

John's book, for John his book. But that," he continues, "has been sufficiently exploded; and therefore the use of the apostrophe, especially in those instances where the pronunciation requires an additional syllable, is, I presume, quite indefensible. To write ox's, ass's, fox's, and at the same time pronounce it oxes, asses, foxes, is such a departure from the original formation, at least in writing, and such an inconsistent use of the apostrophe, as cannot perhaps be equalled in any other language. The genitive case in my opinion," Ash says, "might be much more properly formed by adding *s*, or when the pronunciation requires it, *es*, without an apostrophe, as men, mens; ox, oxes; horse, horses; ass, asses." This, he is aware, is the Anglo-Saxon genitive; but nevertheless he has thought it expedient in his dictionary to conform to a "late refinement and corrupt custom." He notices what he states to be an improper pronunciation in London: he says the *e* in *her*, has wrongly the sound of *u* in *cur*. He thinks it needful to remark that *e* should be pronounced long in hero, rebuild, refrain, adhesion, cohesion. He gives "lieftenant" as an incorrect spelling of "lieutenant." Chum, one who lodges in the same room, is from the Armoric *chom*, to live together. A chump is a thick, heavy piece of wood (our *chunk*, which has no existence). Slick is given as a provincial word for sleek, smooth. To whittle is to make white by cutting. Sled is from the Danish *slaed*, a sledge, or carriage drawn without wheels (our sleigh). He anticipates Webster in his objections to "cannot." "This seems to be a word," he remarks, "improperly, at least injudiciously, compounded, and to have nothing but barbarous custom to support it, for we never write maynot, willnot, can'stnot." Quebec is noticed as "the capital of New France in

North America, now subject to the English."

(f) *Walker*.—I take now another post-Johnsonian dictionary, "the Critical and Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language" of John Walker. My copy is a three-column one in quarto, dated in 1802, and then in the third edition. The first edition came out in 1791. The dictionaries that at present go by the name of Walker are very different from the original work. The quarto Walker is curious now as a repository of the pronunciations of our grandfathers and their predecessors for a generation or two back. These pronunciations, as being now for the most part obsolete, are of course eliminated from the modern Walkers. This lexicographer offers "rules to be observed not only by the natives of Scotland and Ireland and Wales, for avoiding their respective peculiarities, but by the natives of London also." He himself was a native and had been a teacher of elocution for many years in London and its neighbourhood; and his ear had been vexed with local accents and tones and vocalizations which he desired to set right. For, just as here in Canada we are more ready to note with disapproval deviations from the normal custom of speaking in an Englishman than in a Hibernian or Scot, so Walker is specially out of patience with Londoners when they transgress in this respect. "The inhabitants of London," he says, "have the disadvantage of being more disgraced by their peculiarities than any other people." He then points out their faults of pronouncing *w* for *v*, and *v* for *w*; not sounding *h* after *w* in such words as which, when; affixing *h* where it ought not to be affixed, and dropping it where it ought not to be dropped; pronouncing *e* like *u* in such words as *her*, *mercy*, and so on.

Thomas Sheridan, an Irishman,