Quikscript As I Use It

ʃ ʒ (ʌ ² ₁ �ı.

by Scott Ellsworth — as of 10 May 2014

I have long been interested in proposed spelling reforms for the English language. Back in high school I devised my own system of spelling, which I then revised several times over the following decades. By the time of my last revision to it in 2011, what it had evolved into was mostly an adaptation of the International Phonetic Alphabet with 39 letters in upper and lower case, including the Old English æ and ð and also the þ: Tu meɪk ə laŋ stɔri ŝɔrt, ɪt beɪsɪkli lʊkt laɪk ðɪs. Then I discovered Quikscript. I immediately saw its superiority over my own system: Ronald Kingsley Read had offered a brilliant set of graphically simple letters, including single letters for the diphthongs, as well as a set of handy abbreviations, all reducing the effort required for writing. And I enjoyed learning to draw those beautiful new letters.

But as I learned Quikscript, I did have some reservations. First of all, I had difficulty reading the sample texts: As I was just beginning to recognize the new letters, at the same time I had to "decode" the British pronunciation that it represented into my native American English. The degree of difficulty was surprising for me, because as an American I can very easily understand Queens Received English when I hear it spoken (though less so with other British dialects). I found out that Kingsley Read actually desired standardized spelling for all variants of the English language. On page 22 of his Quikscript Manual he says, "The choice of standard spellings is convenient for writing and reading." That would mean that in order to spell words correctly in Quikscript I would have to remember some regular correspondences between British and American English, such as "write ‑ı instead of ‑ʌ when unstressed at the end of a word and in certain prefixes such as ɟı‑ and ʔɔı‑." And also: "Whenever ʌ occurs in a word immediately after an alveolar consonant /l, ı, ʊ/, then add a ‑ı‑ in between those two sounds," so write ʊʌ as ʊⱨ, lʌʊ as lⱨʊ. But due to convergence of sounds in my own dialect, I would have to just memorize the spellings of many words: When I say ‑ɹ, I'd have to remember to write it as either ‑ɹ, ‑ı, or ‑ı, depending on the word. And then there are a whole host of over individual cases of words I'd have to write specially, such as writing ʊd as ʊd, ʌʃm as ʌʃm, ʔɔʃʊ as ʔɔʃʊ. I can imagine someone from York writing in Queens Received English, being familiar enough from radio and television to be able to mimic it quite accurately. But an American would have to spend a lot of time memorizing details of a foreign dialect, just in order to spell correctly at home.

[These two paragraphs are transcribed at the end of this document:]

What's the point of coming up with a logical new way of writing, if it still requires memorizing so many special spellings diverging from actual pronunciation? I prefer to keep in mind what Kingsley Read also said on page 22 of the Manual, "Quikscript spelling should be regarded as a convenience, not as a cultural fetish." So I decided early on that I would make it easy and just write Quikscript based on my own American pronunciation.

But as I moved along I felt the need to make a few other small adaptations of Quikscript for my personal use, including a couple of diacritic marks — yes, I do remember that George Bernard Shaw specifically asked in his will for an alphabet *without* any diacritics, but in my personal use I find it

hard to avoid them. My reasons now follow — you will occasionally notice some features of my Quikscript usage before I explain them, so please bear with me.

Contents

An Accent Mark

With a logical system of writing such as Quikscript, a general principle is that words should be written the same if they're spoken the same. But what about words that are identical in all respects except for the stress of their syllables? There are words in English that in speaking we distinguish only by stress:

traditional	Quikscript	meaning {from Merriam-Webster online}
readable	ؤلاد؛	adj. able to be read easily
redouble	ؤلاد؛	adj. make twice as great in size or amount
intern	ؤحز	n. an advanced student or graduate usually in a professional field gaining supervised practical experience
intern	ؤحز	v.t. confine or impound, especially during a war
reefer	حٱٔ	n. a refrigerator car, truck, trailer, or ship
refer	حٱٔ	v.t. send or direct for treatment, aid, information, or decision; v.i. direct attention usually by clear and specific mention
increase	ٱحزٱ	(the noun, or in some cases the verb with special emphasis)
increase	ٱحزٱ	(the verb)
outside	ٱلاٱ	(as an adjective, or with emphasis for distinction from "inside")
outside	ٱلاٱ	(as an adverb or a preposition)
discus	حٱزٱ	n. a heavy disk (as of wood or plastic) that is thicker in the center than at the perimeter and that is hurled for distance as a track-and-field event

discuss	⟨Quikscript⟩	v.t. present in detail for examination or consideration; talk about
usher	⟨Quikscript⟩	n. one who escorts persons to their seats (as in a theater) v.t. conduct to a place; precede as an usher, forerunner, or harbinger; cause to enter
assure	⟨Quikscript⟩	v.t. give confidence to; make sure or certain; inform positively [Probably only in American and Canadian English do these two differ in stress alone.]

For the 2009 version of my own orthography, I realized that stress can distinguish meaning in English, and began using accent marks accordingly. The accent marks used above are from Read's Manual, p13, where he introduces them by saying, "The indications of stress, not normally used, may help beginners." I find that the particular shape of accent mark he offered works very well with Quikscript, not interfering at all with the readability of the letters.

Languages in which stress is phonemic (meaning that it can potentially distinguish meaning) offer at least two methods of handling it: Russian, for example, uses accent marks to indicate stress only in dictionaries. Anywhere else, it is normally up to the reader to guess which word is being used based on the context. Spanish, on the other hand, consistently indicates stress, but it does so in a very economical way: It uses accent marks only to indicate *irregular* stress (though it uses them additionally to distinguish between different words or usages that are pronounced the same.) In the interest of easy clarity, I opted for the Spanish approach, minus its use for words pronounced the same.

In working on my own orthography earlier, I discovered that stress in English can be indicated economically, just like in Spanish, indicating only irregular stress. With the stress rule that I devised or deduced, I found that I only have to write an accent mark on about 1-5% of all words written. (In the sample text at the end of this document, I counted 158 words, 7 of them with accent marks, so that's 4.4%.) See "The Stress Rule," further along. In the meantime, here are examples of words on which my rule requires and does not require accent marks:

accent mark:		no accent mark:	
Orthodox	Quikscript	Orthodox	Quikscript
tofu	⟨Quikscript⟩	Hindu	⟨Quikscript⟩
create	⟨Quikscript⟩	cremate	⟨Quikscript⟩
manifest	⟨Quikscript⟩	manpower	⟨Quikscript⟩
idea	⟨Quikscript⟩	phobia	⟨Quikscript⟩
income	⟨Quikscript⟩	inert	⟨Quikscript⟩
surprise	⟨Quikscript⟩	sanitize	⟨Quikscript⟩
myself	⟨Quikscript⟩	organization	⟨Quikscript⟩
everyone	⟨Quikscript⟩	inappropriateness	⟨Quikscript⟩

accomplishment ⟨quikscript⟩

A Little Dot Underneath

I use little dots below certain letters, to show that a separate syllable forms around a syllabic consonant. Specifically, these are the ⟨⟩, ⟨⟩, and ⟨⟩. Here are some word examples:

banner	⟨quikscript⟩
battery	⟨quikscript⟩
emerged	⟨quikscript⟩
simple, simpler	⟨quikscript⟩, ⟨quikscript⟩

(that last word is *three* syllables)

These dots can make such words easier to read, by pointing out where there's an extra syllable to pronounce. This can also aid in applying the stress rule. Most users of Quikskript probably tend to add a "silent ⟨⟩" to convey this syllabic quality, but I prefer to remain truer to actual pronunciation (for American English). Note that the presence or absence of these dots (and thus of syllabic quality) can even change the meaning of a word. For example, if I help you out in some way, one might say that I'm "<u>lightening</u> your load." But the word "<u>lightning</u>" is a different word entirely. So:

lightening	⟨quikscript⟩	(three syllables)
lightning	⟨quikscript⟩	(two syllables)

This syllabic quality is probably only a feature of American and Canadian English, so other dialects might not have use for these dots. Read's manual seems to always use the ⟨⟩ where I use the letter ⟨⟩. His intent may have been to create a spelling universally usable for all dialects of the English language, with the ⟨⟩ part pronounced in Britain and the ⟨⟩ part pronounced in the US. But since I see international standardization of Quikscript spelling as a lost cause, what I notice is that practically nobody pronounces both the ⟨⟩ and the ⟨⟩, which means that nearly everyone is writing a "silent letter." Sure, the beautiful ligature-swirl ⟨⟩ doesn't take more effort to write than the ⟨⟩, but I think that silent letters are one of the things a good system of writing should do away with. I could have nevertheless opted to use that beautiful swirl instead of my letter with a dot underneath, but that would fail to distinguish cases where the ⟨⟩ actually is pronounced before an ⟨⟩, such as in "around" ⟨quikscript⟩ and "Maria" ⟨quikscript⟩.

These dots would be used in any situation where something we know of as a consonant is pronounced in a syllabic way. So these instances could also occur:

The bee made a "<u>bzzzz</u>" sound as it flew. ⟨quikscript⟩

Unstressed Vowels Losing Their Full Quality

I'll need to start this topic off by saying something about *phonemes:* The linguistic concept of a phoneme is very relevant to a discussion of any improved alphabet for the English language. Wikipedia defines it as "the smallest segmental unit of sound employed to form meaningful contrasts between utterances." Here's an example to illustrate: In English we have a letter "t" to represent the phoneme /t/, and this phoneme manifests as several different sounds in American/Canadian English, according to where the phoneme occurs in a word or phrase: (with their pronunciations represented in the International Phonetic Alphabet)

- as [tʰ]] in <u>t</u>able (an aspirated, or more "explosive" t)
- as [t] in s<u>t</u>able (not aspirated)
- as [ɾ] in be<u>tt</u>er (a "flap" like for the letter r in Spanish pe<u>r</u>o)
- as [t˺] in be<u>t</u> (an unreleased final t—the sound ends with the tongue still closed against the gums behind the upper teeth)
- as [ʔ] in bu<u>tt</u>on (manifesting as a glottal stop just before a syllabic n)

It's said that the best way to design an alphabet is to make each letter correspond to one phoneme, since the writing system then corresponds most closely to our (unconscious) model of the sounds our language consists of. In this way, the Orthodox system of writing does a fairly good job most of the time using the letter "t" to represent the phoneme /t/. In the same way, in Quikscript I write this phoneme consistently with the letter "ǀ".

This then introduces our topic: In the English language, vowel phonemes, when unstressed, tend to be expressed as the central vowel sounds [ɨ] or [ə]. These two sounds are not easy for a native speaker of English to distinguish from each other, since they are not themselves phonemes, and since they only occur unstressed. But to distinguish them, here is an example of both . If a woman whose name is Rosa has a garden, and in it she grows roses, then those are:

<div align="center">

Rosa's roses (as spelled)
[ɹəʊzəz ɹəʊzɨz] (as pronounced)

</div>

(taken from Flemming, Johnson, "Rosa's Roses: Reduced Vowels in American English," *Journal of the International Phonetic Assocation*, 2007)

From my own observation, it seems that the [ə] typically replaces the back vowels, while [ɨ] replaces the front vowels. So:

<div align="center">

/æ, ɛ, eɪ, ɪ/ → [ɨ] — which I write in Quikscript as ı

/ɑ, o, ɔ, ʊ/ → [ə] — for which I write ɾ

</div>

A good example of this transformation is the word "men," and then the derived word "policemen," where the vowel phoneme /ɛ/ in the second word has become unstressed and is pronounced [ɨ]. This plural word is just barely distinguishable from its singular counterpart, "policeman," whose last vowel is the unstressed [ə].

I use the Quickscript letter "ꞁ" to represent the sound [ɨ], even though this sound itself has no letter to represent it in the alphabet, because it's fairly close to the [ɪ] sound for which that letter was intended, because the [ɨ] sound is sometimes replaced by an [ɪ], and because /ɪ/ is one of the most common phonemes that becomes the [ɨ] sound.

So in this way, I could represent the word "system" as 𐑅𐑦𐑕𐑑. But let's consider whether this is really the best way: If we insist on writing it with the "𐑧" simply because that's how to represent the old letter "e," that would seem absurd — a logical, new system of writing should be based on pronunciation, not on the problematic old spelling system that we'd like to replace. So, based purely on pronunciation, how do we know whether we're dealing with the phoneme /ɪ/ or /ɛ/? We can address the question in this way: When you add an adjective ending, the stress shifts onto the syllable in question, so that you get "systemic" /𐑅𐑦𐑕𐑧𐑥𐑦𐑒/. The second word is a derivation of the first one, so this demonstrates that the [ɨ] sound that you hear in the first word is really the /ɛ/ phoneme being expressed as the [ɨ] sound in an unstressed syllable. So I write it with the letter "𐑧", rather than "ꞁ" in both words. Similarly, I spell the word "hydrogen" as "𐑣𐑲𐑛𐑮𐑩𐑡𐑧𐑯" rather than "𐑣𐑲𐑛𐑮𐑩𐑡𐑯", taking into account other occurrences of the roots "hydro" and "gen" where their vowels are fully expressed. And my spelling of the ending in the word 𐑛𐑦𐑮𐑦𐑝 is informed by the derivations 𐑛𐑦𐑮𐑦𐑝𐑦 and 𐑛𐑦𐑮𐑦𐑝𐑩𐑯. In general, I try to write vowels as they are actually pronounced unless there is some other derivation of that word or root where it's fully expressed.

These transformations occur frequently, but they do not seem to happen in a fully predictable pattern: For example, "existential" /"𐑧𐑜𐑦𐑟𐑑𐑧𐑯𐑖𐑩𐑤"/ and "access" /"𐑨𐑒𐑕𐑧𐑕"/ each contain an unstressed /ɛ/ that doesn't transform to [ɨ]. And the same logic could be taken to strange extremes in spelling. For example, what should I do with "atom" vs. "atomic"? I could write the word "atom" as 𐑨𐑑𐑩𐑥 instead of 𐑨𐑑𐑥 (keeping in mind the word "atomic" /"𐑩𐑑𐑪𐑥𐑦𐑒"/, yet it seems just too strange and confusing to write it that way. I just write the word as "𐑨𐑑𐑥", since some derived words in English do have a changed vowel anyway — for example, "𐑯𐑱𐑖𐑩𐑯" and "𐑯𐑨𐑖𐑩𐑯𐑩𐑤".

In addition to vowels losing their full quality, another phonemic spelling issue arises with the phonemes /d/ and /t/ in American and Canadian English. When these phonemes occur between two vowels and/or certain syllabic consonants (but not when the following syllable is stressed, and I think not next to a morpheme boundary), it manifests as the "flap," [ɾ]. So here too, there are words in which we could "interpret" which phoneme to spell based on pronunciation rather than on their orthodox spelling. So for example, "liter" and "leader," both pronounced the same, could both be spelled 𐑤𐑰𐑛𐑮, and this practice could apply in any case where there is no derivation of a given word where that sound is pronounced voiceless. But interpreting the flap regularly as the /d/ phoneme brings up quandaries where a /t/ flap might often be heard pronounced voiceless when enunciated clearly. So here I find it easier to maintain the old phonemic interpretation of /d/ and /t/, grounded in etymology — though this inevitably causes some words to be spelled differently that are normally pronounced the same (as with the word pair just mentioned). And, yes, even though this means that my Quickscript spelling is in this one case influenced by Orthodox spelling.

The Abbreviations: A Somewhat Modified Standard List

I've made a few small changes to the list of standard abbreviations from pages 14 and 17 of the Quikscript Manual. My additions are shown here in green, changes in brown, omissions in red.

orthodox	spelled out	abbr.	comments
also	⟨ʃʃo⟩	⟨ʃʃ⟩	adapted to Standard American English pronunciation
and	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
are	⟨⟩		The full word is easy to write in a single beautiful penstroke, or to type with one keystroke.
as	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
be	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
because	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
become	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	At first I kept forgetting which of these two words to abbreviate—then for simplicity I just kept on abbreviating them both.
been	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
before	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
being	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
but	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
can	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
cannot	⟨⟩, ⟨⟩		
can't	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
come	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
comes	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
coming	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
could	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
couldn't	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
did	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
didn't	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
do	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	
doctor	⟨⟩	⟨⟩	

Word			Notes
does	𝄫	𝄫	I seem to have added this abbreviation by accident, thinking that I remembered it from the Quikscript Manual.
don't			
done			I seem to have added this abbreviation too by accident.
et cetera			
ever			
every			Adapted to the pronunciation.
for			
from			
go			
going			
gone			
good			
had			by analogy
have			
have to			a logical extension
haven't			
he			
he's			By logical extension from the abbreviations for "he" and "is"
he'll			a logical extension from the abbreviations "he" and "will"
him			
his			
into			
is			
it			
its			
little			
made			

Word			Note
make			
making			
me			
Mr.			
Mrs.			I found Read's original standard abbreviation confusing because it looks like "Ms."
Ms.			
much			
never			
not			The Senior Quikscript half-t makes this a handy abbreviation for this very common word.
of			
often			The abbreviation would be to simply not write the dot — more a confusing inconsistency than a convenience.
on			Not adapted to pronunciation, so as to avoid confusion with the word "awe" [" "].
only			
people			
perhaps			
shall			Rare word; replaced with "she'll."
she			
she'll			A logical extension from the abbreviations "she" and "will."
she's			
should			
shouldn't			By logical extension (originally by accident).
so			
such			I found myself using this abbreviation almost automatically as an analog to "much", so I decided to just go with it.
than			
that			For simplification, I use this abbreviation not only for the conjunction and relative pronoun but also for the demonstrative.

the	⟨glyph⟩, ⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
these	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
think	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
thinking	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
this	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
thought	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
time	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
times	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
to	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
very	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
we	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
we're	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
what	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
whatever	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
which	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
will	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
with	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
without	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
won't	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	just by analogy
would	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
wouldn't	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
you	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	
your	⟨glyph⟩, ⟨glyph⟩		I don't drop the dot.
yours	⟨glyph⟩, ⟨glyph⟩		I don't drop the dot.

More Abreviations: Optional

These are additional optional abbreviations for my personal, that I easily understand within a specific context of use. [A partial list.]

orthodox	spelled out	abbr.	comments
admin	𐑨𐑛𐑥𐑦𐑯	𐑨	
BCE		𐑚𐑒	
business	𐑚𐑦𐑗	𐑚	
cm	𐑕𐑧𐑯𐑑	𐑕	
f		𐑓	abbreviation following a page number, for "and following page"
fair trade	𐑓𐑺𐑑	𐑓-𐑑	
ff		𐑓𐑓	"and following page<u>s</u>"
gigabyte	𐑜𐑦𐑜	𐑜𐑚	
incl.	𐑦𐑯𐑒𐑤, 𐑦𐑯𐑒𐑤𐑵	𐑦𐑒	
kilobyte	𐑒𐑦𐑤	𐑒𐑚	
lvm		𐑤𐑝𐑥	"left a voicemail"
market	𐑥𐑸𐑒	𐑥𐑒	
marketing	𐑥𐑸𐑒𐑦	𐑥𐑒𐑦	
megabyte	𐑥𐑧𐑜	𐑥𐑚	
message	𐑥𐑧𐑕	𐑥	(when written next to a date)
mind	𐑥𐑲𐑯	𐑥𐑯	
page	𐑐𐑱𐑡	𐑐	(when immediately preceding a number)
pages	𐑐𐑱𐑡𐑩	𐑐𐑐	
paid	𐑐𐑱𐑛	𐑐𐑛	
pound	𐑐𐑬𐑯𐑛	𐑐𐑝	
Quikscript	·𐑒𐑢𐑦𐑒𐑕𐑒𐑮𐑦	·𐑒	
Shambhala	·𐑖𐑨𐑥𐑚	·𐑖𐑚	
social enterprise	𐑕𐑴𐑖𐑤 𐑧𐑯𐑑𐑼𐑐𐑮𐑲	𐑕-𐑧	
street	𐑕𐑑𐑮	𐑕𐑑	
translate	𐑑𐑮𐑨𐑯𐑕𐑤	𐑑𐑮	
translation	𐑑𐑮𐑨𐑯𐑕𐑤𐑯	𐑑𐑮𐑯	
United States	𐑿𐑯𐑲𐑑𐑦𐑛 𐑕𐑑𐑱𐑑𐑕	·𐑿𐑕	

voicemail

weekdays:		months:	
(Monday)		(January)	
(Tuesday)		(February)	
(Wednesday)		(March)	
(Thursday)		(April)	
(Friday)		(May)	
(Saturday)		(June)	
(Sunday)		(July)	
		(August)	
		(September)	
		(October)	
		(November)	
		(December)	

So I can write a date like **ʃr23ʌ13**, meaning "Sunday, the 23rd of June, 2013," or just **23ʌ** for "the 23rd of June."

How I Handle Abbreviated Affixes

I basically don't use them, except on abbreviated words. Why? First of all, I don't abbreviate the **-ɪl** as **-l** as Read recommends on p18 of the Manual, because in Standard American pronunciation it fails to distinguish some or all of these words:

I need to distinguish this:		from this:	
	pawing		pong
	thawing		thong
	sawing		song
	paying		pang
	slaying		slang
	saying		sang

— 12 —

Some affixes I don't abbreviate as recommended because they occur so infrequently that it seems like too much effort to watch out for them and drop the vowel when required. For example, the suffixes -land, and -man/-men on p20 of the Manual, and -ward/-wards on p21. Abbreviating -tion as **-ᴄʊ** is nice for handwriting, but it can garble derivations such as "professionally." And abbreviation of affixes interferes with my application of the Stress Rule for determining where to write an accent mark.

And where Read tells us to write the word affixes **-ᴊ, -ꞁ𝑗, -ᴄᴛ, -ᴨ, -ᴅᴜᴊ, ꝙᴨ-**, I write them almost the same but with my syllabic dots, as **-ᴊ, -ꞁ𝑗, -ᴛ̇, -ᴈ̇, -ᴅ𝑗̇, ꝙᴈ̇-**.

So I finally just gave up abbreviating affixes altogether, and for my use it seems simpler this way.

The Stress Rule

The rule is a bit more complex than the one in Spanish, and requires getting familiar with a list of affixes:
1. One-syllable words (which are used very frequently in English) never need any accent mark, since there's only one syllable to consider.
2. Otherwise, the stress falls on the second-to-last ("penultimate") syllable—except that certain syllables are ignored (skipped over) for purposes of this rule:
    - (a) the vowel ʌ, whenever it immediately precedes another vowel
    - (b) most commonly-used prefixes and suffixes (in the table that follows)
3. If this rule fails to determine any syllable to stress, then just disregard part 2 and apply penultimate stress to whatever syllables are present.

The prefixes and suffixes *disregarded and unstressable* for part 2.a are:

prefixes	examples; counterexamples
ꝙᴐʀ-	ꝙᴐ𝑟ᴧ, ꝙᴐ𝑟ꞁᴑᴊ, ꝙᴐ𝑟ᴛᴪᴏꞁ, ꝙᴐ𝑟ᴢᴄꞁ
ꝙᴐʌ-	ꝙᴐʌᴘᴏᴊ, ꝙᴐʌᴑᴏꟼ; ꝙᴐʌᴘᴧᴊ, ꝙᴐʌᴊᴄᴧ
ꝙᴐ-	ꝙᴐᴊᴧᴏ, ꝙᴐꞀᴑꞁᴊ, ꝙᴐᴊᴧ, ꝙᴐᴜᴏʌᴍ, ꝙᴐᴊᴜᴏꞁ, ꝙᴐᴊᴛᴪᴋ, ꝙᴐᴅᴄꞁ; ꝙᴊ ᴅᴄꞁ, ꝙᴊ ᴊᴛᴛ, ꝙᴊ ᴢᴧᴊ, ꝙᴊ ꞁᴧᴇꞁ
ꝙᴐᴊ-	ꝙᴐᴊᴍꞁᴐᴧ, ꝙᴐᴊᴘᴏᴊᴑꞁ; ꝙᴐᴊ ꝙᴇ ᴊᴄᴪ
ᴊᴧ-	ᴊᴧꞁᴏᴏ, ᴊᴧᴊᴧᴅ, ᴊᴧᴊᴏᴪ; ᴊᴧʼᴊᴪᴛ
ᴊᴊ-	ᴊᴊᴊᴄꞁ, ᴊᴊꝙᴐᴊ; ꝙᴄᴊᴊ ꝙᴇ ᴊᴄᴪ
ꝙᴐᴛᴏꞁ-, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢ-	ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢᴢᴄꞁ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢꞁᴅᴜᴋ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢꞁꞁᴐ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢꞁᴇᴧ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴊꞁᴑꞁᴏꞁ; ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢᴊᴇꞁ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢꞁᴅᴅᴐ, ꝙᴐᴛᴪᴢꞁᴧ (The second group here is stressed on the prefix but doesn't require an accent mark by part 3 of the stress rule.)
ᴋ-	ᴋᴊᴏ, ᴋᴏᴏᴏ, ᴋᴊᴛᴍᴏ, ᴋᴏᴋ, ꝉᴋᴧᴋ; ᴋ ᴤᴥᴦᴀᴟᴊ, ᴋᴛᴪᴑꞁ, ᴋᴊᴊᴏꞁ
ᴦᴧ-	ᴦᴧᴊᴢᴊᴏ, ᴦᴧᴦᴏᴏᴧᴤ, ᴦᴧᴏᴏᴢᴢ, ᴦᴧᴏᴋᴋ, ꝙᴦᴋᴋᴛᴛᴛ; ᴦᴧᴊᴊᴊᴄᴦᴪ, ᴦᴧᴏᴊᴋᴢᴤ
ᴦᴧꞁ-	ᴦᴧꞁᴅᴏᴧᴋᴊᴄꞁ, ᴦᴧꞁᴛᴛᴪᴊ, ᴦᴧꞁᴛᴑᴛᴪ; ᴦᴧꞁᴊᴊᴛꞁ
ᴦᴧ-	ᴧᴋᴧᴧ, ᴧᴋᴏᴊᴪᴑ, ᴧᴋᴏᴏᴢᴏ, ᴧᴋᴊᴛᴏᴏ
ᴦᴛᴛ-	ᴦᴛᴛᴏꞁᴛᴊ, ᴦᴛᴛᴏᴏᴏᴪ
ꞁᴛᴛ-, ꞁᴪᴋ-	ꞁᴛᴛᴏᴏᴋᴤᴏᴏ, ꞁᴛᴛᴑᴧᴋᴠᴥᴧ, ꞁᴛᴛᴑᴅᴋᴢ, ꞁᴪᴋᴄꞁᴑᴊ, ꞁᴛᴛᴑᴧꞁᴩ, ꞁᴛᴛᴑᴢᴄꞁ; ꞁᴪʼ ꞁᴋᴑᴢᴧ

(the preposition), (these are pronounced as an unstressed -);

unstressed -);

(unstressed pronounced as -);

suffixes	examples; counterexamples

Other affixes that are specifically *not disregarded* for the stress rule are:

<u>prefixes</u> <u>examples</u>

suffixes   examples

(The prefix and suffix entries, and the example words, are written in a constructed/invented script that cannot be faithfully transliterated.)

-il-ʌ   (When this entire suffix occurs, the suffix -il is *not* ignored, while the suffix -ʌ *is* ignored — so stress falls on the syllable just before this suffix)

Some notes on how the stress rule plays out:

They are not based on a word's etymology, but rather are applied wherever a specific sequence of sounds may appear. So, for example, the ignored prefix ʌ- comes mostly from the Latin prefix e-/ex-, but the rule applies equally to the names *(name)* and *(name)*.

More than one affix can occur consecutively. Here are some examples (with hyphens to show the boundaries of the syllables and affixes, and with bold for the the non-ignorable syllables):

(script word)	deodorant
(script word)	confused
(script word)	non-reimbursement
(script word)	reinternalizing
(script word)	immediately

ᴎⵦ-ᴕⵏ-ᒋᴕ -ⵜ	international
ⴺ-ᑕ|ᒉ-ⵦⴷᒉⵏ-ⴺ	efficiency
ᒉᴕ-ᴉⴱ-ᵧᴎ	management

(Looking at the affixes for the stress rule could perhaps imply a different interpretation of what a word's root is: In fact, it would seem to identify the root word in "efficiency" as "fish," in "deodorant" as "ode," and in "confuse" as "few"! But of course this is not really a reinterpretation of word roots, only a system to determine regular stress.)

The suffixes -ᒉ and -ⵧ have to be included on the list even though they're non-syllabic, so that their presence won't sometimes negate all or part of a chain of ignorable suffixes — so, for example, the -ⵧ in ᒉⵏᒉⴷⵧ allows the preceding -ᴷ- to remain an ignorable syllable for the stress rule.

Here are some examples of normally ignored and unstressable affixes that actually do carry stress, so that they need an accent mark to override the stress rule: ᴉᴷᴎᵨᴇ, ⵎᒉᒉ, ᴉᴎᴷⵏᵦ, ᴷᴎᵧᵦᵟ, ᴷᴕᒉᵟ, ᴎᵨᴑ, ᴉᵨᴺᴷ.

An ignorable prefix can never occur at the very end of a word; an ignorable suffix can never occur at the very beginning of a word. So, for example, ᒉⵏᴑ has an ignorable prefix. But even though the ᴑ can be an ignorable prefix, here it's at the very end of a word and thus it cannot be considered an ignorable prefix. Therefore the rule shows the ᴑ as the only stressable syllable in this word.

As suggested in Part 3 of the stress rule, occasionally Part 2 will fail to determine a syllable to stress. This happens when all the syllables in a word can be identified as ignorable affixes — either nothing remains in the word after disregarding the ignorables, or there's just one non-syllabic consonant:

ᒋⵏ-ⵍ-ⴺ	beady
ᒋ-ᴉᴑ-ⵏ-ᴷ	barrier
ᒉᴉ-ᵧ -ᴷ-ᴑ	dithering
ᒉᴉ-ᵧ-ᴑ	dimming
ᴑᴉᴑ-ⵧ-ᴷ-ⵏ	forgery
ᴑ-ᒉᴉ-ⵧⵦ-ᵟ	indigenous
ⵦ-ᴷ	inner
ⵏ-ᵧ-ᵟ	eagle
ⵦ-ⵏ	any
ᵟᒉ-ᴷ	utter

— 17 —

<center>ⵔ-ⵖ-ⵣⵏ   ugly</center>

<center>ⴽ|-ⵎ   outer</center>

So part 3 just reevaluates the word, to find a syllable to stress. In some cases, an accent mark is needed.

Often the stress rule correctly predicts changes in stress between different derivations of the same word. For example, ⵎⵏⵉⵔⵍ and ⵎⵏⵉⵔⵍ; ⵑⵍⵇ| and ⵑⵏⵇⵓ|; ⵔⵔⴲⵏ and ⵡⵏⴲⵓ; ⵔⵚⵔⴷⵏ and ⵚⵔⴷⵏ; ⴷⵓⵓⵏⵗ and ⴷⵓⵓⵏⴳ; |ⵑⵔⵚⵓ and |ⵑⵔⵚⵓ, and the two alternate pronunciations ⵔⵉⵇⵊ and ⵔⵉⵇⵊ.

A Modified Font

Since I use Quikscript a little differently, for my convenience I came up with my own modified font, which I named "Suave" because when optimizing spacing for my own tastes, I ended up liking smooth transitions from letter to letter. I added the accent mark, the syllabic dot, single and double smart quotes, smart fractions, correct parentheses, and a few additional symbols. I also reshaped some non-letter symbols. I claim a "copyleft" for the font, since it is based on a series of predecessors created by other Quikscript users (of the King Plus font, and so on), and since I think it's best to make it fully available for others to use and modify as they choose, as long as they give some credit to those of us who did the work — basically in the spirit of the Open Source movement.

I moved a few letters around to suit my own preferences for typing, and added a few common affixes to minimize keystrokes. With single keys for certain common affixes, typing the word "commission" for example requires just three keystrokes, and "shunning" and "mental" each take only two. I also changed spacing around letters to better suit my own esthetic preferences, though my spacing is not always perfect, nor always consistent when formatting is changed or when accent marks are used.

I use ligatures like ⵄ and ⵝ, though I could have opted for a phonemically correct ⵔⵄ and ⵔⵝ, and I do this just because I happen to like their beautiful shapes, as well as the reduction in keystrokes.

I have not yet made a Unicode version of the font, for two reasons: I'm not sure that the character encodings for Quikscript have been finalized yet. And I find it easier to let the computer think I'm typing Latin letters, because I would otherwise have to create a Linux keyboard layout and keep reassigning my list of keyboards (Ubuntu Linux only allows four keyboard layouts to be active at a given time, and I already have American, Russian, German, and Spanish set up).

I've started playing around with a bold version and an italic version for Suave, but this is still at a very early stage. I also have plans to make special bold and italic versions of Suave, and to create several new fonts, which I would call "Brushstroke," "Essayist," "Poet," and "Dignitarian." But it may take a long time before I get to these, since I feel an urge to shift my attention to a number of other things, such as getting back to work on a novel that I started long ago, and to get back to sketching.

Here is my keyboard layout for Suave ⵏⵙⵔⵒ: (The accent mark, by the way, is typed right *after* the letter to be accented — it lives in the location of the back-slash on the standard American keyboard layout.)

<center>— 18 —</center>

upper	~	!	⟨glyph⟩	#	$	%	⟨glyph⟩	/	*	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	+
lower	⟨glyph⟩	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	-	=
standard upper	~	!	@	#	$	%	^	&	*	(	)	_	+
standard lower	`	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	-	=

upper	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	{	}	⟨glyph⟩
lower	⟨glyph⟩	/	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	[	]	'
standard upper	Q	W	E	R	T	Y	U	I	O	P	{	}	|
standard lower	q	w	e	r	t	y	u	i	o	p	[	]	\

upper	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	:	"		
lower	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	;	'		
standard upper	A	S	D	F	G	H	J	K	L	:	"		
standard lower	a	s	d	f	g	h	j	k	l	;	'		

upper	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	<	>	?			
lower	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	,	.	•			
standard upper	Z	X	C	V	B	N	M	<	>	?			
standard lower	z	x	c	v	b	n	m	,	.	/			

The Names of the Letters

There were certainly things I liked about each of the two sets of letter names that I saw originally. But for various reasons I wasn't satisfied overall with either one. So here too, I came up with my own arrangement. For most of the letters I simply used the word for which they stand as one-letter abbreviations, except in cases where doing so creates ambiguity. This arrangement makes both the letter-names and these abbreviations easier to remember.

#	letter	name	name	#	letter	name	name
1	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	pipe	21	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	ink
2	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	be	22	⟨glyph⟩	⟨glyph⟩	me

3	ǀ	ᴋ ⁄ɦ⁊	tot (to)	23	ᴠ	ᴊᴏ	and
4	ᴠ	ᴎ	do	24	⸴	ᴎᴠ	will
5	ᴄ	ᴄᴕ	can	25	ᴐ	ᴐᴜ	roar
6	ᴚ	ᴚᴏ	go	26	ᴉ	‖	it
7	⁊	⁊ᴒᴋ	think	27	ʌ	ᴀ	eat
8	ᴄ	ᴇᴧ	the	28	ᴜ	ᴜ	ed
9	ᴆ	ᴆᴈᴆ ⁄ᴆᴜ⁊	fife (for)	29	ᴇ	ᴇᴈ	age
10	ℓ	ᴦℓ	of	30	ᴊ	ᴨ	as
11	ᴋ	ᴋᴏ	so	31	ᴈ	ᴈ	eye
12	ᴌ	ᴫ	is	32	ᴊ	ᴊ	ah
13	ᴄ	ᴄᴧ	she	33	ᴌ	ᴌᴈ	awl
14	ᴈ	ᴈᴜ	zhe	34	ᴎ	ᴍ	on
15	ᴌ	ᴧᴌ	which	35	ᴧ	ᴧᴈ	oil
16	ᴈ	ᴈᴈ	judge	36	ᴦ	ᴦᴡ	udder
17	ᴩ	ᴩᴏ ⁄ɦ⁊	yo (you)	37	ᴩ	ᴩᴉ	out
18	⁄	⁄ʌ	we	38	ᴏ	ᴏ	owe
19	ᴦ	ᴧ	he	39	ᴠ	ᴎᴈ	wool
20	ᴠ	ᴠᴦᴉ	what	40	ʌ	ᴨ	ooze

41	ᴢ	ᴢᴡ	llan
42	ᴆ	ᴢᴆ	loch
43	⸴	⸴⸴	ll
44	ᴠ̣	ᴠ̣ᴠ̣	nn
45	ᴐ̣	ᴐ̣ᴐ̣	rr
46	ᴖ	ᴖᴖ	mm
47	ᴐ̈	ᴐ̈	(trilled r)

Other Notes

Since Quikscript is intended as a superior system of writing, it makes perfect sense to do away with

the apparently unique English-language practice of trapping commas and periods inside quotation marks "like this‚" for example, "and like this͈." This practice may be starting to die out in Orthodox spelling anyway, due to necessary cases like for mentioning a filename like "Quikscript as I Use It.pdf"‚ or an address like "www.thiswebsite.org'͈.

I don't use the Quikscript X's (the one voiced and the other voiceless). I don't have anything against them; I just find that in my own handwriting I get by more easily without them, and it's easiest to write with the keyboard similarly to how I write with the pen.

I don't bother with Read's recommended underlining of numerals.

I tend to put the naming dot in front of *each* component of a name (corresponding more closely to Orthodox use of capital letters for names), as this improves clarity for me.

I write place names consistently as single words, unless they consist of clearly identifiable separate words in English. So, for example: ⟨Quikscript⟩, ⟨Quikscript⟩, ⟨Quikscript⟩, ⟨Quikscript⟩ but ⟨Quikscript⟩. I also more often omit word-connecting hyphens, and join words when their intonation suggests it: Words seem clear enough in Quikscript that I can just write ⟨Quikscript⟩ and ⟨Quikscript⟩ and ⟨Quikscript⟩ as one word each.

I write Quikscript as I pronounce it. Overall my pronunciation is nearly identical to Standard American English, but it seems I deviate from the standard in a few places, such as these words:

orthodox spelling	me	standard
bank	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩
coupon	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩
gas	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩
guess	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩
pang	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩
thirteen	⟨Quikscript⟩	⟨Quikscript⟩

In my Quikscript spelling, as in my pronunciation, I make no distinction between "sense" and "cents" and thus spell them both ⟨Quikscript⟩, while the longer word sensation I generally pronounce and spell ⟨Quikscript⟩.

Regarding handwriting, mine is about the same as the Senior Quikscript expounded in the Manual. But I frequently attach the half-t *after* another letter, which in the Manual I see used only for the word "⟨Quikscript⟩" (and on p19 Read says, "invariably with ⟨-Quikscript⟩ followed by a penlift" — I don't understand why he says this). I find this half-letter very handy, using it for example in "⟨Quikscript⟩", "⟨Quikscript⟩", and in my abbreviation "⟨Quikscript⟩" for "not." I also often use a half-letter version of "⟨Quikscript⟩"‚ as for example in a word like "⟨Quikscript⟩".

One wonderful thing about Quikscript is the way it enables more accurate pronunciation of foreign words, such as place-names, if desired:

orthodox spelling	usual	closer to native
Berlin		
Harlech (Wales)		
Mumbai	[?]	
Warsaw		
Tokyo		

A Sample Text

For my sample text, I took the first two paragraphs in this document that have no special characters:

*Here I just opted for the pronunciation that has long been familiar to me in America. Would it be more correct to refer to him, in British pronunciation, as ⟨Quikscript⟩, or would an Irish pronunciation perhaps be more appropriate?