

widespread acceptance in English letters, does it not savour of literary barbarism to seek for a phonetic English spelling, by substituting for a poetically constructed word, a mongrel orthography, such as is found inclosed between parentheses in the pronouncing dictionaries? And the absurdity of the seeking is found in the variety of the grotesque results already indicated. As well, it seems to me, might we object to the French form of our English word "champagne," and insist upon writing it "shampain" or "shampane," as to persist in the anglicization of *ouananiche*.

The lake trout,—forked tail,—lunge or *touladi* is fortunate in the almost universal maintenance for the name of its variety, of the original French orthographical illustration of the Indian sound represented by the pronunciation of *namaycush*. But in the case of another North America fish,—*esox nobilior*,—whose popular title in its original form, like that of the *ouananiche* and *namaycush*, comes down to us, as correctly claimed by Mr. Fred. Mather, from its Indian nomenclature, an apparent desire to get away from French orthography has produced a somewhat similar confusion of language to that already described in the case of the *ouananiche*. The original spelling of the Indian name was undoubtedly "maskinongé," and such it is still called in the Statutes of Canada. According to Mgr. Lafleche, "maskinongé" is derived from *maskk* deformed, and *kinongé*, a pike, and was applied to the *esox nobilior* by the Indians because it appeared to them a deformed or different kind of pike from that to which they had been accustomed. The river of the same name that flows into Lake St. Peter, which name was subsequently extended to the town since built at its mouth and to the county of which it is the *chef lieu*, was doubtless so called from the number of these fish taken in or near its estuary, and after their Indian name. And it is a singular corroboration of the absolute correctness of the French orthography "maskinongé," that no less an authority than Dr. James A. Henshall, the author of the paper on this fish in *American Game Fishes*, following the nomenclature of Dr. Mitchil, and of DeKay in *Fishes of New York*, substitutes for *nobilior*, as the scientific name of this particular species,—*masquinongy*,—which is about as near as it is possible for English orthography to go in representing the correct pronunciation of "maskinongé." Yet Dr. Henshall claims that by common consent and custom the name is "mascalonge" amongst the majority of anglers and that mascalonge it will be for generations to come! Nor does this mongrel name, which Dr. Henshall himself employs for the title of his monograph on the fish, represent the full extent of the departure from the original name. He gives us himself amongst the various other forms,—*muscalonge*, *muskellunge* and *muskallonge*,—the second of which is the name employed to designate the species by Dr. C. Brown Goode in his *American Fishes*, and which is