

892

R212

UC-NRLF



\$B 257 849

HINTS AND DON'TS
FOR
Writers and Copyreaders

By Robert W. Ransom.

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

892
R 212

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HINTS “DON'TS”

*For
Writers and
Copyreaders*

By
ROBERT W. RANSOM



CHICAGO

PUBLISHED BY THE CHICAGO RECORD-HERALD
1911

HINTS
"DON'TS"

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY ROBERT W. RANSOM.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Published August, 1911.



FOREWORD.

Making its appeal especially to cultured readers, THE CHICAGO RECORD-HERALD should be an example of good English. This it can be without being dull or pedantic. A great newspaper also may be a model of style.

As a step in this direction, and at my invitation, Mr. Robert W. Ransom of THE RECORD-HERALD has compiled the following hints and "don'ts," suggested by frequent lapses in grammar and by faults of diction and style. To these have been added certain "dangerous" expressions and some useful reminders to copyreaders.

The enumeration of newspaper errors, while incomplete, includes most of those which have grown up in recent years, as well as some "old offenders" which persist today.

Compliance with the instructions which follow is expected and will be required.

HENRY BARRETT CHAMBERLIN,
Managing Editor.

HINTS AND "DON'TS."

"LEADS" AND "STORIES."

1. Make "leads" simple and direct. Get to the point at once. The first sentence must be brief, but must set forth the central, vital fact of the "story." Many a great "lead" has been put in three lines of type.

2. Avoid the too frequent use of what has been called the "suspended interest lead," as in: "With her hair streaming down her back, her eyes bulging with terror and her garments disheveled, Madeline Rivers dashed wildly down Clark street last night," etc. Used sparingly, this kind of "lead" is effective. But if all "leads" were built upon this plan, the result would be monotonous indeed. Begin a "story" with a terse, striking statement of fact. Nothing can be more effective.

3. Never begin a "story" with "If you were," etc., "How would you like," etc., "Wouldn't it stun you, if," etc., or with hysterical observations like this: "Ghosts? Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of 'em!" Shun all such excrescences.

4. Avoid, as a general rule, beginning a "story" or a paragraph with "a," "an," or "the." Try to find something more virile.

5. Don't begin a "story" or a paragraph with "yesterday" or any other expression of time. There are other things to be said which are of more importance.

6. Avoid "fine writing," circumlocution and long, involved sentences. These are intolerable.

7. Shun exaggeration and distortion. Tell the plain truth.

8. Don't be afraid to use dialogue in a "story," especially when the conversation is

crisp and pointed. Dialogue brightens up a "story" and gives it "life."

9. Anonymous interviews or statements, inferences and implied accusations are forbidden. "It is said" and "it is alleged" are barred, except, in the case of the latter, when dealing with court papers. Then the allegations are made by the papers, and not by THE RECORD-HERALD. Nor is it safe to base serious charges on the belief or even the word of the police. The suspicion or belief of a policeman is a weak prop in a libel suit. Unless a suspected person is under formal charges or arrest, it is unsafe to go farther than to assert that the authorities are investigating certain facts and circumstances. Detail these and the known results of such investigations. But be sure to state them fairly and in all cases to add what the suspected person has to say for himself.

10. No item printed under the heading, "City News in Brief," should exceed seventy-five words. All "stories" of more than 100 words must contain at least three paragraphs. The first must give the gist of the "story." If it becomes necessary to "kill" the second and third paragraphs the essence of the "story" is preserved.

Some of the faults enumerated here are discussed in detail in the pages which follow.

ON THE WRITING OF "HEADS."

A perfect head is a work of art. It must be a reflex of the "story" it epitomizes, must be apt and striking and must be typographically "right."

Don't editorialize in heads. Make no head stronger than the "story" on which it is based. "Overwriting" in heads is as reprehensible as exaggeration in "stories." Many busy persons read only the headings in a paper. It is incumbent upon a copy-reader, therefore, not to give false impressions. Others read articles the headings to which promise details of peculiar interest. Make the headings as attractive as possible, but always with strict regard for the facts.

Typographically the rules are simple, but rigid.

Don't begin any part of a head with "A," "An" or "The."

Don't begin two successive lines of a head with the same letter.

Cross lines may amplify what goes before or may introduce what follows. When a cross line is intended to introduce a succeeding "bank" construct the line in such a way that it cannot be taken to refer to the preceding "bank." The cross line in the following head is faulty because at first sight it apparently amplifies the preceding part of the head and makes Harrison argue for the company, when in reality it introduces the last "bank" and refers not to Harrison, but to Meagher. "Company Of-

cial Replies" would have expressed the main idea and prevented any possible chance of misconstruction:

HARRISON WELCOMES THREAT OF GAS SUIT

Reiterates Contention That
70-Cent Rate Is Fair and
Invites a Test.

ARGUES FOR THE COMPANY

Vice-President Meagher Attacks
Hagenah Report, Declaring
77 Cents Unfair.

Don't crowd top and cross lines with too many letters and don't write too few. A "tight" line is as bad as one that shows too much white space. Seek the happy medium.

But the top and cross lines are not the only parts of a head that require care and the counting of letters. The "banks" are of equal importance in attaining symmetry.

Don't permit the indented lines in the second "bank" to be longer than those in the first "bank," or those in the third to be longer than those in the second. Make them shorter, thereby obtaining a head with a perfect slope. If there are other "banks," as in an extended head, observe the same rule. If the head is "bad" in proof or in the first edition of the paper, perfect it.

Avoid dashes in heads. If you must use them, however, devise heads so that dashes will not begin or end lines in "banks."

Typographically the following are model No. 7 and No. 2 heads:

MAY 1 LOSES TERROR FOR ALL WHO MOVE

Two Big Real Estate Boards
Vote to Abolish Arbitrary
Lease System.

WILL RENT FOR ANY TERM

Tenants, Landlords and Laborers
Expected to Find Great
Benefit in Change.

CORONATION RITE OF 1911 IS WORK OF "CONFESSOR"

Ceremony to Be Used for
George V. Drawn Up by
Old Saxon Monarch.

PART IS TAKEN FROM BIBLE

Anointing of Britain's King
Copied After the Crown-
ing of Jehoash.

ON THE WRITING OF "HEADS" 7

Subheads in a long "story" should be placed, as a rule, about 200 words apart; in a shorter "story," 100 or 150 words apart. But whenever there is an important change of topic, disregard mathematical regularity and symmetry and use a subhead.

Never use a subhead after a sentence ending with a colon. Paragraph the sentence and place the subhead above it. When you say "Senator Root spoke as follows:" and place a subhead after the colon, you interrupt what follows, if indeed you do not make the speaker responsible for the subhead.

SYNTAX, DICTION, STYLE.

A

ABBREVIATE—Don't use it for "abridge." The former means to "curtail" and the latter to "condense." You "abbreviate" a title; you "abridge" a speech.

ABOLITION—This term is preferable to "abolishment," or to "abolishing" used as a noun.

ADJECTIVES FOR ADVERBS—It is a common newspaper error to use "slow," "quick," "easy," "sure," in their positive, comparative and superlative forms, for the proper corresponding adverbs. Thus one is admonished to "go slow" instead of to "go slowly"; Champ Clark is represented as saying "legislators win fame quicker through wit than through hard work," when the presumption is he said "more quickly"; "he breathes easier now" is seen oftener than "he breathes more easily now," and "I am going sure" is wrongly used for "I am going surely." The rule regarding the proper use of adjectives and adverbs is well stated by Professor F. A. March as follows: "When the wish is to express a quality of the subject, the adjective should be used, however closely it may be situated as to the verb; if the wish is to express some quality of the action of the verb, the adverb should be used."

ADVENT—Reserve it for some important or sacred event. Don't say "the advent of a circus," but use "arrival."

AFTER—Don't use it as an adverb, as in: "He came after." Say "afterward." Most newspapers now use "after" only as a preposition or as a conjunction, as in: "He came after dinner," or "He came after his friend had gone."

AGGRAVATE—Don't use it in the sense of "exasperate" or "provoke." Restrict it to its proper meaning, which is "to make

worse or more severe," as in the expression, "To aggravate the disease."

AIRSHIP—Don't use it to denote an aeroplane, but a dirigible balloon.

ALLUDE—Don't misuse it. Remember that it means only a casual reference to a subject.

ALREADY—Don't use it unless it is necessary to imply a contrast between what has happened and what may happen. Generally it may be omitted without sacrificing anything important, as in: "It is said that many of the books already have been placed in the schools."

AND—Don't say "Try and succeed" when you mean "Try to succeed."

The word "and" is misused again in the following: "Subtracting their votes from the Lorimer votes and Lorimer would have been beaten by four votes." The meaning is: "Subtracting their votes from the Lorimer votes, it is apparent that Lorimer would have been beaten by four votes." No "and" is necessary to establish the connection between the two clauses. Change "subtracting" to "subtract," however, and the use of "and" will be proper and necessary.

Don't say "and" for "or," as in: "Cannon no longer cracks the whip over his party associates and attempts to drive them." The evident meaning here is that he does neither of these things; hence "or" should be used instead of "and."

Avoid the unnecessary repetition of "and" as in: "He spoke, and gesticulated, and ranted, and the audience alternately cheered and jeered him." The first "and" is superfluous.

Don't begin a sentence or paragraph with "and." It adds nothing to the force of what follows and should be eliminated.

A NUMBER OF—This means "two or more" and is most indefinite. Say "several," which means more than two, but not very many, or say "many."

ARCHAIC WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS—"Learnt," "spoilt," "proven" and similar forms for "learned," "spoiled," "proved," etc., and "amongst" for "among" are examples of the survival of the unfittest. Discard the archaic; use the modern.

"That which," as in "We prefer that which is interesting," well may give place to "what."

For "The piece came to its first production" say "The piece was produced for the first time." This is Chicago, not London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna or Boston.

"It is possible to say" or "It is possible to believe" many things, but when an artist achieves a notable triumph, why use either of these timid, preliminary phrases in announcing that fact? Similarly, "it may be declared that the young performer plays surprisingly well" suggests a forced commendation. If praise is to be withheld, withhold it; but if the intention is to commend, do it in no half-apologetic fashion. Dispense, therefore, with "it is declared" and say openly and above board: "The young performer plays surprisingly well."

It is going far afield to say "One needs must have" for "One must have." The latter expresses fully and clearly all that is meant by the former.

Don't use "she" in referring to a country, a city or a ship; each is neuter. Say "it" and leave "she" to the poets and the archaists.

Don't use the archaic word "hostelry" for "hotel," "inn," or "lodging-house."

"Which" as an adjective in such expressions as "in which city," "in which place," "in which event," etc., is out of date in any twentieth-century "story." For "He lived in Chicago, in which city he was born," say: "He lived in Chicago, where he was born." The meaning is precisely the same and the expression more direct, more in accord with modern usage, and more eu-

phonious. For "He expects to win the party nomination, in which event he will become Governor of Illinois," say: "He expects to win the party nomination. In that event he will become Governor of Illinois."

Closely allied is the expression "all of which," often used after a dash, or a period, or even beginning a new paragraph and referring to some preceding statement. This is a species of loose writing seemingly adopted because of the impression that it imparts an air of "smartness" to the subsequent comment. In reality "which" in such cases is used as an adjective, with some noun like "facts," "circumstances," or "things" understood. It would be preferable to say "All this," or "all these," or "all the foregoing," which is precisely what is meant.

Don't begin a sentence or paragraph with "after which," referring to something in the preceding sentence or paragraph. Say "after this," "after that," "then," or "thereupon."

ARTICLE—Use the indefinite article, if you use any, in referring to a person's business, trade or profession. Thus say "John Jones, a machinist," not "John Jones, the machinist"; "Henry Miller, an actor." Conceivably there are other machinists and other actors named John Jones and Henry Miller. To single out the individual by the use of "the" negatives such a supposition and gives your Jones or Miller undue prominence. Or, omit "a" or "an" altogether and say "John Jones, machinist," and "Henry Miller, actor." In referring to a famous personage like Henry Irving, or Sarah Bernhardt, the name alone is sufficient without any professional tag or preceding article. Also, when a person's official title follows his name the use of "the" is unnecessary, as in: "James Bryce, British ambassador."

No article is needed after the expression "kind of," as in: "I dislike this kind of task."

Omit "a" before the dollar mark, as in: "He has invested about a \$1,000,000 in mining."

When a participle is used as a noun, as in the sentence, "Fears have been expressed with regard to mulcting of the farmer," the article should be used before the participle, or omitted together with the preposition following the participle. Say either "the mulcting of the farmer" or "mulcting the farmer."

Don't say "the trousers pocket" for "a trousers pocket," as in: "A torn five dollar bill was found in the trousers pocket of the dead architect." Trousers usually have two, often four, pockets, not to mention a watch pocket.

AS—Don't use it for the conjunction "that," as in: "I don't know as they will come." Such use of "as" is dialectal or colloquial.

Avoid the frequent, monotonous, confusing use of "as" by substituting "when" or "since" if the sense permits.

AVIATION—Apply it only to heavier-than-air machines. Use "aeronautics" in referring to lighter-than-air machines. Wright promotes "aviation," Zeppelin "aeronautics." The former is an "aviator," the latter an "aeronaut." The useful word "airman" is not recognized in the lexicons, but language grows and its day may come. "Birdman" for "aviator" is barred in THE RECORD-HERALD.

AVOCATION—Don't use it when you mean "vocation." The latter mean's one's regular pursuit or calling, while "avocation" is that which calls one away from it.

AWKWARD WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS—Omit the nominative before a participle. A recent "story" about a young man who asked assistance in obtaining a bride contained this clause: "He adding that any maiden with the desired qualifications could find him at a given address." The "he" should have been omitted. Here is a later instance: "The continued ill health of Mr. Lincoln is given as the cause of his impending retirement from the active management of the corporation, he having been anxious for some time to be relieved of the responsibility." Put into English, this sentence would read: "The continued ill health of Mr. Lincoln, who has been anxious for some time to be relieved of the responsibility, is given as the cause of his impending retirement from the active management of the corporation." This use of the nominative absolute is out of place in a modern newspaper "story."

"Not a page but shows genius" is merely a roundabout way of saying "Every page shows genius." The latter is simple, direct and expresses the meaning fully and clearly.

Don't say "If they do not go to work and obtain a judgeship for him." The words "go to work" are unnecessary. Obtaining a judgeship implies work. The expression should read: "If they do not obtain a judgeship for him."

Don't say "going to be" when you mean "will be," as in: "He is going to be the youngest college president in the United States."

Omit "got" in such an expression as "A man has got two arms." Use it only when it means one has acquired or obtained something.

Don't say "paid a call on Senor Limantour," but "paid a call to," "made a call on" or "called on" the senor.

For such an awkward, confusing statement as "the 96,000 figure is less than 2,000 greater than the vote of the Republican primary last fall" substitute the clearer, more direct declaration: "The 96,000 figure exceeds by less than 2,000 the vote at the Republican primary last fall."

Don't say "Senator La Follette did not get to see him." "Senator La Follette did not see him" is sufficient.

B

BACK—Don't say "a few days back," but "a few days ago." Similarly, don't say "a few days ahead" in the sense of "a few days hence" or "a few days from now."

BAD—Restrict it to its proper meaning, which is the opposite of "good." One may accept "bad" money, or have a "bad" temper, but for "bad" pain, "bad" wound say "severe" pain, "dangerous" wound.

BADLY—Don't use it for "very," "very much" or "greatly." Thus, instead of saying "I need the money badly," say "I need the money very much."

BALANCE—Don't use it in the sense of "rest," "remainder" or "residue." Restrict it to its proper meanings.

BEASTLY—Don't use this highly objectionable Briciticism for "very" or "exceedingly," as in "beastly hot."

BESIDE, BESIDES—Distinguish carefully between them. "Beside" means "by the side of," as in: "I stood beside her." "Besides" means "in addition to," as in: "He has several houses besides this."

BIG—Avoid it in heads and in text. Few words have been so overworked or sound so cheap. "Big" refers properly only to physical size. Don't misuse it for "great." Remember that a "big" man may not be "great" and that a "great" man may not be "big."

BLOOD, BLOODY—Avoid as far as possible the use of these unpleasant and generally unnecessary words.

BOGUS—Substitute the preferable word “spurious.”

BOMB—Don’t explode any more metaphorical bombs, as in: “Alderman Jones set off a bomb last night when he charged Alderman Smith with grafting.” The use of “bomb” in this sense is improper and tiresome.

BRING, CARRY, TAKE—“Bring” means to convey a thing from one point to the point where the speaker is, as in: “Bring me an apple.” “Carry” means to convey a thing from one point to another, as in: “This train carries the mail from Chicago to New York.” “Take” means to convey a thing from the point where the speaker is to another point, as in: “Take the book to him.”

BUT—Don’t use it for “only,” as in: “All these flights but led up to the great event.” “But” is a preposition, or a conjunction, and its use as an adverb is archaic or poetical. Avoid also the use of “but that” and “but what” for “that,” as in: “There is no doubt but what (or but that) I shall go.” “There is no doubt that I shall go” is sufficient, and even “that” may be omitted here as unnecessary.

C

CALCULATE—Don’t use it in the sense of “believe,” “expect,” “plan,” “suppose,” “think,” “intend.” In the following sentence it is misused for “expected” or “likely”: “The appearance of ten men like J. Ogden Armour and Louis Swift in a court where it will be decided whether they are to go to jail, be fined or freed is calculated to attract a large crowd of persons.” Obviously calculation in no way enters into the

case. In "we calculate to leave tomorrow" the word is misused for "intend."

CARAVANSARY—An extravagant word, much favored by rural editors, for "hotel." Cultivate simplicity by dropping it.

CASKET—This is a favorite word of the undertaker. Most good newspapers prefer "coffin."

CITY BEAUTIFUL—Don't use the expression when referring to Chicago or to what is known as "the Chicago plan." Some day Chicago may be a "city beautiful"; to-day the expression, having been over-worked, merely excites incredulity and ridicule.

CLAIM—Don't use it as a verb unless the intention is to assert an individual right to something. Ordinarily use "say," "declare," "assert" or "allege."

CLERGY—Don't use it when you mean "clergymen," as in: "Four clergy officiated." "Clergy" is a collective noun and should not be used in referring to individuals.

CLUBMAN—This might mean the cave man, or a policeman, armed with a club. What you really mean is "club member," or "member of a club." Say so. "Club-woman" is even worse than "clubman."

COACH—Don't use it for "street car," even in heads, where the temptation to do so is especially strong. A railway passenger car properly may be called a "coach," but a street car may not; it is just a "street car," or a "car."

COINING OF VERBS—Verbs must not be coined from proper nouns, as "Lexowed," "Sundayed," "Fletcherize," etc., or from nouns generally, as "jailed," "officed," "recessed," "loaned," etc. A man doesn't "office" at 100 Washington street; he has an office there. It would be just as proper to say he "homes" at 52 East Twenty-ninth street," or "clubs" at the Union League. A legislative body or a convention doesn't "recess," but "takes a recess." You don't

"loan" a friend \$5, but you may "lend" him \$5. Some modern writers urge the use of "loan" as a verb in referring to large financial transactions, but the plea is not convincing.

COLLOCATION OF WORDS—Don't describe a man as "a heavy hardware dealer." What you mean is "a dealer in heavy hardware." The man himself may not be heavy, but light.

Don't say a man was "shot in the fracas," or "in the struggle," or in anything else, except some specifically named part of his person. If the "fracas" or "struggle" is too important to omit, change the arrangement of the words and say "in the fracas" or "in the struggle" a man was shot.

The proper position in a sentence of the conjunction "however" apparently perplexes many persons. Since it qualifies, negatives, or institutes a contrast with something previously stated, it should be placed so as to make clear such qualification, negation, or contrast. The following is an example of correct collocation: "England permits virtually no discrimination (by Russia) against English Jews, and Jews from Germany are admitted much as other citizens. In the case of the United States, however, Russia takes greater liberties." Here Russia's treatment of English and German Jews is contrasted with its treatment of American Jews. "However," which emphasizes the contrast, is placed properly after "United States." The following is an example of incorrect collocation: "Scientists of all ages have declared that transmutation is an impossibility. They, however, lose sight of the fact that nature is accomplishing transmutation all the time and everywhere." There can be no contrast here between "scientists" and "they," which stands for "scientists." The contrast is between the negation of transmutation by scientists and the constant disproof of that negation by

nature. "However," therefore, should be placed after "sight," or "fact," or "nature," thereby enforcing the contrast.

Avoid the "splitting" of infinitives whenever the meaning can be expressed as clearly, or more clearly, by so doing. Thus, "indefinitely to defer," or, better, "to defer indefinitely," is regarded more favorably than "to indefinitely defer," and "decides not to go" is far preferable to "decides to not go." Euphony will dictate in most cases that the adverb shall follow the verb and not precede the sign "to."

The same general rule, with the qualifications noted, should apply, by analogy, to the separation of main verbs and their auxiliaries. Thus, "the man was roughly handled" should give place to "the man was handled roughly." Euphony again will demand generally that the adverb follow the main verb rather than precede the auxiliary. Thus, "The fireman had borne him out carefully" is preferable to "the fireman carefully had borne him out."

Adverbs, as a rule, should follow simple verbs. Thus "declared yesterday" is better than "yesterday declared," the fact of the declaration being more important than the time.

In the sentence, "The conservatives had only been able to save the day by adjourning," the verb is mangled and the adverb out of place. Properly written, the sentence would read: "The conservatives had been able to save the day only by adjourning." Only adjournment, in other words, saved it. Place "only" as near as possible to the word to which it refers.

Avoid the unnecessary interjection of a phrase between a verb and a predicate noun. Example: "This work is, in reality, a symphony only in name. It is, more strictly speaking, a suite." Preferably one should say: "This work, in reality, is a

symphony only in name. More strictly speaking, it is a suite."

The following sentence would be smoother and more vigorous if "asked" were placed before "Barnes" instead of being placed at the end: "'Did you pray also?' A. C. Barnes, attorney for the committee, asked."

This sentence appears in the report of a recent meeting: "The State of Oregon was held up as a model for other states to pattern after by the advocates of popular government and ridiculed as an experimental station which had entered upon legislation of vicious tendency by the opposition." Better arranged, it would read thus: "The State of Oregon was held up by the advocates of popular government as a model for other states to pattern after and ridiculed by the opposition as an experimental station which had entered upon legislation of vicious tendency."

The following is another recent instance of incorrect collocation: "Mr. Sherwood was born in Lyons, N. Y., fifty-six years ago, where his father," etc. The "fifty-six years ago" should follow "born," thus bringing "where" after "Lyons, N. Y.," to which it refers.

Position may affect materially the meaning of a sentence. Here is a recent example: "Fourteen elevator operators were questioned and admitted that they would be useless in the event of a fire, as they were all crippled." The reporter did not mean that the men were crippled entirely, but that all the fourteen were crippled in some way. The explanatory clause should read: "As all were crippled." In this connection, don't say "all of the fourteen" or "all of the men." When a part of the whole is mentioned say "of." When all are mentioned say "all," which expresses the meaning fully, and omit "of." Transposing the sentence for the sake of illus-

tration, it will be seen that "of the fourteen seven were crippled" is clear, but that "of the fourteen all were crippled" is illogical.

Here is another recent example of bad collocation: "Mr. Bartzen was criticised for removing Dr. Wilhite, and he appointed the committee to choose a man capable of filling the position as an answer to his opponents." Insert "as an answer to his opponents" after "and" and observe how much better the sentence will read and sound.

COLLOQUIALISMS—Avoid them and substitute appropriate synonyms. The following are barred unless uttered by a speaker:

"Bully," as adjective or adverb.

"Cotton to" for "favor" or "incline to."

"Cute," an abbreviation of "acute," for "clever."

"Do itself proud" for "do itself credit."

"Enthuse" for "become enthusiastic" or "arouse."

"Expect" for "think," "believe," "suppose."

"Level head" and "level-headed" for "common sense" and "sensible."

"Likes" for "equal," as in: "The likes of him."

"Lunch" for "luncheon."

"Mighty" for "very" or "extremely," as in "mighty easy" or in such absurd expressions as "mighty little," "mighty weak."

"Muchly" for "much."

"Negotiate" for "surmount" or "traverse."

"Passenger" for "passenger train," as in the heading: "Wabash Passenger in Ditch."

"Plead" (pled) for "pleaded."

"Posted" for "informed."

"Sleuth" for "detective."

"Tasty" for "tasteful."

"Wire" for "telegram."

Moreover, don't use such barbarous expressions as "ain't" for "am not," "are not," "is not," "isn't," "aren't," "dassent" for "dare not;" "he don't" for "he doesn't;" "done time;" "haint" for "have not" and "haven't;" "had ought" for "ought;" or "unbeknown" and "unbeknownst," which are dialectal, for "unknown."

COMPARE, CONTRAST — Distinguish carefully between these two words. Things are "compared" when the purpose is to show their relative value or excellence or to bring out their characteristic qualities. Things are "contrasted" when the intention is to emphasize their difference. In this connection it is well to note when "compared" should be followed by "with" and when it should be followed by "to." One object is compared "with" another as when, citing Webster, the movement of the *Odyssey* is compared "with" that of the *Aeneid*; it is compared "to" another when it is formally represented, on the basis of a real or imagined similarity, as like the other. Examples: Pope compares Homer "with" Virgil. He compares Homer "to" the Nile, pouring out his riches with a boundless overflow, and Virgil "to" a river in its banks, with a gentle and constant stream.

COMPARISONS—Be careful to use the proper article with the superlative. One who excels all others, for instance, is not given "a foremost place," but "the foremost place." There can be only one "foremost place."

Some adjectives are incapable of comparison. "Unique" is one of them. Hence don't say "most unique," but "unique."

Don't say "the best of the two," but "the better of the two." This instruction, although elementary, is seen almost daily to be necessary.

Don't say "Chicago is to have the most elaborate subway of any city in the world." The words "any city" necessarily include Chicago. Obviously your intention is to exclude, set apart, and compare Chicago's proposed subway system with all other existing or proposed systems. Hence the sentence should read: "Chicago is to have the most elaborate subway system in the world," or "Chicago is to have a more elaborate subway system than any other city in the world." Similarly, don't say "finest of any," but "finest of all," or "finer than any other."

CONDIGN—Don't use it for "severe." It doesn't mean that, but means "deserved."

CONGRESSMAN—The Congress of the United States is composed of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Hence a "Congressman" may be either a member of the Senate or a member of the House. For "Congressman," therefore, substitute the specific term "Senator" or "Representative" to designate the one or the other. The abbreviation "M. C.," following a name, is permissible because it means a "member of Congress," which is a term applied exclusively, although not with strict accuracy, to a person elected to the House of Representatives.

CONSTRUCTION—When it is faulty improve it. Don't permit, for instance, such a slovenly sentence as "Senor Limantour will, or has, resigned." Manifestly "will resigned" is impossible. Change the sentence to read: "Senor Limantour will resign, or has resigned." Repetition of the verb is preferable to the commission of an error.

The following is a conspicuous example of awkward, involved, bad construction: "Chairman Burrows, while refusing to consent to fixing a time for a vote, gave the promise that a vote would be had before adjournment of the present Congress." Here we have the unnecessary repetition of "to"

and the use of two confusing participles, one of which is employed improperly for the infinitive. Simplified and turned into English, the sentence would read: "Chairman Burrows, while refusing consent to fix a time for a vote, promised that one would be taken before adjournment of the present Congress."

Here is another: "By that treaty we agreed with England that we would neither of us own any part of the land in which the canal was to be built and that we would neither of us fortify it." The expression "We would neither of us" is improper and inelegant, while "it" as used might refer either to the canal or the land. Properly written, the sentence would read: "By that treaty we agreed with England that neither of us would own any part of the land in which the canal was to be built and that neither of us would fortify the canal."

When "hence" is used in the sense of "from this cause or reason," clearness will result by placing it at the beginning of an independent sentence. The following involved paragraph, for example, would be improved by resolving it into two sentences, the second beginning with "Hence:" "The Cuban government is lending cordial aid, since the prime necessity of revealing the underwater body of the Maine as nearly as possible in the same condition as when the battle ship sank is recognized, hence the methods employed must be free from all suspicion and the appliance utilized such as to obviate any further stress or distortion of the hull."

The expression "one of the first, if not the first, witnesses" is manifestly wrong, but the error persists. Both words "first" are made to qualify the plural noun "witnesses," but the first "first" obviously is plural while the second is singular. What you should say is: "One of the first witnesses, if not the first."

Don't say "A tragedy that cost the lives of one boy and perhaps of a second," but "A tragedy that cost the life of one boy and may cost that of a second." A boy has only one life. The tragedy referred to actually cost one life up to the time of going to press; the possibility that eventually it might cost another does not justify the use of "lives," even with the qualifying word "perhaps" or the word "second."

Don't use "one or both" to qualify a plural noun, as "one" is singular and "both" is plural. Example: "Some of the hospital inmates were without one or both arms." A careful writer would have said that some lacked one arm and some both arms.

CONSUMMATE—No respectable newspaper ever "consummates" a marriage. The reason will be found in any lexicon.

CONTRADICTIONS IN TERMS—Avoid such patent absurdities as "The aviator landed on the water" and "the Arnold system of subways will cover the entire city." One "lands on the ground" and "alights on the water." A subway "extends under a city," but, not being a roof, cannot be said to "cover" it.

CORPORAL, CORPOREAL—Don't confuse them. "Corporal" signifies "bodily" as opposed to mental, as in "corporal punishment." "Corporeal" signifies "material" as opposed to spiritual, as in "a corporeal form."

CORPSE—This is another favorite word of the undertaker. Say "body."

COUPLE, PAIR—Despite the difference in their meanings, these words are used often as if they were synonymous. Couple, as defined by Webster, means two of the same kind connected or considered together; a male and female associated together, especially a man and woman married, betrothed or partners in a dance, as "a married

couple" or "first couple" in a quadrille. "Couple" applies to two things of the same sort, regarded as in some way associated, but not necessarily (except in the case of two married or betrothed persons) matched or belonging together. Do not use it for "two," as in: "A couple of apples." "Pair" means two things of a kind, similar in form, suited to each other and intended to be used together, as a pair of gloves; or a single thing composed of two corresponding parts, as a pair of shears; or two of a sort associated together, as a pair of horses. "Pair," in modern usage, applies to two things which belong or are used together, frequently so that one is useless or defective without the other. Nowadays one does not speak of "a married pair," but "a married couple." Meaning two, the word "couple" is plural and requires a plural verb. "Pair," indicating unity, requires a singular verb.

D

DATA—This is a plural noun, like *memoranda*, and requires a plural verb.

DELICIOUS—Refers primarily to the pleasure derived from certain of the senses, particularly taste and smell, as, delicious food, a delicious fragrance. Most good newspapers are content so to limit its meaning, and, instead of saying "delicious music" or "delicious humor," to say "delightful," "fine," "charming," etc.

DEMEAN—Don't misuse it for "degrade," "debase" or "disgrace." The word means "to behave" or "conduct" (oneself), as in: "He demeans himself like a gentleman."

DENOTEMENT—Don't use it, as in "her denotement of grief," when you mean "portrayal." "Denotement" means "sign," "indication," and the two principal dictionaries agree in terming it "rare." "Portrayal" means dramatic representation, acting, and is precisely the word required.

DEPOSITARY, DEPOSITORY — Don't confuse them. "Depositary" is a person with whom something is deposited; "depository" is the place where it is deposited.

DEPOT—Don't use it unless you mean a storehouse or magazine. The place in which a railway stores or tranships goods properly may be called a freight depot, a warehouse, freight house or freight terminal, but there is no such thing as a "passenger depot." Say "passenger station," "railway station" or "station."

DINER—The word means "one who dines." Its use for "dining car" has become common, but is not approved.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT DISCOURSE —In the former use the present tense and quote; in the latter use the past tense and do not quote. In indirect discourse, after a main verb in the past tense, the present tense cannot be used. Example: "He wrote that 'my policy is the only one calculated to bring relief.'" This should be: "He wrote: 'My policy is the only one calculated to bring relief,'" or: "He wrote that his policy was the only one (that was) calculated to bring relief." The word "that" after "wrote" or "said" throws the quotation into indirect discourse and compels the use of the past tense and the third person.

DIRECTLY—Don't use it for "as soon as." Example: "Directly he arrived in the city he went to his hotel."

DISCOMMODE — Practically replaced nowadays by "incommode."

DISORDERLY, DISREPUTABLE— A house may be disorderly without being disreputable, or it may be disreputable without being disorderly. If it becomes necessary to speak of a house of ill-fame, say "disreputable house," or "house of ill-repute," "brothel," or "dive" Do not locate it, except as in a named street, unless its location by street and number is an essen-

tial point in an important crime story or a reform crusade. In any event do not advertise the name of the keeper. The use of the word "resort" in this sense is improper, unless preceded by the word "evil," because "resort" also has an innocent meaning. The recent employment of "resort" instead of "summer resort" so offended a reputable hotel-keeper in a suburb of Chicago that a retraction was demanded and printed.

DIVERS, DIVERSE—Don't confuse them. "Divers" means "sundry" or "various," while "diverse" means "opposite" or "conflicting." "Divers" persons, for example, naturally have "diverse" tastes.

DIVORCED—Don't use it alone, as in "divorced woman," "divorced man," "he was divorced," "she was divorced," "they were divorced," if you know or if it is possible to ascertain who obtained the divorce. A man may divorce his wife, and a woman her husband, but the quoted expressions merely indicate that a divorce was granted, without telling who obtained it, while the first and fourth may cast a slur upon an innocent woman. Always state plainly, when possible, who obtained the divorce.

DOMESTIC—Don't use it as a noun. Say "servant," "housemaid" or "maid."

DRASTIC—A "good" word when used properly and not too often, but somewhat overworked and should be reserved for important subjects and rare occasions. "Radical," "extreme" and "harsh" are acceptable substitutes for everyday use.

DRUNK—Don't use it. Say "intoxicated."

E

EACH OTHER—Use this when referring to two persons and "one another" when referring to more than two.

EFFECT, AFFECT—Don't use one for the other. "Effect" means "to bring about," while "affect" means "to have an influence upon." Examples: "Time effects many changes"; "the decision affects many important interests."

ELEGANT—Use it sparingly and appropriately. Don't say "an elegant day" or "an elegant dinner," but restrict the word to its proper meaning. According to March it refers to something exquisite or refined, as to dress.

EMIGRANT, IMMIGRANT—Distinguish between them. An "emigrant" goes forth from one country to another, whereas an "immigrant" comes into a country. Russians coming to America are "emigrants," from a European standpoint; once they are here, they are "immigrants," from our standpoint.

ENGLISH—Don't say "English government" for "British government." Scotsmen and Irishmen who support the government, as well as Canadians, Australians and others who consider themselves part of the British Empire, object to the term "English government." In this connection, also, "Scotsmen" is preferable to "Scotchmen." The Scots prefer "Scotsmen."

EPITHET—The expression "a noble man" or "an honor to her sex" is an epithet equally with "a fiend incarnate." Properly an epithet is an expression applied to any person or thing, and may be a term of honor or dishonor.

EXAGGERATION—Avoid it in all serious writing. Don't say "The applause shook the very rafters," or "Belmont Park rocked and roared with an outburst of wild, uncontrolled enthusiasm," or a theater audience "did not dare to breathe," because no intelligent reader will believe you. You can put strength and color into your "stories" without laying on exaggeration with a trowel. In short, be sane.

EXCEPT—Don't use it for "unless," as in: "Except you have a ticket you cannot ride." "Except" sometimes is used properly as a conjunction, but it cannot be used so here.

EXCLUSIVE—This word has been overworked. It is unnecessary and in bad taste to speak of an "exclusive colony" or an "exclusive neighborhood."

F

FARTHER, FURTHER—"Farther" refers properly to distance. Restrict it to that sense. "Further" should be used only in such expressions as "He said further" and "Further it is to be considered."

FASHIONABLE—Don't use it to describe a boarding-house; say "select," "choice" or "genteel."

FILIBUSTERER—Both this and "filibuster" mean one who resorts to obstructive tactics. But "filibuster" also means the tactics themselves. Don't use "filibusterer," meaning the agent, as it was used recently, when you really mean "filibuster," signifying the action.

FIND—Be careful how you use it. Ordinarily it means to "discover." It also means to "hold," "determine," "declare," as when a jury "finds" a defendant guilty. The following sentence is faulty: "Finding that the tuberculin test of cows is unreliable, the commission reported unfavorably on the plan of the Chicago Health department." As thus used, "finding" might imply a discovery by the commission with which the paper printing it agreed. In fact, however, the commission merely declared that in its opinion the test was unreliable. Hence the writer should have said "holding," "declaring" or "asserting," thus putting the responsibility for the statement clearly upon the persons making it and not upon the paper printing it.

FIRE LADDIES—No newspaper of the first class uses this weak, puerile diminutive. Say "firemen."

FIRM—Don't refer to an insurance company as a "firm." Two or more insurance agents may constitute a firm, but an insurance company cannot. It is a company or a "concern."

FIX—Don't use it in different senses, at least not in the same sentence or paragraph, as in "fixing the blame," "fixing a carriage," "fixing a date," etc. Properly it means "to make fast," and careful writers restrict it to that meaning instead of using it indiscriminately for "to place," "to mend," "to make," etc.

FLAY—Don't use it in heads or in "stories" for "criticise," "censure," etc., unless you add that the "flaying" was verbal or figurative. "Flay" means "to skin"; also "to torture."

FORTUNE—This word is used most loosely. Often the real meaning is simply "a competency." To be accurate and reasonable, say "large fortune" or "small fortune," as the case may be.

FUNNY—Don't use it when you mean "strange" or "remarkable."

G

GAMBLING-HOUSES—Do not advertise them by locating them, unless definite location is an essential element in an important crime story or a reform crusade.

GIRL, HIRED GIRL—Don't use either. Say "servant," "housemaid," or "maid."

GOODLY—Most good newspapers restrict "goodly" to its primary meaning of "comely" and instead of "goodly number" say "large number" or "considerable number."

GORE, GORY—Avoid the use of these as you would the use of "blood" and "bloody."

GREATER NEW YORK—The best New York papers do not use the term, but say New York City.

GRILL—Don't use it in the sense of "criticise," "censure," etc. To "grill" means to "broil on a gridiron." You might as well say "fry an opponent" as to say "grill an opponent."

GUEST—Primarily a "guest" is one whom you entertain at your home. Usage permits the application of the word to a person staying at a hotel, which usually "entertains" him for pay. For this reason some papers prefer to call such a person a "patron." If you dislike either "guest" or "patron," say a person is "registered at" or is "staying at" such and such a hotel.

H

HACKNEYED EXPRESSIONS — "Bids fair," while allowable, has been overworked and should be retired in favor of the more sensible, more direct "seems likely," "probably will," or some other equivalent expression.

"Shook the dust of the place off his feet" is of the highest origin, but has been overworked. It was used recently to chronicle the fact that a prisoner "left" the Joliet penitentiary.

Don't use such an absurd, extravagant, would-be "fine" expression as "knights of the grip" for "commercial travelers," "traveling salesmen" or "drummers." It is a fit companion of "the lacteal fluid" and other expressions dear to the rural journalist.

"Cheered to the echo" has done service so long that it might be well occasionally to say "cheered" and forget the echo.

"Fears" and "hopes" are not "entertained" in the best newspapers. Such emotions may be felt, but to say they are "entertained" is mere extravagance and so-called "fine writing." Say "It is feared"

and "It is hoped" and you will say all that is necessary. In any event don't say "Fears of his recovery are entertained." That implies regret at the prospect of recovery. What you really mean and should say is "It is feared he will not recover."

Drop altogether and forever that absurd introductory flourish, "It goes without saying that." If the succeeding statement really "goes without saying," say it at once and omit the preliminary palaver.

Don't say "For seven long (or short) years," "for seven long (or short) months," "for seven long (or short) weeks," "for seven long (or short) days," "for a few brief moments," etc. Barring leap years, every year comprises approximately $365\frac{1}{4}$ days; practically, all the years are of equal length. Quadrennially a day is added to February, but with this exception the months are decently regular, year by year. A week consists of seven days, while twenty-four hours make a day, sixty minutes an hour and sixty seconds a minute. A moment is a minute division of time; an instant. Hence the folly of qualifying these various periods by "long," "short" or "brief" should be apparent. Curb the temptation to indulge in "fine writing" and omit the adjective.

Don't help to perpetuate those outworn phrases, "Severed his connection" and "tendered his resignation." For the former substitute "quit," "left," or anything else that will convey the idea; for the latter say "resigned." When a janitor "severs his connection" or "tenders his resignation" it is time to call a halt. "Severs his connection," moreover, is unpleasantly suggestive of a surgical operation. The suggestion is heightened when, in referring to a person who has left a business association, it is said he has "severed his connection with that body," as the fact was stated recently.

Let the "severing" be done hereafter in surgical wards, not in the columns of THE RECORD-HERALD.

"Solon" means, among other things, a "legislator," but the word in this sense has been overworked and cheapened by applying it indiscriminately to members of Congress, legislatures, city councils, county boards, boards of trustees, etc. Thus we see constantly "Solon," "State Solon," "City Solon," "Village Solon," etc. Drop "Solon" altogether, or reserve it for occasional use only, and then restrict it to a member of some standing in an important legislative body. The absurdity of calling a Broderick or a Coughlin a "Solon" should be apparent.

"City father" is as bad as "Solon," and "City dad" is even worse. Both should be retired in favor of "alderman," "councilman," or "member of the council."

Don't say "municipal building" for "city hall," or "inquisitorial body" for "grand jury."

Retire "victory perched on his banner," which has served since the middle ages, if not longer, and substitute something more modern to convey the simple idea of victory.

Another overworked veteran is "leave no stone unturned," which often is used without the least sense of appropriateness, as in the following recent example: "The jury will leave no stone unturned in delving into the legal phase of the authority by which dynamite in such quantities is stored in Jersey City." As a matter of fact that particular jury will look up law books, not stones.

Don't let anybody "whip out" a "gun," revolver, pistol, bowie knife or any other weapon. The "whipping out" will be inferable from the fact of an actual or attempted shooting or stabbing; rapid instead of leisurely handling of firearms and knives is assumed. A revolver or a pistol is not a

"gun," and to "whip out" the latter would be physically impossible. Nor is it necessary, as a rule, to advertise the make of a weapon by using the expression, "Colt's" or "derringer," or to specify its size by saying "32 (or other) caliber." When it becomes necessary to do this, for the purpose of showing that a wound was inflicted by a weapon of a certain kind or size, make the fact apparent that identification is the important point at issue.

Discard such stale expressions as "old Sol," "fair Luna" and "Dan Cupid" and say "sun," "moon" and "Cupid."

HAD—Few words in the language are abused more often. An alderman "had an order passed," as if it was necessary only to issue a fiat to the City Council for that purpose, and the victim of an accident "had his neck broken," implying deliberate intention. Writing correctly, you will say: "On motion of Alderman Blank an order was passed" and "his neck was broken." If several orders are passed, use this form: "The following orders presented by the aldermen named were passed:"

By Alderman Blank—For a sidewalk, etc.

By Alderman Jones—For an extension of water pipes, etc.

HAD BETTER—This expression for "would better" or "might better," as in "I had better starve than do anything dishonest," although formerly of good repute, is falling into deserved disuse. "Had starve" is grammatically impossible, and the addition of "better" helps the case not at all. The use of "had better" nowadays is confined to literary reactionaries and "stand-patters," to the careless and to the ignorant.

HALED—If one is pulled with force, dragged, or hauled to the place of trial, the expression "haled to court" is allowable; otherwise, not. In civilized countries one is "taken to court" ordinarily.

HALF—Don't say "a half hour" for "half an hour," which follows analogy and a long line of precedents. Don't say "cut in half." What you mean is "cut in halves."

HANGAR—According to the latest terminology of aviation the word is discarded in favor of the simple but adequate English word "shed."

HERO—Don't use it so often as to cheapen it. Bestow it only upon a person who performs a real act of heroism.

HIT—Don't use it in heads or "stories" in the sense of "assail," "attack," "criticise," "censure," "impugn" or "rebuke." It can mean none of these things except figuratively. When so used it necessarily and unpleasantly suggests the idea of a physical attack. Substitute another word. This may be done in a headline by changing the construction so that "hit" will not be necessary. The "hit" limit was reached recently in the head: "Miss Pankhurst Hits Women of the West." "Suffragette Rebukes Women of the West" would have been better.

HOLLAND HOUSE—The name of this well-known New York hotel is "Holland House," not "the Holland House." Similarly, say "Hotel La Salle," not "La Salle Hotel," and "Hotel Sherman," not "Sherman Hotel." Always, when known, use the name given to a hotel by its proprietors.

HOT—Figuratively speaking, a fight may be "hot," but the word has been overworked without reason in applying it to all sorts of fights, chiefly political. Frequently another word, like "brisk," "close," "exciting," "furious," "lively," "stubborn," or even "warm," will be found to describe the situation exactly.

HOW—Don't use it as a conjunction for "as." Example: "People get their revelation how they can." This is a rank Briticism, and archaic at that. Say "People get their revelation as they can."

|

IDENTITY—Often used loosely, as in: "The police have not learned the man's identity," meaning merely that they have not learned his name or history. "Identity" properly means "sameness," as in: "The identity of the prisoner with the man seen skulking about the house the night of the murder." It would be well to restrict the word to that meaning. Its use for "name" is only another example of the desire to indulge in "fine writing."

ILLY—Don't use it. Say "ill," which is an adverb as well as an adjective. One might as well say "welly" as "illy."

INAUGURAL, INAUGURATE—Don't use the former as a noun, as in: "President Taft delivered his inaugural." You should say "inaugural address." The word "inaugurate" is abused grievously and often. It means to induct into office with suitable ceremonies; to invest with power or authority in a formal manner. Thus, a president or a governor is inaugurated, but a hotel is not, a saloon is not, and a policy is not unless some inaugural ceremonies mark its beginning. The proper substitute is "install." Sometimes "begin" or "initiate" may be used with propriety.

INVIDIOUS DISTINCTIONS — Avoid them. Do not array capital and labor against each other; do not speak of the "classes" and the "masses." In a crime or suicide "story" do not refer to the nationality, race or religion of the criminal or the suicide, unless the nationality, race or religion is an essential, inseparable element in the "story." Hence do not use in such "stories" the expressions "Russian Jew," "negro," etc., unless under the exceptional circumstances referred to.

IRE—Don't overwork it in heads. Say "anger" once in a while, if only for the sake of a change.

J

JAP—Barred in heads and “stories” by the best newspapers as an abbreviation for Japanese.

JEW, JEWISH, HEBREW, ISRAELITE—Use “Jew” and “Jewish” in referring to the Jewish people, race, or religion, and use “Hebrew” only in referring to the language. But do not say “Jewish nation”; it does not exist. An “Israelite” is a descendant of Israel, or Jacob; a Jew.

K

KNOW—Avoid the “you know” and “don’t you know” habit. Both expressions are used frequently without the slightest reason. “You know” properly may introduce a truism or some particular fact known to the person addressed, but should not be used loosely.

L

LADY—As a rule, say “woman.” In any event, don’t say “a man and a lady,” but “a man and a woman”; nor “a man and his lady,” but “a man and his wife.” Associate “man” and “woman,” “man” and “wife” and “gentleman” and “lady,” if the last-named words are used at all.

LAST—Don’t use it when you mean “latest.” There is an essential difference. For example, a living author’s “latest” book may not be his “last.”

LEAKED OUT—Barred by some good papers. It is better to use “became known,” “became public,” “transpired,” or other equivalent expressions.

LEARN, TEACH—It is inexcusable to confuse or misuse these. One “teaches” pupils, but does not “learn” them; the pupils “learn.”

LEGISLATIVE TERMS—Don't say a resolution was "passed." It never is "passed," but is "adopted," or "fails of adoption," or is "lost," or "defeated." A motion also never is "passed." It is "carried," or "prevails," or is "lost" or "defeated." An amendment or substitute is "accepted" by the maker of an original motion, or the author of a bill, and then is "adopted," or not adopted, by the body. Bills and orders are "passed" and laws are "enacted."

LENGTHY—Favorite word with British speakers and writers, but practically discarded in this country in favor of "long."

LESS, FEWER—"Less" applies to quantity and "fewer" to number. Hence don't say "no man ever had less friends," but "fewer friends."

LIABLE—The best newspapers do not use it for "likely," even though the lexicographers do.

LIE, LAY—It would seem unnecessary at this late day to instruct writers and copy-readers regarding the proper use of these verbs, meaning respectively "to recline" and "to place." But the recently printed statement, "he had lain his shotgun on the ground," would indicate the contrary. "Lain" is the pluperfect tense of "lie." The pluperfect of "lay," which is the verb to be used, is "laid."

LIGHT, LIGHTS—Don't say "according to his lights," but "according to his light." The word "lights" means "lungs."

LIKE—This may be a noun, adjective, verb or adverb, but is not a conjunction. Hence don't say "It looks like this is our only chance," but "It looks as if (or though) this is our only chance."

LIKE, LOVE—Make the proper distinction. A man "likes" the works of a certain author, which please his taste; he "loves" his family, which appeals to his affections.

LIKELY—As an adverb the tendency is

to use it to modify only adjectives, not verbs. Thus, "You are very likely right" is unexceptionable, but "You will likely fail" should give place to "You are likely (adjective) to fail," or "You probably will fail."

LIVE, RESIDE—One may "live," i. e., "exist," at an office as much as at home. "Reside" suggests permanence and something pretentious. If a substitute for either expression is desired, say "His home is at such and such a number on such and such a street."

LOTS—Don't use it for "a great many" or "much," as in: "Lots of diamonds," "lots of money."

LOVELY—This adjective has been abused by applying it haphazard to all sorts of pretty or agreeable things, as in: "A lovely dress," "lovely ride," "lovely hat," "lovely view," "lovely melody," "lovely breeze," etc. The portrayal of character by an actress may be charming or delightful, but it is not "lovely." March defines "lovely" as "attractive," "lovable," and admonishes that "it should be used only in connection with things which stir the affections."

M

MAD—Don't say "mad" when you mean "angry." A "mad" person is one bereft of reason; an insane person.

MARRY—A man marries a woman; a woman is married to a man; or, the man and the woman marry, or are married. No man ever should be "married to" a woman and no woman should "marry" a man in **THE RECORD-HERALD**.

MAST—Don't say a flag displayed on land was at full "mast" or half "mast," but at full "staff" or half "staff." "Mast" is a naval and "staff" an army term.

MIDDLING—Discard it and say "tolerably" or "fairly."

MILITIA—This term includes all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 18 and 40 years. When organized, they constitute the National Guard. Do not refer to a national guardsman, therefore, as a militiaman. For brevity, in heads, he may be called a guard.

MILLIONAIRE—This is a noun, meaning a person worth a million or more, and not an adjective; but many writers and copy-readers persist in misapplying it as a noun and in misusing it as an adjective, as in: "Millionaire packer," "millionaire attorney," "millionaire banker," and "millionaire" everything else, whenever a man appears to have a competency. This is very cheap, in bad form and will not be permitted in **THE RECORD-HERALD**.

MONSTER—Don't use it as an adjective. The circus men do so to signify huge, enormous, vast, gigantic, colossal and the like, but the circus men are not noted for nicety of language.

MOST—Don't use it for "almost" as in: "Most any kind of servant." This expression was attributed recently by a careless writer to a noted Evanston woman whose English is impeccable.

N

NAMES—The expression "of the name of" is as awkward as it is unnecessary. Don't say "A dentist of the name of Paul Martin, who resides at 2642 Calumet avenue," but "A dentist named Paul Martin, who resides," etc., or, better, "Paul Martin, a dentist, of 2642 Calumet avenue." Retain the "of" before the street address. The brevity of "Paul Martin, 2642 Calumet avenue," is suggestive of a city directory rather than of a well written newspaper. Don't say "a woman of the name of Stein," but "a woman named Stein," or, better, call her Miss or Mrs., as the case may be,

and give her Christian name. These are details which a reporter always should ascertain. In a large city many women are likely to bear the name "Stein." Above all, don't say "A woman named Jennie Smith," or "A man named Tom Jones." The name indicates the sex.

Special care should be used in regard to the names of clergymen. A Roman Catholic priest must not be called "Rev. Mr. O'Gara." He is "Rev. Joseph O'Gara," or "Rev. Father O'Gara," or "Father O'Gara." Never write "Rev. Smith." Write "Rev. John Smith" or "Rev. Dr. John Smith." After the full name has been given do not repeat in stilted, formal style each time the gentleman is mentioned "Rev. Mr. Smith," but write "Mr. Smith" or "Dr. Smith," as the case may be. Note particularly that the pastor of the Central Church is Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulus, that the head of Sinai Temple is Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, and that the preacher at Abraham Lincoln Center by his own expressed preference is plain Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Don't mutilate names by abbreviating them. It is little short of a crime to print "Chas." for "Charles," "Jno." for "John," "Jas." for "James," "Jos." for "Joseph," or "Wm." for "William."

Do not print the names of members of THE RECORD-HERALD staff, or the names of other papers and the members of their staffs, unless the mention of the names is a matter of real news. Under no circumstances should the name of any paper be drawn in or serve to identify a person, unless the connection is an important element in a "story" in which the paper figures. A savor of rural journalism attaches to the publication of the fact that Mr. Blank of THE RECORD-HERALD was toastmaster or speaker at a dinner, or that he attended some other function. Omit the name of the paper. Exceptions: "By Wil-

liam E. Curtis," "By Sumner," etc., and "By So-and-So, Staff Correspondent, etc." The name of William E. Curtis and his connection with THE RECORD-HERALD also may be used in a head and in the body of an article. These names are assets of the paper and are advertised accordingly.

NEITHER-NOR, EITHER-OR—When you use "neither," also use "nor." "Either" is followed by "or."

NICE—The word has been overworked to express quality indiscriminately, as in: "Nice fruit," "nice play" and "nice" almost everything. Especially don't use it when intending to speak in a complimentary way of a man. No real man would care to be known as "a nice man." Substitute "fine," "agreeable" or some other synonym.

NO USE—"Of" must precede it, as in: "It is of no use to repine."

NONE—This word means "no one" and "not anything," but as a plural it means also "not any." Hence the recent dictum of a school of critics, that it always must be followed by a singular verb, will not stand. When the meaning obviously is singular, use a singular verb; when obviously plural, use a plural verb.

NOTHING LIKE—Don't use it for "not nearly," as in: "He is nothing like as rich as you are."

NOW—Frequently no harm will be done by omitting it, as in the sentence: "All classes here believe that the end is near for the present government and that its downfall now is only a question of a short time." Here "now" is wholly superfluous; in fact, the entire second clause in the sentence is redundant, the idea having been conveyed adequately in the first.

0

OCCUR—Don't say "the marriage occurred" unless it really is a sudden, chance

affair. A marriage usually is arranged in advance for a certain date. Hence it "takes place" and does not "occur."

OF COURSE—Like "you know," it is used so often and irrelevantly, especially in conversation, that it has become almost meaningless. Employed occasionally and sparingly, it is effective in expressing emphatic assent or assertion.

OFFICER—Don't use it for "policeman." An "officer" is one who holds an office, while a "policeman" is an employe serving in the ranks.

OVATION—Most good newspapers consider it extravagant, and some bar it altogether. The word should be reserved for a really great occasion.

OVER—Don't use it in the sense of "more than."

P

PANTS—Discarded by all self-respecting newspapers in favor of "trousers."

PARAPHERNALIA—This is a plural noun and requires a plural verb.

PARTIAL—In its primary sense this word means "biased." When it might be taken in this sense, although perhaps another is intended, use a word concerning whose meaning there is no doubt. Thus, a "partial" report might mean either a biased report or a report in part, i. e., a report of progress. It is well in all cases to be precise and accurate and to say exactly what you mean. For the adverb "partially," unless you intend to convey the primary meaning, it is better to say, uniformly, "partly" or "in part." The one thing to be expected above all else from a judge is impartiality. It was hardly in accordance with the niceties of language, therefore, when a judge recently appointed to a more exalted position publicly expressed the hope that in due time he might "partially" fill it.

PARTY, PARTIES—A party is a body, company, or association of persons; a person concerned or interested in an action or affair, or the plaintiff or defendant in a lawsuit. Don't use "party" when you mean "person," as in "a party named Johnson."

PAST—Don't use it in the sense of "last." An event that is past occurred "last year," or "last week," or "during the last few days," not the "past year," the "past week" or the "past few days." Every year, week or day since the creation and until the present is "past." What you mean is the year, week or day immediately preceding the present. Hence say precisely what you mean, which is "last." Again, do not use the redundant expressions "for some days past," "in years past," "a year past," as in : "The property has been acquired piece by piece for more than a year past." The form of the verb used with such phrases shows that the time is past. Omit "past."

PATROLMAN—Don't use it for "policeman." All "patrolmen" are not "policemen"; some patrol coasts or electric light lines.

PEARY—Don't call him "Commander," or "Lieutenant," or "Captain," but "Rear Admiral," which is the title bestowed upon him (1911) by the Sixty-first Congress.

PEOPLE—Don't use it when you merely mean "persons." The word "people" suggests humanity in the mass. Instead of saying "six people were present," say "six persons."

PER DAY—Don't use it, as in: "He earns \$5 per day," but say "a day." "Per day" is half Latin and half English. The correct Latin phrase would be "per diem."

PLAIN CLOTHES MEN—Don't use it; say "detectives." The public isn't interested in knowing whether they wear plain clothes or uniforms.

POSSESSIVE CASE—Avoid the unnecessary use of the double possessive, as in: "A friend of Miss Roosevelt's." Say "A friend of Miss Roosevelt" and all will be well. Formerly the double possessive would have been regarded as necessary in this case to indicate that Miss Roosevelt has more than one friend. Now such a fact is assumed.

PREPOSITIONS—Be careful in their use. Following are examples of frequently misused words:

"At" for "in," as in: "He lives at Galesburg." When residence is meant use "in." When arrival at a point is meant use "at," as in: "He arrived at Chicago." When a larger field is meant use "in," as in: "He arrived in America."

"By" for "with," as in: "He was hit by a club." Use "with" before an instrument or means and say "He was hit with a club" Use "by" before an agent or doer, as in: "He was beaten by a footpad."

"In" for "into," as in: "The report was divided in four parts."

"In" for "on," as in: "He lives in Washington street." The use of "in the street" for "on the street" dates back to the days when people almost literally lived "in the street." Then the streets were so narrow that "in" was proper. Now one "lives in the street" when one has no home, while one clearly and definitely lives "on the street" when one's residence borders the street. But there are exceptions to many rules. The expression, "he does business in Wall street," is preferred to "He does business on Wall street." Here "in Wall street" is peculiar and is more definite and descriptive than "on Wall street." Similarly, we speak of "the man in the street," not of "the man on the street."

"Into" for "in," as in: "Jones started into business," "The robber placed the bar-keeper into the ice box."

"Of" for "from," as in: "He died from scarlet fever." A person dies "of" a disease and dies "from" the effects of a disease.

"Of" for "in," as in: "He came to Garrett Biblical Institute in 1891 as instructor of history and theology." He was an instructor "of" students and an instructor "in" history and theology.

"Of" for "to," as in: "Her divorce suit first attracted public attention of her romance."

"On" for "upon," as in: "The blame was placed on him."

"Onto," usually called a colloquialism and barred in many papers as inelegant. All that is conveyed by the statement, "She came onto the vast stage alone," would be told just as well, indeed better, had the writer used "on" or "upon."

"To" for "of," as in: "With a view to obtaining," "With a view to determining," etc. Say "of obtaining," "of determining," etc., or use the infinitive form "to obtain," "to determine," etc.

"To" for "for," as in: "A dinner was given last night to Prince Henry." Actually and properly the dinner was given "for him," i. e., in his honor. As a scion of royalty and abundantly able to pay for his own sustenance, no one would presume to give a dinner "to" him. Dinners are given "to" persons who ask at the door for something to eat. In the case of anyone whom it is sought to honor or compliment, the dinner is given "for" him. In this connection, also, it is well to remember that for the same reason the person honored is not "given the dinner," but that "the dinner is given."

"To" for "at," as in: "He had been to the ball game." "To" implies direction, destination; "at" a state of rest in a place.

"To" for "instead of," as in: "He chose

death to life as a helpless cripple." One "prefers" death "to" life or one "chooses" death "instead of" life.

"Differ from," according to the high authority of Professor March, is preferred to "differ with" where the meaning is "to be different from." Diamonds "differ from" rubies. When you and another person disagree in opinion concerning something you "differ with" him.

"Under the circumstances" is preferable to "in the circumstances." The former, really meaning "under the surrounding conditions," is clear, logical and backed by a long line of authorities. The latter really means "within the circumstances," which does not express exactly the idea sought to be conveyed.

Don't end a sentence with a preposition, as in: "These are questions we must deal with" for "with which we must deal;" "Where has he gone to?" for "Where has he gone?" "Where am I at?" for "Where am I?" The "to" and "at" also are redundant. Omit them.

Don't use "of" after verbs like "approve," "disapprove" or "permit," as in: "I so heartily enjoy what I so thoroughly disapprove of," a supposedly "smart" remark in a current play; or "I cannot permit of your going so soon." These verbs do not require "of." The first example is bad also in that a preposition ends the sentence. But there is a clear distinction between "admit," which means to permit to enter, or to concede as true, and "admit of," which implies capability. You "admit" a friend to your home or you "admit" a fact; a given situation "admits of" no compromise. Don't use "to" after "admit" when the latter means "concede," "own," "confess," as in: "Mr. Davies admitted to possessing some novel views." The preposition is superfluous.

"Of" is unnecessary also before the word "whether" in such an expression as "The question of whether we shall go or stay."

Don't use "on" after "later," as in the expression, "I'll see you later on." It is unnecessary.

Don't use "with" after the verb "continue," as in the sentence, "They continued with their investigation." "Continued" is sufficient; omit "with."

Don't use the barbarous expression "up until" for "until," which adequately conveys the idea of "up to the time that."

Don't say "finish up." The word "finish" is sufficient.

Don't say "think for" for "think," as in: "He is older than you think for." The "for" is unnecessary.

Don't separate a verb and a preposition which naturally are joined and which thus make a compound verb. Thus, don't "Put a revolt down," but "Put down a revolt."

PRETTY—Don't use it in speaking of girls. The word has been overworked. Besides, it is assumed always that all girls are "pretty."

"Pretty" is overused as an adverb in the sense of "in some degree," "somewhat," "moderately," "considerably," "tolerably" or "rather," as in: "Pretty good," "pretty fast," "pretty slow," "pretty sure," "pretty cold," "pretty plainly." This addiction to the word "pretty" has led to the use of "pretty much everybody" and "pretty nearly all" for "nearly everybody" and "almost all," which express the meaning fully and are far preferable on the score of simplicity.

PREVENTATIVE—This is an unnecessary doublet of "preventive." Use the latter.

PROBE—Don't use it either for "investigate" or "investigation," if you can find a good substitute, as, for instance, "fathom," "sift," "examine," "scrutinize," "investigate," "look into," "inquire into," "delve

into" and "ferret out" as verbs, and "quiz," "inquiry," "examination," "investigation" and "inquisition" as nouns. A short word often is necessary in "heads," but a change in construction frequently will permit the use of a better though longer word. In "stories" you are not thus limited to short words. "Probe" is not ungrammatical, but merely has been overworked.

PROFANITY—Avoid it. In no event use a string of dashes to indicate a profane, vile appellation; you might as well print the objectionable phrase. Say the person "uttered a vile oath" or "applied a vile epithet."

PROMINENT—This word, like some others, has been greatly overworked for the purpose of exalting the leading character in a "story" that needs bolstering. Thus we have "prominent" financiers, politicians, actors, contractors and saloonkeepers. It is noticeable that the adjective never is used to describe John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan, or others who really are "prominent." Generally speaking, it may be said that if a man is "prominent" his name and business will indicate that fact without any tag.

PRONOUNS—The first or some other paragraph of your "story" may mention John Smith. If you refer to him in a later paragraph, repeat his name; then you may designate him thereafter in that paragraph as "he." But every paragraph in which he is mentioned must contain his name. Too many "stories" mention more than one name in one paragraph and leave the reader to guess who is meant by "he," "him," "his," "she," or "her" in the next. The writer may know, but the reader does not and cannot know.

Don't use "it" to mean different things in the same sentence, as in the following: "Although all the details of the programme were not worked out, it was evident it would

give the people a series of attractions;" "it is declared that it is almost impossible for the legations to obtain action on any question." This is a prevalent newspaper error. Avoid it.

If you refer to a committee, populace, state or nation in one place as "it," don't refer to the same thing in another place as "they." Also, don't permit such slovenly work as the following, in which "state" is referred to by "it," neuter, and "states" are made feminine: "The state now enjoys a position of advantage from which it may look on while certain of the sister states are giving an initiative and referendum demonstration." A careful writer would have said "while other states."

"Anyone" and "everybody" are singular nouns and require singular pronouns in agreement with them. For "If anyone wishes to patronize 'Secret Service,' they will do it without this chronicler's sympathy" say "If anyone wishes," etc., "he or she will do it," etc. For "Everybody put additional locks on their doors and windows" say "Everybody put additional locks on his or her doors and windows."

"Who" and "whom" have caused an infinite deal of trouble for writers and copy-readers. Too many seemingly forget that "who" is in the nominative case and never should be used except as the subject of a verb, while "whom" is in the objective and never should be used except as the object of a verb or preposition. For an error like the following there is no excuse: "If other clues develop, I shall follow them up, no matter who they hit." Here "who" is plainly the object of "hit" and is used improperly for "whom." But quite as often "whom" is used incorrectly for "who," as in the following instances: "Billie is in daily communication with Zelaya, whom he states is now in Brussels;" "with Lorimer were David L. Frank, Charles Ward, and

Patrick H. O'Donnell, whom it was announced would assist Mr. Hanecy." For some occult reason the writer, or copy-reader, or both, considered "whom" the object respectively of "states" and "was announced." The difficulty, seemingly, is due to the two parenthetical clauses, "he states" and "it was announced." Draw a ring, mentally, around such clauses, regard them for the moment as nonexistent, and it will be apparent that "whom" is used improperly for "who," the subject respectively of "is" and "would assist."

"Whoever" and "whomever" also frequently are misused. Examples: "The king will honor whoever he pleases (to honor);" "I hereby pledge myself to support whomever may receive the nomination." In the first example the nominative "whoever" is used incorrectly for the objective "whomever" as the object of the verb "pleases (to honor)." In the second example the objective "whomever" is used incorrectly for the nominative "whoever" before "may receive." Doubt as to which is the proper word to use always may be removed by remembering that "whoever" is equivalent to "the (or any) person who," and "whomever" to "the (or any) person whom." Thus the first example resolves itself into "The king will honor the person whom he pleases (to honor)," and the second into "I hereby pledge myself to support the person who may receive the nomination." While "whomever" apparently is the object of "support," the real object is the implied antecedent, "the person," and "who," referring to "the person," is the subject of "may receive." The case of this compound relative always depends upon what follows it, and not upon what precedes. But the idea may be expressed better by discarding "whoever" and "whomever" and by saying, respectively, "the person who" and "the person whom."

Distinguish between "who," "which" and "that" used as relative pronouns. "Who" refers properly only to persons; "that" refers to persons or things; "which" refers only to "things." "That" is used generally after superlatives and the ordinal numbers "first," "second," "third," etc.; after the words "all," "very," "same;" after a collective noun signifying a body of persons; after "who" used interrogatively, and after persons and things taken conjointly. "That," unlike "whom" and "which," does not admit of a preposition before it. When a relative clause is simply descriptive or parenthetical, use "who" or "which," as in: "This horse, which I bought yesterday, is high spirited." In such a case a comma always must precede "who" or "which." But if the relative clause is explanatory or restrictive, careful writers prefer "that," without a preceding comma. Thus they would say: "The horse that I bought yesterday is high-spirited." Here the relative clause restricts the application to the horse bought yesterday and excludes any other horse. Present usage generally favors "that" in such cases. In this connection it is well also to remember that when relatives joined by a conjunction refer to the same antecedent, they should not change their form. Thus, "He that stole the money and who was captured" is wrong. The relatives here should be uniformly "that" or uniformly "who."

"You and I" often is misused. A common error is to use "I" with "you" after a verb or preposition, when both should be in the objective case. Examples: "He dislikes you and I;" "This is strictly between you and I." In each case say "you and me."

PROPOSAL, PROPOSITION — Distinguish between them. A "proposal" is an offer, as in "a proposal of marriage," "proposals of peace." "Proposition," as opposed to "proposal," denotes more definitely the

thing proposed, as in "a proposition to buy or sell." A "proposal" is virtually an "overture"; a "proposition" may be the outcome of a "proposal," furnishing something definite for discussion, deliberation and negotiation.

PROPOSE—Don't use it for "intend" or "purpose," as in: "I propose to go abroad."

PROTEST—The authorities differ as to whether "protest" as a transitive verb may be used in the sense of "make protest against," as in: "I protest your statement." The dictionary which approves such use cites an example from a magazine not noted as an authority. It is better to say "protest against." If this is too long for heads, some short synonym may be found. Frequently "protest" is used when the writer really means "challenge," "criticise," "question" or "denounce."

PROVIDING—Don't use it when you really mean "provided," which signifies "on condition," "with the understanding," etc. Thus, don't say "I shall go providing it doesn't rain," but "provided it doesn't rain." "Providing" is the participle of the verb "provide," "provided" is a conjunction, and a conjunction here is imperative. Be careful in the use of "providing" in legislative "stories" to avoid ambiguity. Example: "The bill amends section 10 of the life insurance law providing that the superintendent of insurance shall," etc. "Providing" as here used refers to "law." In reality it is meant to refer to the proposed amendment, which the writer proceeds to set out. Insert "by" before "providing" and the intended meaning becomes plain.

PROW—Don't use it for "bow." "Prow" is poetical; the boatman, yachtsman and sailor say "bow."

PUNCTUATION—Don't expect the compositors and proofreaders to do everything. Writers and copyreaders having a proper

regard for their work as it finally appears in the paper will not ignore punctuation.

Some papers punctuate too closely and others too loosely. The one safe, general rule is to punctuate so that the meaning of a sentence will be clear to the reader. But whatever you do, don't separate a nominative and its verb by a comma unless there is an intervening clause. The latter always should be preceded by a comma and followed by one.

In a case like this a noun in apposition to another noun requires no following comma: "Lum Jim, a Chinese whom the federal authorities are about to deport." A comma after "Chinese" would be unnecessary. It is misused also after "rioting" in the following: "Startling developments occurred today in the rioting, which followed the action of the Senate on the champagne question." The use of a comma after "church" in the following is especially absurd: "To this lone woman the comfort of divine worship as a member of the church, had been denied."

Avoid the use of the dash and the parenthesis. Both are confusing and both as a rule are unnecessary. Moreover, both are going out of fashion. Short, simple, forcible sentences are preferable to long, involved sentences larded with commas, semicolons, dashes or parentheses. But if you feel that you must use a dash at the beginning of a parenthetical clause, instead of a comma, don't fail to use its companion dash at the close. Never use another mark of punctuation with the dash.

Q

QUITE—Don't say "quite a few." No established meaning of "quite" will permit it. Say "several," which is precisely what you mean. Don't say, also, "a quite large house," or "a quite rich man." The word "quite" properly does not mean anything less than completeness.

R

RAISE—Children are “reared,” not “raised.”

RAP—This is quite as bad as “hit” in the sense of “criticise,” “censure,” “rebuke.”

REMAINS—This is another favorite word of the undertaker. Don’t use it. Say “body.”

RENDER—Don’t use this extravagant, far-fetched, equivocal word for “sing” or “play.” Mme. Nordica “sings” and Busoni “plays” various things, but neither “renders” anything, except when the reporter or critic resorts to “fine writing” or the copy-reader overlooks the chief function of the blue pencil.

REPETITION—Don’t repeat a word unnecessarily in the same sentence. Use an accepted synonym. But beware of such atrocities as “the canine” for “the dog,” “the equine” for “the horse,” and “the feline” for “the cat.” The words “canine,” “equine” and “feline” are adjectives, not nouns. It is better to repeat a word than to use such expressions.

Don’t begin a sentence with the same word or phrase that concludes the preceding one. Example: “The Senate will be occupied with the Lorimer case. The Lorimer case is due to take shape as an open fight on the floor soon after the gavel falls.” For the second “the Lorimer case” substitute “this,” or “the latter,” or some other appropriate expression.

REPORTER—Don’t say “A reporter of THE RECORD-HERALD,” or “A RECORD-HERALD representative,” but “A reporter for THE RECORD-HERALD,” or “A RECORD-HERALD reporter.” Leave “representative” to the press agent and the commercial traveler. Never say “THE RECORD-HERALD reporter,” as if the paper had only one reporter.

RIGHT, LEFT—In referring to a bank of a river or side of a street it is better to say "north," "south," "east" or "west," as the case may be, instead of "right" or "left," unless, as in the following, the direction in which one is traveling or looking is clearly set before the reader: "Descending the stream, they saw on the right high banks, and on the left flat meadows."

ROAST—Don't use it as a noun, in the sense of "ridicule," or "criticism," or as a verb, meaning to "ridicule," or "criticise." "Roast" is in the same class as "grill," "hit," "flay," "rap" and "score." All are used figuratively in the sense indicated and all have been overworked.

ROMISH—Don't use it for "Roman Catholic." It is intended as a term of reproach and is barred.

S

SCARCELY, HARDLY—Make the proper distinction. "Scarcely" means "with a scant margin," as in: "I arrived scarcely an hour ago," while "hardly" means "with difficulty," as in: "I can hardly walk."

SCORE—As bad as "hit," "rap" or "flay" in the sense of "criticise," "censure" or "rebuke." The word "score" means none of these things. It means "to mark with lines, scratches or notches; to notch."

SECURE—Don't use it when you mean "obtain," "procure," "acquire" or good, plain "get." Properly "secure" means to "make safe." It would be well to restrict it to that meaning. "Secure" has been overworked by a class of writers and copy-readers who seem to regard it as an "elegant" word. For no other apparent reason they will "secure" a divorce, a house, a meal, a night's lodging, a suit of clothes or a shave.

SELDOM OR EVER, SELDOM EVER—Used improperly for "seldom if ever," "sel-

dom or never." Often plain "seldom" will express all that is intended.

SHORTLY—Don't use it so persistently, as if it were a choicer and better word than "soon." Within the last few years "shortly" almost has superseded "soon" among writers and copyreaders in search of something "fine." No reason exists for discarding so short, good and serviceable a word as "soon."

SHOW—Don't degrade a dignified theatrical performance by referring to it as a "show."

SICK—It is better to say "ill," "indisposed" or "ailing." The tendency now is to confine "sick" to the sense of "nauseated." In any event, do not apply in print "sick" or "unwell" to ladies.

SIGNED—It no longer is in good form to use "(Signed)" before a signature. The latter, in small caps, implies that the writer signed the document to which his name is appended.

SINCE—Don't use it when you mean "ago." The difference between "since" and "ago" is stated succinctly and exactly by Webster as follows: "'Ago' refers to a point in past time; 'since,' in strict usage, to the period intervening between such a point and the present; in 'ago' the mind is carried back from the present; in 'since,' forward from a starting point in the past; as, 'I met him ten years 'ago,' but have not seen him 'since.'"

SLANG—Like nonsense, a bit of it "now and then is relished by the best of men." A deft use of current slang often adds to the vivacity of a "story," but the slang must be clever and it must not be ungrammatical or vulgar. No apologist, however eminent, can justify "in the soup," "on the hog," "cop" or "copper" for "policeman," "peevd" for "piqued," "awful" and "awfully" for "very" or "exceedingly," "buzz wagons" for "automobiles," "dope" for "in-

formation," or like atrocities. "Sky pilot," on the other hand, has the quality of apt description to commend it, and at least is not vulgar. But no well-ordered newspaper in ordinary news "stories" or in heads will characterize writers as "ink slingers." The expression makes undignified the paper using it and offends needlessly those upon whom it is bestowed.

Don't use the adjective "some" for the adverb "somewhat," as in: "He is some tired." Don't use, moreover, such barbarous expressions as "some horse," "some picture," "going some," etc. These have acquired a certain vogue recently, but are to be shunned.

A recent and popular addition to slang is "and then some" for "and more," as in: "He earns all he gets, and then some." When this bit of ephemeral slang shall have run its course we probably shall hear again: "He earns more than he gets," which is good English and far more striking.

Nowadays most papers allow great latitude in the use of slang in the sporting columns. This, "though it make the unskillful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve." But the judicious have their remedy. They can "skip" the sporting pages.

SORT—This is a singular noun. Hence don't say "these sort," but "this sort."

SPLENDID—Reserve this much abused word for things that suggest splendor. A sunset may be "splendid," but a book is not. President Taft's stand on certain public questions may be brave, manly, excellent, admirable, patriotic, far-seeing, broad-minded, statesmanlike, and altogether praiseworthy, but only a careless writer would call it "splendid."

STATE—Don't use this exceedingly fussy, formal verb except for equally formal occasions. Ordinarily use "say."

STATE TAX COMMISSION—Don't call it "Deneen's commission," or "governor's

commission," either in heads or in "stories." This body was created, not by Governor De-
neen, but by the Illinois general assembly, because of the interest aroused by the Chi-
cago Civic Federation in the subject of tax reform.

STOP, STAY—Don't confuse them. "Stop" means "to cease from any motion or course of action," as in: "I shall stop at Chicago." "Stay" means "to remain," as in: "I intend to stay there a week." One does not "stop" at a hotel, but "stays" at a hotel.

SUBJUNCTIVE MODE—Occasionally you will encounter "If I be not mistaken," or "If it be fair," and like phrases, but the subjunctive mode has fewer devotees than formerly and virtually is out of date. Say "If I am not mistaken," "If it is fair," etc. In any event don't say: "Rather than make such a confession he would accept any verdict that be forthcoming." Only a few extreme sticklers for the subjunctive would go as far as that.

SUSTAIN—Properly the word means "to hold up or support," and one who dies of injuries never "sustains" them. Injuries may be "received" or "suffered," or the construction of a sentence may be changed and its meaning preserved by saying "the man was injured" in such and such a manner and to such and such an extent. "Sustain" in this sense is another word favored by those who admire so-called "fine writing." A careful copyreader will cut it out and substitute a different word or a different construction.

T

TAUTOLOGY—Avoid needless repetition of the same idea in different words. For example:

Don't permit anyone to say: "We repeat what we have said before, that," etc. "We repeat that," etc., is enough. Even

this may well be omitted and the statement thus absurdly introduced be printed without labeling it as "repeated."

Don't say "a big throng." Remember that "throng" means "multitude."

Don't say "and also" when "and" alone clearly expresses the intended meaning, as it usually does.

Don't say "The spread of the plague still continues." The word "continues" is sufficient and "still" is superfluous. For the same reason don't say "still persists."

Don't say "from hence," "from thence," "from whence." The adverb is sufficient without "from." "Hence," for instance, means "from this place." It is unnecessary as well as ungrammatical to repeat "from."

Discard the cant society term "high noon" and say "noon," which is all that is necessary.

Don't say "They both denied the accusation." "Both" expresses the idea fully and clearly without "they."

It is unnecessary to say "condor bird," for the reason that a condor is a bird.

Don't say "he lives in fine style." The combination is redundant and the thought intended to be conveyed may be expressed fully in the statement, "He lives in style." No adjective is needed and none should be used.

Omit "as" in "equally as well" because it is superfluous, and say "equally well."

"Don't say "real facts," "exact facts" or "true facts." They would not be "facts" if they were not "real," or "exact" or "true."

Don't say "widow woman." A widow necessarily is a woman.

Don't say "old adage." If it's an adage, it's old.

Omit "in" as unnecessary in the expression "in so far as" and say "so far as."

Don't say "equanimity of mind," but

"equanimity," which means "evenness of mind."

Don't say "no one else but me." Omit "else" as superfluous.

Don't say "new beginner." The word "new" is superfluous.

Don't say "not by any manner of means," but "not by any means," or "by no means." Drop "manner of" as superfluous.

Don't say "for some time to come," as in: "The troops are to stay where they are for some time to come." Naturally they will not stay for some time "past." Omit "to come."

It will be quite safe to omit "state" in "state legislature" and to say "Congress" instead of "national legislature." In any event don't say "Illinois state legislature." A "legislature," as generally if not universally understood, is a state body. The use of "national legislature" for Congress evidences either a fondness for "fine writing" or fear of repeating a short and good word. Repetition is preferable to the use of "fine" phrases. Discard also "State Representative" and say "Representative." The context will prevent confusion with "Representative" meaning a member of Congress.

Don't say "general consensus of opinion." "Consensus" itself means "a general agreement, or concord."

Don't say "return again" unless you really mean a second return. Don't say "return back." The word "back" is superfluous.

Be careful in the use of "complete," "completed," "completely," "completion," "entirely," "totally" and "wholly." When a building is completed it is finished, and you add nothing except a misused word when you say it is "entirely completed." Stop at "completed." To say a building is "completed only partly" or "completed in part" involves a contradiction. Say "it is almost completed" or "nearing completion." Don't say "final completion," because

"final" is superfluous. Again, don't say "completely destroyed," "totally destroyed" or "wholly destroyed." When a building is "destroyed," by fire or otherwise, you cannot add to the destruction by the use of any of these adverbs. Say "destroyed," or "the building is a total loss." If the work of the flames is not complete, say that a specific part was "destroyed," or, if the fact justifies it, "the building was almost destroyed."

The following example of tautology is from a recent foreign dispatch: "Tonight the railroads are completely tied up the length and breadth of Portugal."

Don't say "insurance underwriter," but "underwriter," or "insurance man," or "insurance agent." An underwriter is one who underwrites a policy of insurance; an insurer. Hence "insurance underwriter" means "insurance insurer." If you wish to distinguish between different classes of men engaged in the insurance business, say "fire underwriters," "fire insurance men," or "fire insurance agents"; "life underwriters," "life insurance men," or "life insurance agents"; "casualty underwriters," "casualty insurance men," or "casualty insurance agents." A few papers bar such expressions as "insurance man," "railroad man," "newspaper man," but the use of the noun as an adjective in such cases is in accordance with approved precedent. The word "churchman," for instance, is in accepted use and is clearly an evolution from "church man."

Don't say "old veterans." All "veterans," with the exception of a single class, are supposed to be "old." The exception embraces the so-called "Spanish War Veterans," many of whom are not "veterans" in the ordinary acceptance of the term. When the veterans of the Civil War and the soldiers of the Spanish-American War figure in a "story," distinguish between

the two classes by giving each class its proper designation.

Don't say "a young man 22 years old." The reason should be obvious.

Don't say "possibly may" or "possibly might." The verb itself conveys the idea of "possibility." Omit "possibly."

"The la grippe" appears occasionally in spite of admonitions that "la" means "the." Say "la grippe" or, Anglicised, "the grip," and you will be correct.

TENDERED—Don't use it in the sense of "given," as in: "A banquet was tendered him last night." A banquet is "tendered" when it is "offered." When it takes place it is "given."

THAT—Use the conjunction when it is necessary to the sense and omit it when it is unnecessary. It is necessary, for instance, after such verbs as "allege" and "stipulate" and unnecessary after "say." Examples: "Mrs. Michaelis alleges that Brand is endeavoring," etc.; "the ordinance stipulates that the city will stand the cost of repairs;" "he says he will be a candidate." If Mrs. Michaelis made other allegations, "that" should be repeated before each, both for the sake of good English and as a matter of safety to the paper, which by so doing connects each charge with the verb "alleges."

"That" is unnecessary after the conjunction "provided," where it always is understood. Hence don't say "Provided that the repairs are necessary."

"That" is unnecessary also after "notwithstanding." Hence don't say "Notwithstanding that the population had doubled."

Be consistent in the omission of "that" after "say," i. e., don't omit it once and use it later, as in the following: "The International Typographical Union, he said, would stand for the protection and fulfillment of its contracts, and that the members of the Chicago Typographical Union would be the

first to take this stand." Inverted, the sentence would read: "He said the International Typographical Union would stand," etc., "and that the members," etc. "That" is omitted after "said" in the first clause and used after "he said" (understood) in the second. If omitted once, it should be omitted again; if used once, it should be used again. As previously stated, however, its use after "said" is unnecessary.

Avoid the mixed construction involved in the following: "Both denied having received any offer to sell their votes, or that they had offered to award the contract for any consideration." Be consistent and say "or having offered to award," etc.

Don't repeat "that" through mere carelessness, as in: "It is figured that if Mr. Lorimer can be vindicated by a majority voting that he should retain his seat in the Senate, that the same vote will be a repudiation of Colonel Roosevelt." The third "that" is a thoughtless repetition of the first.

Don't say "just that near." "That" is not an adverb. What you mean is "just so near."

TITLES—Only the following abbreviations are permissible: Dr., Hon., M., Mgr., Mr., Mrs., Messrs., Mlle., Mme., Rev. Spell out President, Vice President, Secretary, Senator, Governor, Representative, Alderman, Commissioner, General, Colonel, Professor, etc. Never use Mrs. Dr., Mrs. General, etc.; use plain Mrs. Women have no titles by virtue of the offices or professions of their husbands.

The indiscriminate bestowal in this country of the title "Hon." upon Presidents, United States senators, representatives in Congress, members of legislatures, aldermen, all sorts of city officials, and even constables, practically has left it meaningless. Don't use it except in extracts from

speeches or documents and except when it appears with foreign names.

Don't degrade the honorable title "Judge" by bestowing it haphazard by way of a compliment. Keep it for those to whom by virtue of their offices it legitimately belongs. When a judge retires from the bench he ceases to be a judge and thenceforth is an "ex-judge" or "former judge." In introducing him in a "story" call him "ex-Judge Blank" or "former Judge Blank." When you refer to him again in the "story" call him "Mr. Blank." Recently former Judge Alton B. Parker of New York was referred to in three paragraphs respectively as "Judge Alton B. Parker," "Mr. Parker," and "Judge Parker."

Use "Judge" for "Justice" except in referring to members of the Supreme Court of the United States and to justices of the peace. But a presiding magistrate in a police court is a "magistrate."

Writers and copyreaders are enjoined especially against coining titles. Use only those which are strictly legitimate, such as President, Representative, General, Colonel, Dr., Rev., Judge, District Attorney, etc. A lawyer is not "Attorney Brown," but "John Brown, attorney for the plaintiff," or "John Brown, an attorney representing the plaintiff." A person in charge of a restaurant is hardly of sufficient importance to be dignified in type on the first or any other page as "Manager A. Frank"; it is enough to speak of him once as "A. Frank, the manager," and subsequently as "Mr. Frank," or even "Frank." A Pinkerton employe is not "Pinkerton Operative McCafferty," but "John McCafferty, a Pinkerton operative." This coining of titles, unless checked, may lead eventually to "Barkeeper Smith," "Grocer Jones," "Janitor Green," etc. The practice will not be permitted in THE RECORD-HERALD.

TOGA—This word is misused persistently in referring to senators or candidates for the Senate, as in: "Sheehan Out for Toga." The toga was a loose, outer garment worn by Roman citizens when appearing in public. Thus the wearing of a toga did not indicate that the wearer was a member of the Senate, but merely that he was a Roman citizen. It is well known that modern senators do not wear togas, but coats. The use of "toga" may be poetical, but it is not accurate. Moreover, the word has been overworked.

TOTALS TO—Don't use it for "totals." Various sums when added do not "total to" a certain amount, but "total" so much.

TRANSPIRE—Don't use it in the sense of "occur." It means to "emerge from obscurity, become known," and its use for "occur" or "happen" is improper and furnishes only another instance of so-called "fine writing."

U

UNDER—Don't use it as meaning "less than."

UNFAMILIAR WORDS—Don't use them unless there is a compelling reason for so doing, and then be sure you understand their meaning and apply them correctly.

V

VENAL, VENIAL—Don't confuse them. "Venal" means "corrupt," "mercenary," whereas "venial" signifies something that may be pardoned. One enters into a "venal" bargain and one may commit a "venial" fault.

VERBS—Don't use a singular verb with a plural subject, or a plural verb with a singular subject.

In the first place, don't mistake the subject. Frequently it does not come imme-

diately before the verb. Thus, "The end of the years are" should be "The end of the years is," the word "end" and not "years" being the subject. Similarly, "suggest" should be changed to "suggests" in the following sentence, "prominence," and not "foods," being the subject: "Illinois' prominence in the manufacture of cereal breakfast foods suggest the importance to the state of the reduction of duty on such articles." The use of the wrong number in such cases is a common newspaper error.

A prevalent form of this error is found in sentences such as: "It is one of the best books that has appeared this year." Don't be guilty of this careless slip. The qualifying phrase in such cases requires the plural verb, since the "that" refers not to "one," but to the several to which the "one" belongs.

Two singular subjects taken separately require a singular verb. Thus, "Neither Mr. Goodwin nor his wife reside here" should be "Neither Mr. Goodwin nor his wife resides here." The use of a plural verb in such cases also is a common newspaper error.

Two subjects not used in a collective sense and joined by "and" require a plural verb. This sentence recently appeared: "Miss Leslie's return to the stage a year or so ago and her steady practice of her art since then has wrought a notable betterment of her method." Here the auxiliary "has" is used incorrectly for "have." The rule holds good also when two subjects are followed by a predicate noun in the singular number. Thus, "is" in "today's report and findings is the result" is used incorrectly for "are." Another recent sentence follows: "Mr. Blank's conducting and the playing of the orchestra was again one of the most impressive features of the performance." Here "was" is used incorrectly for "were." If one objects to "were" on the ground that it

"doesn't sound right," the word easily may be changed to "constituted" and the meaning preserved unimpaired.

On the other hand, a singular subject and a plural predicate are a frequent cause of stumbling, as in this sentence: "The most recent addition to the curios of the orangery are five astronomical instruments." Here the verb clearly should be "is," although a deft hand would have avoided all possibility either of error or of controversy by transposing the sentence and making "instruments" the subject and "addition" the predicate noun.

The agreement between verb and subject, moreover, must be uniform. Only a careless writer or copyreader will permit, for example, the use of "is" in the first part of a sentence referring to "nation" and the later use of "are" referring to the same noun.

When a collective noun indicates unity, use the singular verb, as in "nation," "Congress," "city council," "government," "committee," etc. The British practice is different, but you are writing presumably for Americans chiefly.

A participle used as a noun is preceded by a noun or pronoun in the possessive, not in the objective, case. Thus, "a policeman prevented the man jumping out of the window" should be "a policeman prevented the man's jumping out of the window," and "I object to him going" should be "I object to his going."

Use the infinitive, rather than a participle, after a verb like "fail." Thus "fail to evoke" is preferred to "fail of evoking."

Despite what seems to be a prevalent opinion among writers and copyreaders, the past tense of the verb "forecast" is "forecast," not "forecasted."

VERY—Don't use it too often. It is a "good" word, but has been overworked.

VOUCHSAFE—Don't use it unless you mean "concede," "grant," "accord," or "deign," and unless you wish always to convey the idea of condescension. Generally speaking, it is used by writers and passed by copyreaders who are enamored of large, high-sounding words, but who do not always have an accurate conception of their meanings. As a result, one encounters such absurdities as: "He would vouchsafe no information," "he would vouchsafe no reply," "he wouldn't vouchsafe anything," whereas all that the reporter means is that "he refused to talk."

W

WAY—This word is not an adverb, but a noun, and hence cannot be used for "far," or for "away" in its intensive sense, in such an expression as "way up into the millions."

WAYS—Don't misuse it for "way," as in: "It is a long ways from New York to Chicago." This is a common newspaper error.

WEALTHY—Don't use it so often, but reserve it for persons who really possess wealth. The word is sadly overworked, principally to build up "stories" by giving the leading characters a standing which they do not possess. Usually the so-called "wealthy" person is merely "well-to-do" or "in comfortable circumstances." Tell the truth by saying so.

WELL KNOWN—In the same class with "prominent" and "wealthy." If a person is really well known, the adjective is mere surplusage; if not well known, it is undeserved and should not be used.

WHATEVER—Useful for imparting emphasis to a statement, but loses its force when used too often. Generally speaking, it may be omitted without harm, as in: "There was no change whatever in the money market."

WHEREFORE—Don't use it to begin a sentence or paragraph. Say "therefore."

WINDY—The derisive term "Windy City" is applied to Chicago by envious rivals, thoughtless speakers and ill-informed country correspondents. Don't permit it to appear in the columns of **THE RECORD-HERALD**, unless it occurs in a speech which the paper is printing in full. Don't accentuate it even then.

WORDS GENERALLY IN DIFFERENT SENSES—Don't use them in the same sentence or paragraph. You are writing, not to confuse the reader, but to enlighten or entertain him.

WORTH—Don't use it to denote a person's fortune or estate, as in: "John Jones is worth \$50,000." John Jones may have property valued at \$50,000, or may leave an estate estimated to be worth that amount, but what he is worth is known only to the Recording Angel.

"WRITE-UPS"—If in the same type as the main "story," they must be preceded by a 2-em dash; if in smaller type, they must begin with a bracket and end with one, but without any preceding dash.

X

XMAS—Don't use this barbarism for "Christmas," either in text or in heads.

Y

YET—Don't use it as an adverb of time unless it is necessary to imply that something may happen. Generally it may be omitted without harm to the sense. Thus "He has not arrived" is sufficient ordinarily without the addition of "yet."





THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

DEC 16 1933

25 JUN 49 MW

YA 00370

227922

892

7212

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

