepatly. This featur of CS is disturbng, as it is almost unown in TO, unless we count NN in TO *unnecessary* or SS in *misspell* as reduplicated (tho both these patrns ar simplifyd in CS *unecesry*, *mispel*). Examples of reduplication in CS ar BB in *probbl*, DD in *needd*, MM in *maxmm*, NN in *consnnt* and *meanng*, and RR in *terr*. Such reduplication cud be excluded from CS, tho at th price of retainng th orijnl uncertntis of TO wich reduplication removes. For instnce, if CS rote *probabl*, riters cud stil not tel from th pronunciation not to rite **probibl*; if CS kept E in *lidd* (TO *lidded*), th vowel-length distinction from *elided* wud be blur (unless th DD of *lidded* wer also kept, therby undrmining a larj part of Rule 3); if CS kept I in *plannng* (TO *planning*), th distinction from *planing* wud be lost (unless th NN of *planning* wer also kept, therby again undrmining a larj part of Rule 3); and if CS rote *teror*,

riters myt be equally inclined to rite **terar*, **terer*, etc. For such systemic reasns, rather hyr priority shud probbly be givn to keepng th reduplicated consnts than to som of th othr disturbng featur listd in this section.

2.3.5 Simplifyd consnts Th abov reduplicated consnts becom posbl only because CS othwise removes nearly al dubld consnts from TO; thus th verb TO *to err* becoms CS *to er*, wile th noun TO *error* loses its O by Rule 2, and Rule 3 simplifys th medial RR, to produce th CS noun *err*. Now if, in a diluted CS systm, Rule 3 aplyd to many fewr words, th reduplicated consnts wud be ambiguus, it not being clear wethr they wer new CS reduplications, or old TO dubld forms. To that extent, th consnt simplifications of CS must be seen as integrl to th systm as a hole.

Nevrthless, th simplification of dubld consnts can be disturbng on first acquaintnce. Th efect may be imperceptbl in such comn TO misspellngs as **accomodate*, **comitted*, **omited*, **embarass*, but especialy in words of one or two sylabls, th disturbnce may also be considrbl. Among monosylabls, th singl final consnts in CS *eg*, *od* hav a distinctly difrnt look from *egg*, *odd*; and th reduction of CK to K turns TO *pack*, *peck*, *pick*, etc into th disturbngly difrnt CS forms *pak*, *pek*, *pik*. Such monosylabls cud be left uncut, wer it not for th resultng confusion of a pair like TO *error/err* (se §2.4.6.AMB (2), belo). Simplifyng medial dubld consnts in disylabic words has th efect of blurng th length of som preceding vowels, as wen TO *follow* becoms CS *folo* (contrast *solo*). Just as CS makes disylabic words endng in unstred Y expections to Rule 3 (to distinguish *holly/holy*, etc), so an expection cud be made with TO *follow* and simlr forms, to giv diluted CS *follo* (no danjer of confusion with reduplicated forms here); such posibilitis ar discusd in detail undr §2.4.5.LT belo.

2.3.6 Post-accentul shwa in medial sylabls Rule 2, §1.3, proposed cutng letrs representng shwa not only in final sylabls, but ofn in erlir (tho nevr initial) sylabls. Wile th efects wer usuly not very disturbng (eg, CS *considratiun*, derived from *considr*), in som cases a significant visul elemnt was lost, as in CS *conslatiun*, *inflmatiun*, *intnatiun*, *adratiun* from TO *consolation*, *inflammation*, *intonation*, *adoration*. In such forms, th lost vowel letr carris th stress in th root verbs from wich th nouns derive, *console*, *inflame*, *intone*, *adore*. If such cuts wer thot too extreme, they cud be excluded from CS by a rule that letrs representng shwa in medial sylabls ar not cut if they ar stred in othr forms based on th same root. By such a rule, CS *ecnomiic* wud keep its first O, since that is stred in CS *econmy*, wile th latr wud keep its secnd O, since that is stred in CS *ecnomiic*, and as a result both *economy* and *economic* wud remain uncut.

2.3.7 Substituted letrs Substituted letrs, particulrly F for GH and PH, and J for DG or soft G, can be very disturbng on first encountr, especialy in initial position (eg, CS *ruf*, *trof*, *filosofy*, *fotografy*, *ej*, *juj*, *jenrl*, *jermn* for TO *rough*, *trough*, *philosophy*, *photography*, *edge*, *judge*, *general*, *German*). Because th F for PH substitution is alrely familir from

comercial spelng (eg, *foto*, *freefone*), it may be less disturbng than th othrs, wile som Y for I substitutions ar comnly found as spelng errs in TO alredy (eg, *simplifyd*). Any one, or al, of these substitutions cud be excluded from CS, tho th loss of th GH > F and IG > Y chanjes wud leve two patrn of GH intact, and loss of th J for soft G chanje wud preserv certn systemic cruces of TO (eg, *ageing* or *aging?*). Stratejicly it is perhaps importnt that CS shud contain at least som letr substitutions, to sho that such jenrl chanjes can be hyly efectiv, and indeed ar in th long term indispensbl.

2.4 Ambiguous forms

Like TO, CS contains varius ambiguous forms wich in difrnt ways may intrfere with fluent, acurat readng. If th CS systm as recmendd by this Handbook had to be diluted to make it acceptbl, it is worth considrng wat myt be gaind by preventng som of these ambiguities from arising. Ther ar sevrl typs of ambiguity, listd here in rufly asendng ordr of likely objectionblness.

2.4.1.X *holly, two, four* Not objectionbl at al in terms of ther stranjeness efect ar th potential ambiguities that wud hav arisn in th norml process of consnt simplification, if Rule 3, §2.5 had not alredy declared them exeptions. They include som 15 disylabic pairs endng in Y of th typ *holly/holy*, and a few isolated pairs like *comma/coma*, *corral/coral*, *vellum/velum*. Simlrly, Rule 1, W.2, recmendd an exeption be made of *two* to prevent ambiguity with *to*, and Rule, 1 U.3.3, recmendd an exeption for *four* to prevent ambiguity with *for*. Such exeptions reduce th regularity of CS for riters, but asist readrs familir with TO. Clearly, such exeptions alredy represent a dilution of CS, and cannot be undon to efect furthr dilution.

2.4.2.SYM *peace/piece > pece* Ther ar over 100 sets (mostly pairs) of homofones that ar difrntly spelt in TO, but wich by losing redundnt letrs aquire th same spelng in CS, as wen TO *peace/piece* merj as CS *pece*. As explaind in Chaptr 2, §1.3, these symetricly merjd forms cause no confusion (ther meanng is elucidated by th context), and ar scarcely mor disturbng than any othr CS form. Th mor comnly ocurng sets that merj in this way in CS include: *aisle/isle > ile*, *altar/alter > altr*, *ascent/assent > asent*, *ball/bawl > bal*, *batten/baton > batn* (asuming british pronunciaton of *batn*), *bell/belle > bel*, *billed/build > bild*, *boar/bore > bor*, *board/bored > bord*, *boarder/border > bordr*, *bolder/boulder > boldr*, *buyer/byre > byr*, *cannon/canon > cann*, *coarser/courser > corsr*, *complement/compliment > complmnt*, *core/corps > cor*, *coward/cowered > cowrd*, *dependant/dependent > dependnt*, *dollar/dolour > dolr*, *flea/flee > fle*, *floe/flow > flo*, *freeze/frieze > freze*, *gamble/gambol > gambl*, *grill/grille > gril*, *hall/haul > hal*, *handsome/hansom > hansm*, *hangar/hanger > hangr*, *hoar/whore > hor*, *hoard/horde/whored > hord*, *hostel/hostile > hostl* (asuming american pronunciaton of TO *hostile*), *immanent/imminent > imnnt*, *knight/night >*

nyt, lea/lee > le, lesson/lessen > lesn, lightning/lightning > lytnng, literal/littoral > litrl, lumbar/lumber > lumbr, mall/maul > mal, manner/manor > manr, mantel/mantle > mantl, marten/martin > martn, medal/meddle > medl, metal/mettle > metl, missal/missile/mistle > misl (asuming american pronunciation of missile), muscle/mussel > musl, mustard/mustered > mustrd, oh/owe > o, ordinance/ordnance > ordnnce, palette/pallet > palet, pea/pee > pe, peace/piece > pece, pedal/peddle > pedl, pedaller/peddler/pedlar > pedlr, petrel/petrol > petr, pidgin/pigeon > pijn, pore/pour > por, principal/principle > principl, rabbit/rarebit > rabit, rapped/wrapped > rapd, retch/wretch > rech, rho/roe/row > ro, rigger/rigo(u)r > rigr, right/wright > ryt, rough/ruff > ruf, rye/wry > ry, sailer/sailor > sailr, sea/see > se, sleight/slight > slyt, sloe/slow > slo, soared/sword > sord, stationary/statonery > stationry, summary/summery > sumry, tea/tee > te, tenner/tenor > tenr, their/there > ther, throe/throw > thro, tough/tuff > tuf, watt/what > wat, weather/wether/whether > wethr, wear/where > wer, which/witch > wich, whither/wither > withr, woa/woe > wo. Slytly mor disturbng ar perhaps *mourning/morning* > *mornng*, wich may appear to belong rathr with th asymetricl merjrs belo. We may conclude that declaring th abov words to be exeptions and exemtng them from cuts wud not make CS signifcantly mor acceptbl. Mor awkwrđ than these ar thre pairs hos distinction in TO depends entirely on a shwa befor L, N or R, but hos meanngs and orijns ar totaly unconnectd: from *exalt/exult* com th TO forms *exaltation/exultation*, wich if deemd homofnus wud merj as *exltation* in CS; simlrly, th two ajectivs distinguishd in TO as *immanent/imminent* wud merj as CS *imnnt*; and from th verbs *confirm/conform* coms th merjd CS noun-form *confrmation*. This dificlty cud be avoidd if th A of *exaltation*, *immanent* and th O of *conformation* wer deemd not to be pronounced shwa.

2.4.3.ASYM *plai*ce > *pl*ace Somwat mor disturbng than th *peace/piece* > *pece* merjrs ar sets wher one word loses a letter or letters, and therby asumes th spelng of an existng TO form, as wen TO *plai*ce is cut to *pl*ace (eg, ‘ther was *pl*ace on th menu’). Th Rules of CS also produce over 100 sets of these asymetricl merjrs like *plai*ce > *pl*ace, th foloing comn words being afectd: *aide* > *aid*, *aunt* > *ant*, *bade* > *bad*, *banned* > *band*, *barred* > *bard*, *bee* > *be*, *bogey* > *bogy*, *bowled* > *bold*, *buoy* > *boy*, *bread* > *bred*, *butt* > *but*, *buy* > *by*, *candied* > *candid*, *canvass* > *canvas*, *chord* > *cord*, *copse* > *cops*, (for *could* > *cud*, se §2.4.4.HH) belo), *cruise* > *cruse*, *damn* > *dam*, *dessert* > (to) *desert*, *fiancée* > *fiancé*, *Finn* > *fin*, *Finnish* > *finish*, *flue* > *flu*, *forego* > *forgo*, *guild* > *gild*, *heard* > *herd*, *heart* > *hart*, *heroine* > *heroin*, *hoarse* > *horse*, *hour* > *our*, *inn* > *in*, *jamb* > *jam*, *knave* > *nave*, *knead* > *need*, *knew* > *new*, *knit* > *nit*, *knot* > *not*, *know* > *no*, *lead* (metal) > *led*, *leant* > *lent*, *maize* > *maze*, *mooed* > *mood*, *mourn* > *morn*, *oar/ore* > *or*, *penned* > *pend*, *plai*ce > *pl*ace, *plumb* > *plum*, *reign* > *rein*, *raise* > *r*ase, *read* (past tense) > *red*, *seamen* > *semen*, *scent* > *sent*, *soled* > *sold*, *steppe* > *step*, *storey* > *story* (alredy US spelng), *straight* > *strait*, *stye* > *sty*, *tolled* > *told*, *tore* > *tor*, *waive* > *wave*, *warred* > *ward*, *wee* > *we*,

welled > *weld*, *whet* > *wet*, *Whig* > *wig*, *while* > *wile*, *whine* > *wine*, *whole* > *hole*, *wholly* > *holy*, *whorled* > *world*, *wrap* > *rap*, *wrest* > *rest*, *write* > *rite*, *wring* > *ring*, *wrote* > *rote*, *wrung* > *rung*. Readrs of CS hav comentd that, of these, they hav found monosylabls such as *butt* > *but* th most disruptiv of fluent readng. If CS had to be diluted, then som (or even al) of th abov merjrs cud be preventd by declaring th longr word to be an exeption, exemt from norml cutng rules. Howevr, such a step shud only be taken with caution, as evry aditionl exeption tends to undrmne th systemic regularity of CS; thus if *write/wrote* wer required to keep ther silent W to prevent confusion with TO *rite*, *rote*, then th loss of W from *ritn*, *rench*, *rong*, etc, is also cald into question.

2.4.4.HH *statues* > *status* A particlrly obnoxious featur of TO ar th hetrofonic homografs of th typ *wind* (as in ‘north wind’ or ‘unwind’) and *tear* (‘rip’ or ‘teardrop’). CS resolvz som of these (eg, *numbr/numr*, *ter/tear*), but unfortunatly creates a few mor of its own, thus *argues/Argus* > *a/Argus*, *bellow/below* > *belo*, *brisling/bristling* > *brislng*, *choir* > *coir*, *could* > *cud*, *done* > *don*, *farrow/Paraoh* > *faro*, *gristly* > *grisly*, *laterally/latterly* > *latrly*, *pall* > *pal*, *statues* > *status*, *thigh* > *thy*, *tongues* > *tongs*, *venues/Venus* > *v/Venus*, *woed* > *wood*, *wrought* > *rot*. These ar acceptd by CS only because, for reasns of rarity, capitlization, difrnt contexts, etc, ther ambiguities ar not thot likely to cause serius misundrstandng. A mor radicl reform than CS cud disambiguate most of them, perhaps as *argiuz/Argus*, *brizlng/brislng*, *cwyr/coir*, *cwd/cud*, *dun/don*, *faro/faero*, *grisly/grizly*, *paul/pal*, *staetus/statiuz*, *tungz/tongz*, *veniuz/Vienus*, *raut/rot*. Howevr, if reducing th stranjeness-efect of CS wer paramount, sevr of these pairs cud be alowd to remain uncut as exeptions, eg, *argues* (perhaps implyng that al verbs endng in U shud ad -ES, not -S for ther inflections, and so leving *statues*, *venues* uncut too), *bello*, *brisling*, *choir*, *pall*, *tongue*. On th othr hand, to make an exeption of *could*, *laterally*, *thigh* wud do mor serius damaj to th systm, since they wud undrmne th importnt CS patrn of *cud/wud/shud* and *fedrly/jenrly/litrly/librly*, etc, as wel as th abliton of al GH spelngs (*nigh[t]*, *sigh[t]*, *thigh* > *ny[t]*, *sy[t]*, *thy*).

2.4.5.LT *cities* > *citis*, *follow* > *folo* As noted undr Rule 1, E.3.3, som marjnl latent ambiguity arises in CS between voiced and voiceless valus of S in th endng -IS. This alrely ocurs in a few cases in TO, as between th voiced plural S of *taxis* and th voiceless S of non-plural *axis*. Two CS cutng patrn agravate this ambiguity: first, Rule 1, E.3.3, respels many -IES, -EYS plurals as -IS (eg, TO *cities*, *chimneys* becom CS *citis*, *chimmis*); and scnd, sevr words like TO *practise*, *promise* lose ther final E by Rule 1, E.1.1.13, to giv CS *practis*, *promis*. Th result is latent ambiguity between th endngs of, eg, *bronchitis/posbilitis*, but th only instnce of actul confusion so far recordd was a misreadng of CS *yris* (from TO *eyries*) as

representng TO *iris*. If such dangers of misreadng wer felt to be excessiv, then forms with -IES for plurals cud be recmendd insted, eg, *cities*, *chimnies*, *yries*, wile -IS is reservd for voiceless, non-plural endngs such as *axis*, *practis*, etc. (This distinction wud satisfy those speakrs for hom th final vovls of TO *clematis/cities* difr in length anyway.) A long-term, radicl solution to this problm myt sugest *sitiz*, *chimniz*, *praktis*, *promis*, *bronkytis*, but such forms lie far beyond th scope of CS.

If th abov ambiguitis pose posbl hazrds for th readr, it is th riter ho is mor likely to be trubld, if at al, by th anomlus vowl spelngs of th related nouns and verbs *sheath/shethe*, *reath/rethe* (Rule 1, A.2.2.3), wich myt be compared to th anomlus vovls of TO *precede/proceed/procedure*. If such isolated discrepncis wer thot to outwei th gain of alynnng *brethe*, *shethe*, *rethe*, *sethe*, then th A cud, expectionly, be kept in *sheathe*, *reathe*.

Certn patrn involvng latent ambiguity wer comentd on in Chaptr 3, especialy those containng a short vowl hos CS form paralels TO forms (or othr CS forms) containng a long vowl. Posbly somwat disturbng for th readr (se Rule 3, §2.2.3.O) ar words such as *follow* > *folo* wich alyn with *polo*, *solo*; and likewise *willow* > *wilo* wich alyns with *silo*. Simlr latent ambiguity may be observd in th foloing cases: *brackish* > *brakish* versus *rakish* (Rule 3, §2.2.6.SH); *bonnet* > *bonet* (Rule 3, §1.8.TT & §2.2.1.ET) versus *brunette* > *brunet* (Rule 3, §1.8.TT); and *village* > *vilaj* versus *silage* > *silaj*, *cottage* > *cotaj* versus *dotage* > *dotaj*, and *rummaj* > *rumaj* versus *plumage* > *plumaj* (Rule 3, §2.2.2.GE). An isolated case is TO *comment*, wich wen reduced to CS *coment* then paralels *moment* with long O; this ambiguity cud be avoidd if th E wer deemd to represent shwa and th CS form reduced to **comnt*. Altho these latent ambiguitis ar defects in th CS systm (and cud esily be overcom in a mor radicl spelng reform), they ar not felt to entail serius practicl problms. Even less problmatic, since ther ar no paralel forms containng long vovls, ar *ready*, *steady* > *redy*, *stedy* and *sweaty* > *swety*, tho they myt nevtrhless be felt to sugest ryms with *needy*, *sweety* rathr than with *eddy*, *jetty*. In a patrn wher numerus actul ambiguitis thretd, as between pairs like *holly/holy*, Rule 3 (§2.5.1) redily alowd expections retainng dubld consnnts from TO; and CS cud without sufrng too much systemic damaj alow expections in th presnt cases too, with dubld consnnts retaind as in *follo*, *willo*, *brackish*, *bonnet*, *brunett*, *villaj*, *cottaj*, *rummaj*. To go furthr and dubl previusly singl consnnts to create forms such as **reddy*, **steddy*, **swetty* wud exceed norml CS procedurs (aftr al, TO toltrates sevrl simlr discrepncis, as between *very/ferry*, *proper/copper*), and they canot therfor be so esily recmendd, howevr much th resultng forms may be considrd ‘improved’.

2.4.6.AMB

(1) *advocate/advocat*, *leavs/leves*, *place*, *their/their* A comn kind of ambiguity arises merely from th process of conversion from TO to CS, or vice versa. It is not an ambiguity of sound-symbll corespondnce afectng readrs or riters of CS itself, and dos not therfor

constitute a systemic defect, indeed it reflects an advantaj CS has over TO. Wher CS disambiguates pairs of words that ar hetrofones in TO, anyone convertng text from TO to CS has to discrimnate by sound between ambiguus meanngs or gramatiel functions. Thus in numerus paralel pairs of words such as *to advocate/an advocat*, or *to present/a presnt*, and in individul pairs such as CS *a tear(drop)/to ter*, a cut is made for one of th meanngs but not th othr. Provided th convertr nos how th two words ar pronounced and undrstands th cutng rules for each pronunciation, no dificltly arises in such cases. Mor complex is th case of TO *leaves*, wich actuly produces hetrografs in CS but wich th riter has to distinguish acording to wethr th word is th plural of *leaf* (CS *leavs*) or th TO verb *to leave* (CS *to leve, he leves*). Th reverse patrn of ambiguity confronts th convertr from CS to TO in having to decide wich meanng of CS *place* requires expansion to TO *plaice* (se §2.4.3.ASYM abov for a list of such pairs) and wethr CS *ther* requires expansion to TO *their* or *there* (se §2.4.4.HH abov for a list of such pairs). A computerized conversion program wud eithr need to be equipd with a parsr to make th necesry discrimnation in these cases, or wud need to oprate intractively with th user, promptng th user to make a choice wenevr such words arose.

(2) ***betterment/detriment*** A very minor ambiguity of sound-symbll corespondnce (wich myt equally hav been listd undr §2.4.5.LT abov), partly inheritd from TO, arises in consequence of Rule 2, §1.2.M, wher a difrng sylabl structur is conceald in pairs like CS *setlmnt/complmnt, betrmnt/detrmnt, infrmation/acrmny*. In th first word of each pair th structur is as *setl + mnt* with sylabic L, and *betr + mnt, infr + mation* with sylabic R, wile th secnd word in each pair has sylabic M. If it wer tht importnt to make this distinction clear in CS, th shwa-letr cud be retained befor sylabic M, givng *complemnt/complimnt* (also *implemnt, suplemnt*), *detrimnt, acrimny*, th main disadvantaj being th continuing distinction between th two frequently confused forms *complemnt/complimnt*. Anotr such patrn is seen in th TO pairs *knobbly/probably, worry/orrery*, wich by th aplication of th norml CS rules alyn as *nobbly/probbly* and *worry/orry*, th *nobbly, worry* hav two sylabls and *probbly, orry* thre. It wud not be dificlt to alow *probbll* (wich is th only CS form to be ritn with reduplicated B) expectionly to retain its A as *probabl* (cf, th CS exeptions *arabl, berabl*), but th paralels of *onry, litry* make it hardr to justify **orery*.

(3) ***added > add*** Readrs comng to CS from TO for th first time ar likely to be initialy disturbd by a few cases of forwrds incompatibility, that is, words hos CS form coincides with that of a difrnt TO word. Two such cases hav ocurd repeatdly in this Handbook alredy, namely CS *add, err* wich corespond to TO *added, error*, and not to TO *add, err*, wich in CS ar ritn *ad, er*. (Conversly, users educated in CS wud be disturbd in readng TO by th bakwrds incompatibilty of *add, err*, wich corespond to CS *ad, er*, and not to CS *add, err*, wich in TO ar ritn *added, error*.) Five furthr cases ar CS *bowl, clever, dingy, lever, raged*, wich cud

be mistaken for TO forms, insted of being identfyd with TO *bowel, cleaver, dinghy, leaver, ragged*; TO *bowl, clever, dingy, lever, raged*, on th othr hand, ar ritn *bol, clevr, dinjy, levr* (asuming ameriçn pronounciation), *rajed* in CS. Again, altho these problms of compatbility cud be overcom by making exeptions of th words concernd, to do so wud undrmine th systemic regularity of CS, a procedur wich, it is sujestd, wud be betr resistd: afr al, within CS itself th pairs *ad/add, er/err, bol/bowl, clevr/clever, dingy/dinjy, levr/lever, raged/rajed* ar as distinct as *add/added*, etc, ar in TO. If TO *thee* wer felt to be a livng word in modrn english and wer cut to CS *the*, it wud join this list: “My cuntry, ’tis of the...”; but as an arcaic form *thee* cud be alowd to keep its -EE.

(4) *err/heir > er* Th CS form *er* is aditionly problmatic in that it is also ambiguus within CS, resultng not only from from TO *err* by Rule 3 (§1.1), but also from TO *heir* by Rule 1 (H.1.1, and I.1.4.). If TO *err/heir* ar presumed difrntly pronouncied, a case cud be made for leving TO *heir* as CS *eir*, despite th paralel, very helpful reduction of TO *their* to CS *ther* (and simlrlly *bear, there* to *ber, ther*).

(5) *hallow > halo* Th typs of ambiguity found in *add* and *err/heir* ar combined in th cases of *hallow, winnow*, wich by Rule 1 (W.3.3) and Rule 3 (§2.2.3.O) wud becom *halo, wino*, producing not merely forwrds incompatibility, but ambiguity of stresd vowl length within CS itself. Unless th rarity of these words in modrn usaj is jujd to rendr th problm nugatry, exeptions wud seem cald for, overriding Rule 3 and leving *hallo, winno* (wethr or not th consnts ar left dubld in simlr forms such as TO *follow, minnow*, as discusd in §2.4.5.LT abov); se Rule 3, §2.2.3 for th recmendation that exeptions be made for *hallow/winnow*. Less stridently ambiguus than these ar TO *borough/borrow, bureau/burrow*, wich th CS rules cut to *boro/boro, burau/buro* respectivly; if ther ambiguity wer found unacceptbl, RR cud esily be kept to distinguish *boro/borro, burau/burro*. But alowng *hallo, winno, borro, burro* wud jenrly reinforce th case for making exeptions of th mor numerus, but merely latently ambiguus, forms like *folo, mino*, givng *follo, minno*, etc, as wel.

(6) *showd/vowd* Finaly, ther is th varying retention of W (Rule 1, W.3.2) in difrnt derivativs of TO *show* and som rymng verbs (*sho, shos, shoing, showd, shown; snoed, snowy*). This is perhaps th most iritating inconsistncy in th hole CS systm, and is only persistd in by th Handbook because th *vow/show* inconsistncy is th sorce of an enormus numbr of errs in TO (especialy mispronounciations by non-nativ speakrs). No satisfactory solution to this -OW problm has been found within th rules of CS. We ar therfor faced with a choice between a mor radiçl solution (eg, *shohd, shohn, ohd, snohd, snohy, vow, vowd*), or retention of W thruout (*show, shows, showing, showd, shown, owd, snowd, snowy, vow, vowd*). If th recmendd CS forms ar felt to be intolrblly untidy, th conservativ choice apears inescapebl.

2.4 Th integrity of th systm

We thus se that not al th cuts recmendd in th CS Handbook and observd in practis in this chaptr ar strictly necesry for th coherence and integrity of th CS systm as a hole. On th othr hand, we also se how many intrconections ther ar between al thre cutng rules (and th substitution rules), so that if a set of exeptions is made in one group of words, ther ar ofn side-efects wich cal othr parts of th systm into question. It is therfor strongly urjd that readrs ho ar evaluating CS shud do so on th basis of th hole systm, rathr than, as it is al too esy to do wen first examng a new spelng reform proposal, reactng in favor of or against individul CS forms. Apart from som of th unquely anomlus TO forms like *broad*, *choir*, *friend* wich ar (not always entirely satisfactrly) delt with by Rule 1, most CS spelngs that difr from ther TO equivlnts do so within a coherent framework. If one of th supports of that framework is moved, then th stability of othr parts, or even of th hole structur, can be compromised.

For that is th natur of a wel-desynd riting systm: it has a coherence that alows both readrs and riters of th languaj to move confidntly from th ritn form to th spoken, and from th spoken to th ritn. Th CS orthografy for english is far from flawless (indeed, th first half of this chaptr amounts to a catlog of th most obvius flaws inheritd from TO), but compared with TO, wich has no desyn and no coherent framework, consistng rathr of countless bords, spars, joists, rafters and purlins tied loosely togethr into a perilusly shaky structur, CS ofrs th kind of solidity enjoyd by many othr languajs, and wich english too wud equally benefit from.