

## The Quirk Concern

A paper by Braj Kachru always deserves the most careful study, and his article in *ET25* is no exception. One is impressed as ever by his range of reference as well as by the tenacity with which he upholds sociolinguistic concepts fashionable in the 1960s. But the differences between us remain fairly considerable – and Quirk remains concerned.

Year by year, as I visit such countries as Malaysia, the Philippines, and his own India, my perceptions both of the degree of English use and the attitude to standards of English among teachers and officials plainly do not accord with Kachru's. It does not seem to me impossible that the lack of interest in establishing local standards of English may correlate with an actual or predicted contraction in the internal use of English in at least some of these countries: and India is a case in point. (See Richard Bailey's paper, as also my own, in *The State of the Language*, edited by Christopher Ricks and Leonard Michaels, University of California Press (US) and Faber (UK), 1990.) If the social and economic value of English in the long term is seen as lying in its *international* currency (a perception common to such very different countries as Japan and Singapore), the relevance of 'recognising' a local variety – describing it, teaching it – is not likely to be high.

But I must protest when Professor Kachru speaks of my 'Rejection of the cline of varieties within a non-native variety' (p.5). The *existence* of such a cline is obvious to everyone, everywhere. If a linguist wishes so to label it, then the French I speak is all too patently 'British French' – and my 'British German' is still lower on 'the cline of

varieties'. I do not however think that the cause of education and language learning would be served if my faltering performances were to be recognised as 'varieties in their own right', and I am equally unenthusiastic when I hear visiting experts in Japan assuring teachers and students about 'Japanese English' as a pedagogical target.

I am pleased that Professor Kachru has detected some shift in my thinking over the years, since it is among a scholar's foremost duties to reach new conclusions as new evidence presents itself. But one must not exaggerate either the degree of shift in my views or its rapidity. In Chapter 1 of *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, published in 1972 but written a year or so earlier, my co-authors and I already harboured doubts about the 'interference varieties' (Kachru implies that we called them 'institutionalised' but we did not) and about the 'active debate on these issues in India, Pakistan and several African countries' (p.26). These doubts were reflected in the cautious *may* we used in suggesting that some of the 'interference varieties . . . may be thought stable and adequate enough to be institutionalised.'

The position is simply that events in the subsequent twenty years have served to deepen such doubts, not remove them.

Randolph Quirk,  
University College London,  
England

## Darkness and light?

Hands up those of you who managed to get through every word of Braj Kachru's article 'Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern' (*ET25*). Well done! Now keep your hands up if you can honestly say that you under-

stood first time what the author was getting at. Well that's marvellous! You deserve a handsome prize – both of you!

At the risk of showing up my own stupidity, I confess that when I tried to read Braj Kachru's article for the first time, I found it so chock-full of academic jargon that I couldn't even guess its general field of concern, let alone the author's personal opinions about it. By pure luck, I still had my old copy of *ET21* containing the *Quirk* article; so I did the obvious thing and re-read that. It was like passing from darkness into light. Quirk's style, so clear and elegant, made me wish that articles like Braj Kachru's could in future be translated into everyday English before being inflicted on the innocent readers of *English Today*.

Finally, at the risk of seeming impertinent to *you*, Sir, may I make a suggestion about *English Today* in general? It seems to me that its unique appeal up to now has been the way it is addressed to the *general* readers in all parts of the English-speaking world, while at the same time drawing on the expertise and attracting the attention of distinguished scholars such as David Crystal, Frank Palmer, Dwight Bolinger and Randolph Quirk. In this way it is entirely different from the myriad publications on linguistics, emanating regularly at enormous expense from every self-respecting university in the world, written by academic linguists in one place in order to interest and impress other academic linguists working in similar rarefied fields somewhere else. Though rarefied, these fields exert an enormous gravitational pull, and I feel that *English Today* is in some danger of being drawn in the same general direction. So *please* Sir, let me urge you to resist this tendency, and

reject all contributions like Braj Kachru's, loaded with technical terms and full of scholarly references to learned articles in university libraries, that the average reader has no hope of ever seeing, and which he wouldn't understand anyway. Let's keep *English Today* as it used to be – a magazine for human beings.

Philip Tregidgo,  
Petersfield, Hampshire, England

## Relevant and fun

I am enjoying the January issue very much, especially Braj Kachru and David Crystal. Keep up your excellent work on *ET*. Not only do I believe in what you are doing, but also think there has long been a need for a journal like *ET*. If only other journals could be relevant and fun too.

Alan Kaye,  
Department of Linguistics,  
California State University,  
Fullerton, California, USA

## Bouquet

Fascinating article by Michelle Aldridge in *ET*25 – 'How the language grows up'. Many thanks.

Sybil Sarel,  
Birsay, Orkney, Scotland

## Children and language

Michelle Aldridge's article on 'How the language grows up' in *ET*25 (Jan 91) particularly interested me, as I've had opportunities to study nieces and nephews, etc., learning to speak, not to mention bilingual neighbouring children of various nationalities. Two personal episodes come to mind of points not touched on in the article: (1) Mairi (aged 3) saying *I wealed it* for 'I leaved it' (meaning 'I left it behind'), featuring word reversal; (2) Emilio (aged 2), already bilingual, with Spanish parents

and English-speaking nursery and neighbours (having recently returned to Scotland after a holiday with Spanish grannies), catching sight of a neighbour's full glass biscuit jar: 'Uno, uno,' followed by a very deliberate 'One', with one finger held up.

Anna Dunlop,  
Edinburgh, Scotland

## Brouhaha

It would seem from the following quotation that as 'agenda', 'data' and 'media' move from being plural nouns to singular, 'brouhaha' is (are?) making the journey in reverse:

'Television, however, is generally recognised, at least in Britain, to be "different". That is why it is now in an era of burgeoning codes and guidelines; and why the Independent Broadcasting Authority, code-maker to commercial broadcasting, some months ago hit upon the idea of holding a symposium on this particular genre; why, also, when we gathered last week, the brouhaha about the Government's views on impartiality were an unplanned extra layer of controversy' (*The Listener*, 25 Oct 90).

Amanda Martin,  
Reading, Berkshire, England

## Ingle-ish

In *Post & Mail*, *ET*24, Alan Swan tells us of the amazing and amusing pseudo-English which he regularly comes across in published form. He asks who is responsible for the stuff, whether anybody collects it, and whether it has a name.

I don't know who is responsible for it, but I do know that I've been collecting samples of it for a number of years. If I had to give it a name, I think it would be 'Ingle-ish'. A column which I compile for the *Professional Translator & Interpreter* is largely devoted to this ever-expanding dialect, and I would be delighted

to receive from *ET* readers any anglo-gibberish they may come across.

Stephen J. Coffey,  
Florence, Italy

## Verbal likes and dislikes

*Nice* must be the nastiest word in the English language if a survey among journalism students in London reflects the real world.

Asked to write down three words they disliked, as well as three they liked, more than a quarter of the 60 or so respondents, mostly on courses at City University's Graduate Centre for Journalism, included *nice* as one of their pet hates.

Other disliked words came nowhere near. Words like *like*, *proactive*, *computer*, *heterosexual*, *anti-semitism*, *basically* and *cute* popped up just two times each. Nothing, apparently, matches the cringe factor of *nice*.

Among these other words, *rain* and *rape*, *pungent* and *pong*, *hype* and *holistic* all seem quite reasonably dislikeable. But some brought social baggage too. The woman who contributed *skeletal* said people told her she pronounced it wrong in conversations. Another put down *copulation* – then went to some lengths to tell the others it was only the word she disliked. A French student wrote down *frog* – and added that he didn't like eating them either.

*Likes* appeared nowhere near as homogenous – itself an entry in the list – with *outrageous* hitting the highest score at four.

Just remember, though, that journalism students turn into journalists. Look out for upcoming articles with a rash of words like *tangerine* and *Maine*, *juxtapose* and *synecdoche*, *kite* and *prat* and *plummeted* and *peace*, *auspices*, *anathema*, *diminutive* and *dude*, *fetid*, *torture*, *rhombus*, *wine* and *wild* . . . and *you*.

Humphrey Evans,  
London, England

## Dispatches from Florida

'In lapidary inscriptions,' as Dr. Samuel Johnson, pioneer lexicographer, critic, poet, novelist, essayist, and brilliant observer of the passing 18th-century scene, once noted, 'a man is not upon oath.'

In the writing of obituaries, though, those sometimes dis-comforting intimations of our own mortality, the journalism textbook says, 'There are two hallmarks of a good obituary: It should be accurate, especially as to names and ages, and it should be interesting.'

Florida is the mecca for so many from different areas, generally from the Northeast and the Midwest of the United States, as well as from the eastern provinces of Canada and from such distant places as Britain and Germany.

Its mythical paradisaical state powerfully attracts the young and the middle-aged, to say nothing of those whom *Esquire*, in its November 1990 euphemism of the month, terms the 'chronologically gifted.'

Such an area seems to require of its obituaries, besides the six basic details of name, age, identification, funeral service, time and place of death, and burial or entombment, some response to those two adverbs seldom heard today: *whence* and *whither*.

Thus the obituary writer faces the challenge of accounting for the many regions whence the decedents had come, and the places whither they relocated: whether, for example, to the Tampa Bay area, or to communities such as Sarasota, Venice, Port Charlotte, Fort Myers, or Naples.

In addition to meeting these needs, the obituarist, at least on the West Coast of Florida, has developed an unusual and formulaic juxtaposition of the decedent's occupation and religion. Thus, in one instance, the decedent, a woman, was 'a home-

## Dedicated to the preposition

1

Andy: Thanks for weekend bid,  
But you just watch my foam!  
Minute schools's out, home I run.  
I'm homesick – sick FOR home!

2

Andy: Ma made rabbit stew.  
I'm her gastronome.  
Now I'm down to tea-and-toast.  
I'm home sick – sick AT home.

3

Andy: See you, after all!  
Packed my brush and comb.  
Let's go places. Now, dear pal,  
I'm home-sick – sick OF home!

Alma Denny,  
New York

maker and a metaphysical spiritualist.' Other instances help to establish a pattern:

○ 'He was an insurance broker and was Jewish.'

○ 'She was an X-ray technician and was an Episcopalian.'

○ 'He was a self-employed painting contractor and a Protestant.'

○ 'He was an auto body repairman and was a Catholic.'

The celebrated John Milton, who delighted in etymological punning, would have enjoyed this item, once its contemporary terms were explained to him: 'He worked for Johnny's Car Wash and was a Baptist.'

The *Tampa Tribune*, in a recent obituary of a 5-year-old girl, bestowed adulthood upon the child by its solemn reporting: 'A native and lifelong resident of the Tampa Bay area, she was a Protestant.'

A striking linkage of occupation and religion appeared in the *Sarasota Herald-Tribune* in its obituary of a 31-year-old woman who had come to the area 12 years before from New Jersey:

'She was a bartender and a Methodist.' Such an obituary evokes the shades of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and of John Wesley himself, the founder of Methodism, who enjoined his followers that they 'never be triflingly employed.' It also demonstrates that an obituary need not be as 'grim as death itself,' in the words of the textbook. Indeed, it may be not only accurate and interesting, but also, quite unintentionally, even entertaining.

E. Leo McMannus,  
North Miami, Florida, USA

## The simplification and internationalization of English

After reading John Simpson's statement of the rule for consonant-doubling in the inflected forms of English verbs (ET18) and Christopher Upward's comment on it (ET21), I would like to express my views.

As a world language, English should and could be changed to meet all mankind's will. People all over the world 'would like English to be written simply, to obey rules'. Linguists should take an active part in language standardization or reform. 'But small steps could perfectly well be taken to ameliorate the situation little by little', as follows:

(1) Using the experience of turning letter-doubling into 'singling' of Esperanto for reference, we should turn 'consonant-doubling in the inflected forms' into 'singling'. In Esperanto 'letero' is in place of 'letter'. I would suggest that common words like 'cut', 'dig', 'nod' should inflect as 'cuting', 'diging', 'noded', 'noding'. It will be of service to mankind because simplification will meet his needs.

(2) We may substitute a certain number of regular spellings from International Words for irregular ones, e.g. *catastrophe* /kætæstrəfi/, in Spanish *catastrofe*, in German *Katastrophe*, in Esperanto *katastrofo*; it is therefore proper to use *katastrofe* as a World Word: *philosophy* /filsəfi/, in French *philosophie*, in Spanish *filosofia*, in Indonesian *filosofi*; it is therefore desirable to adopt *filosofi* because it accords closely with the pronunciation. *Thermos* is, in Spanish and Indonesian, *termos*, in Esperanto *termoso*; it is easier to pronounce *termos*.

(3) I have always believed that the World Language for all human beings in the future will be the combination of languages of the East and West. English, as a global language, should absorb more words from Oriental languages without changing in

Readers' letters are welcomed.

ET policy is to publish as representative and informative a selection as possible in each issue. Such correspondence, however, may be subject to editorial adaptation in order to make the most effective use of both the letters and the space available.

## Protocol point

When it's serious talk  
That you demand a lotta,  
With tele screen viewers  
You're persona non grata.

Dick Hayman  
Salinas, California

form. Chinese is a language spoken by the largest number of people in the world. When we adopt derived words from Chinese, I suppose we need to make them in accordance with the Chinese Phonetic Alphabet, e.g. we can use *gaoliang* instead of *kaoliang*, *Beijing* instead of *Peking*, *renseng* instead of *ginseng*, *lizhi* instead of *lychee*.

Hou Yongzheng,  
Dalian, China

## English-spelling phonemes

How often have teachers of English echoed the cries of George Bernard Shaw's 'enry

'iggins! If only we could agree on a set of standard spellings of the English phonemes! If school children in Taipeh start their lessons with the 37 phonetic signs of Chinese, why can't the English-speaking world do likewise!

Many phonetic schemes have been devised. Here is another. It is the one I use. Perhaps you will find it useful too. It is very simple and, I believe, very helpful. It is designed solely as a practical tool. This set of English-spelling phonemes: can be typed; is very easy to learn; can be read without instruction, after a moment's thought, by a mature English reader; and is a great aid in teaching pronunciation, spelling and reading.

The symbols are illustrated in the Box. The phoneme symbols are shown in Part 1; an example group of words in Part 2; and individual examples in Part 3. I use angle-brackets to indicate a 'sound' or the symbol for that sound, for example: two English phonemes are <th>, <ear>; the long vowels are <ee, ir, ar, or, oo>; 'was' = <woz>, means that the word 'was' is sounded as

### The Elder spelling system

(1) The 44 base phoneme symbols:

p	t	k	f	th	s	sh	ch	h	
b	d	g	v	th'	z	z'	j		
m	n	ng	w	l	r	y			
a	e	i	o	u	u'	ee	ir	ar	or
oo	(short, long vowels)								
ae	ie	oi	ue	ou	oe	ear	air	oor	
(diphthongs)									

Additional standard symbols:

c = <k>, qu = <kw>, x = <ks>

(2) A group of words which together use all the letters, and use all the 44 phonemes: one word for each vowel/diphthong sound, but <i> twice; all consonant sounds used, some more than once.

(22 words, 64 phonemes)

thing	jet	th'at	rush	not	pu't
weep	bird	hard	cork	loot	
gate	five	point,	tune	mouse	vote,
year	chair	poor			
zip	az'ure				

(3) English-spelling phoneme symbols, with examples

a	mat	o	pot
a-e, ae	name, Rae	o-e, oe	bone, toe
air	pair	oi	boil
ar	car	oo	soon
b	bit	oor	poor
ch	chin	or	for
d	did	ou	loud
e	pet	p	pen
ear	year	r	red
e-e, ee	Pete, see	s	sit
f	fat	sh	ship
g	get	t	top
h	hat	th	thin
i	pit	th'	th'is
i-e, ie	bite, pie	u	cut
ir	bird	u'	pu't
j	jet	u-e, ue	tune, cue
k	keep	v	very
l	lot	w	wet
m	map	y-	yet
n	not	z	zip
ng	sing	z'	az'ure

(4) Standard and modified forms:

c = <k>	cat	c' = <s>	c'ell	<sel>
ch	chit	ch' = <k>	ch'ord	<kord>
g	gun	g' = <j>	ag'e	<aej>
h	hot	h'	h'ew	<h'ue>
n	bin	n' = <ng>	ban'k	<bangk>
ng	sing	ng' = <ng-g>	fin'g'er	<fin'g-u>
s	sit	s' = <z>	has'	<haz>
th	thin	th'	th'e	<th'u>
u	cut	u'	pu't	<pu't>
wh = <w>	which	wh' = <h>	wh'o	<hoo>
z	zip	z'	az'ure	<aez'u>

<woz>. Where it is useful to distinguish a different or special usage I use the apostrophe <'> immediately after the phoneme symbol – see Part 4. Three of these are standard English-spelling phonemes <th', u', z'>; the others are modifications of spelling, as in ch'ord; or of normal English pronunciation, as in has'. This notation is used only for consonants – with one exception, <u'>.

The phoneme symbols have been chosen using the guides, in order of priority: able to be typed; standard sound and spelling; commonest sound and spelling; otherwise least likely to be confusing, in distinguishing words by meaning.

*The consonants.* These are sounded more or less in one way, and where there are several allophones there is little confusion of meaning. Only two consonant sounds present a problem:

<th'> = <voiced th>, <sh'> = <voiced sh>, which I take as either <sh'> or <z'>.

*The vowels.* These are troublesome and any choice of symbols will be contentious.

(i) The short vowels. The letters of the short vowels (a, e, i, o), are mostly of standard pronunciation. But we have two common sounds for u, as in: cut, pu't.

(ii) The 'Policeman-ee' vowels, <a-e, e-e, i-e, o-e, u-e>, or <ae,

ee, ie, oe, ue> – the 'names' of the letters 'aeiou'. These 5 'vowels' and their spelling convention is the most distinctive feature of written English – and occurs in a vast number of words.

(iii) The other 2- and 3-letter vowel symbols. We have for the 6 short vowels a set of single letters <aeiouu>. The 'Policeman-ee' convention suggests the choice of 2-letter symbols for the long vowels and diphthongs, if at all possible. I scanned a 40,000 word list and found the commonest spelling combinations of the rest to be: <ir, ar, or, oo; oi, ou; ear, air, oor>.

At this point note that many of these spellings have a common feature – they end in an (-r). Consider the 'centring' diphthongs, <ear>, <air>, <oor>. They have a sound which ends somewhere near a brief unstressed <u>; not very different from a short standard English <r>. Thus a natural choice for the symbols for these diphthongs is <\*\*r>. This choice is particularly apt because in standard English, in a sequence -(vowel) (r), the (r) is never sounded; indeed, <r> is sounded only in the sequence (r) (vowel)-. Nevertheless, an <r> sound is lurking there, and is sounded in some dialects, the 'rhotic' dialects. These considerations also apply happily to the choice of the symbols for three of the long vowels <ir, ar, or>.

Note again. This English-spelling phoneme notation uses the letter r in: <ir, ar, or, ear, air, oor>. These are distinct symbols for distinct sounds. There is no r-sound in any of them. Note also. The 'schwa' is not in my set of English-spelling phonemes. It is taken as an unstressed allophone of <u> (or, in some words, of <i>).

For further information, write to:

John Elder,  
17 Cedar Road, Mount Eden,  
Auckland, New Zealand

## Situational English

The correspondents in the exchange of letters printed below have kindly given their permission for readers of *ET* to 'eavesdrop' on their discussion of a significant Australian-based English-language course.

### Deserving recognition

Dear Mr. Alexander,

Owing to a slight muddle (mine) about renewing subscriptions, I have only just received my copy of the January 1990 issue of *English Today*, with your thoughtful overview of the English Language Teaching syllabus down the years. I have long been a fan of yours, and many of your publications adorn my shelves and have supported my teaching since I began in ELT in 1972. As always, your article on the syllabus clarified and illustrated the main lines of development admirably and readably.

However, I was a little disappointed – and you may of course put this down to mere anti-podean pride – that you limited your examples to those from the UK, the USA and (once) France. Canada, New Zealand, India, Singapore, Australia . . . have all contributed insights and impetus to the common pool of knowledge and approaches in our profession. So, although it in no way invalidates your overall account and its stages, I thought you might be interested in the attached, and some additional information.

The enclosed photocopies [not provided here: Ed.] come from *English for Newcomers to Australia*, 3rd edition, June 1952, based on a syllabus which had appeared in September 1951 and March 1952. This had evolved in the immediate postwar years, when Australian teachers grappled with big classes of refugees and other immigrants from a variety of non-English-speaking backgrounds, for whom the speedy

learning of English was a survival need. You will note that this was still regarded as EFL, not yet ESL. Unfortunately, I haven't a copy of the earlier editions for comparison, nor of the syllabus itself, nor of the teacher's handbook mentioned in the Foreword, but it is clear that 'fluency', 'communication', 'use' of the language was aimed at, via a structure-based and 'situationally'-presented syllabus; and, despite its obvious limitations, I believe it was effective, helped no doubt by the fact that the learners were also living in an English-speaking community. It would thus seem, from the publishing date of 1952, that George Pittman and his book deserve mention alongside Hornby and Fries, as a pioneer of this kind of syllabus.

*English for Newcomers to Australia* continued to be used and revised for quite some time: there was a fourth edition (and even a French course, *Let's Speak French*, based on the same methodology, piloted in 1957 and eventually published in 1963), and it finally evolved into *Situational English*, which was likewise designed to teach groups of immigrants of mixed language background in Australia (photocopies (2)).

There seems to be a slight discrepancy in the titles and notes on the two title pages: my copy of the Teacher's Book is the version issued for teachers of immigrants in Australia, and has 'This book must not be sold' on the pre-title page, whereas my Student's Book is the 'world-wide' edition. It is odd that the 'local' version is claimed to be adapted from the 'world-wide' version (though note the common final paragraph in the 'Foreword'/'About This Book' sections).

While both products deserve recognition as the end-point of a twenty-year development for a particular context and need, I can only share your (implied) surprise that Longmans agreed

to publish it in 1965, given the developments in materials already occurring at that time. *Situational English* did by then represent a somewhat dated approach to the teaching of English; and indeed, some rather bizarre cultural practices were modelled therein, including (as you note) the need to identify one's own nose and those of other people (Unit 6), 'George' and 'Peter' introducing their wives to each other as 'Mrs Miller' and 'Mrs Scott' (Unit 14), and the heavy office humour which recurs as a leit-motiv throughout (e.g. Units 13, 45, 47, 52, . . .).

What is perhaps even more astounding is that, when I was asked to teach English to intending migrants at the Australian Embassy in Paris, 1972–1975, the textbook with which we were issued was *Situational English*. Mind you, as a neophyte English-teacher – I was a Modern Languages graduate, who had just arrived in Paris as an Assistante d'anglais at a high school – I was jolly grateful for the step-by-step guidance the book gave. As a syllabus, it worked quite well; and we very quickly began to treat much of it in the tongue-in-cheek manner it needed, and to supplement it with other materials (I especially enjoyed using your own *Practice and Progress*, *For and Against*, and the readers *April Fools Day* and *Worth a Fortune*).

As you say, we've all continued to move on in ELT; it has indeed been 'a remarkable century'. Australian adult TESOL is currently especially strong on differing learning styles, and 'learner-driven' courses, so teachers are increasingly responsible for 'negotiating' their courses with their students, and for choosing appropriate materials from all the wealth available – which means the impossible but delightful task of keeping up with what is being published. Articles like yours are invaluable in helping us keep sight of the

'forest' while also enjoying the 'trees'.

Ruth Nicholls,  
TESOL Education,  
The University of New England,  
Armidale, New South Wales,  
Australia

### Truly pioneering

Dear Ms Nicholls,

Many thanks for your letter of February 16 which has just been forwarded to me from *English Today*.

It was not my intention to ignore the considerable contributions which have been made to ELT by Canada, New Zealand, India, Singapore, Australia et al. (not to mention the non-native contributions which have been made worldwide). Just put it down to my ignorance and the fact that I had to maintain a delicate balance between readability and merely codifying and

listing the immense number of influential publications available. My article had to be restricted to a fixed number of pages and had to be of interest to a general ELT audience, not one specializing in EFL.

I was very interested in your enclosed photocopies. Though I knew that *Situational English* was broadly based on *English for Newcomers to Australia*, I had never seen the original, nor did I have any idea that it went back to the beginning of the 50s! You have cleared up a point that has puzzled me all my working life, explaining how an apparently antediluvian course (*Situational English*) was published in the mid-sixties. Seeing the original material, I can now appreciate just how far-sighted this course was, far outstripping in methodology anything available in the 1950s. It's a truly pioneering course, appropriately from a land

famed for its pioneering spirit! I actually used *Situational English* extensively in the 60s and I was profoundly influenced by the insights in its Teacher's Books; they were truly formative for me. I only wish I had the information you have just provided me with at the time I wrote my article. My emphasis would certainly have been different and I would have been able to pay proper tribute to Pittman for a syllabus so far in advance of its time.

Thank you very much for writing to me and for filling in the missing gaps in my knowledge. I was reassured to hear that my omission did not spoil your enjoyment of my survey and thank you for your kind words about my work. I have copied your article and this letter to the editor of *English Today*.

L(ouis) G. Alexander,  
Haslemere, Surrey, England

## CROSSWORD

### ET26 CrossworLd solution

1	S	O	2	U	N	3	D	S	4	Y	M	5	B	O	6	L	I	7	S	M			
	K		H		I		L		U							O				8	S		
9	A	T	H	E	N	A	E	U	M						10	C	H	U	M	P			
	T		U		G		M		P						A				N		E		
11	E	P	H	O	D	S								12	S	T	O	D	G	E			
							O		13	G				14	S		E			W	D		
15	D	E	16	P	E	N	D	E	N	C	E					17	S	A	K	I			
	U		R		G		N		U						18	K			V		L		
19	S	K	I	M					20	B	U	F	F	O	O	N	E	R	Y				
	T		N						21	P		S			F								
22	C	U	C	K	O	O									23	C	L	O	S	E	25	T	
	O		E		G				26	A					27	L			R		K	I	
28	A	S	T	E	R				29	B	R	U	T	A	L	I	S	E					
	T		O		O																		
									30	O	N	O	M	A	T	O	P	O	I	E	S	I	S

### ET25 CrossworLd winners

The winners of *The Oxford Book of Humorous Prose* (ed. Frank Muir, 1990), the prize for our January 1991 crossword, are:

Sean Devine, Blacsroih, Co-Dublin, Ireland  
Valerie High, Ware, Hertfordshire, England  
E.M. Race, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, England  
Anne C. Newton, Washington D.C., USA  
M. Skeggs, Eltham Park, London, England

## ETYMORPHS

Answers 1(d), 2(a), 3(c), 4(a), 5(b), 6(c), 7(a)