

quent and the difrence between the strest and unstrest sounds of certn words greater than in the average speech of certn peopl."

If this be true of transatlantic speech, where, for exampl, for *Gladstone* they say glædst:n;, it is more marktly true in cisatlantic speech, where we say glædston-*The Athenæum* continues:—

"If we ar right in this opinion, it is a pity that the 'Elementarbuch' shud hav been so genrally accepted in Germany as an authority on orthoepy. Doctor Sweet himself, indeed, makes no such claim for it; he seems rather to think that ther is no criterion for determining which of two pronunciations is the beter. We shud be inclined to say that, as the end of language is to be understood, the intrinsically best pronunciation is that which has the greatest degree of clearnes shot of what genral educated uzage agrees in condemnig as pedantic."

When a word has a setld or "fixt" form, it is easier for both printer and reader—variant forms ar a vexatios nuisance in a printing-office, where the dozen, hundred, or thousand busy workers *must* agree to act in concert. Variant forms hinder the reader, too. He wants forms familiar to his eye, forms which, stereotyped by habit and use, right or rong, strike his mind as a picture, and which he has not to stop to spel out. This he finds much easier, and prefers becaus it offers les resistance, for "motion is in the direction of least resistance." But let Kewitsch speak in words translated by Mr N. J. Werner, St Louis:

"The management permits each contributor to portray his pronunciation as seems best to him. This shifts the responsibility on the riter of an articl and lessens the editor's own work. The result is that readers ar burdend if not dismayd in its perusal. When as a German I find it difficult as wel as time-robbing to read such matter in my mother-tung, what about the foriner? Whoever wishes to treat of dialects shud contribute to a jurnal of his own cuntry. . . . We rite not only to please ourselvs but that our contribution may be red; els it might as wel be lockt up in our desk."

With Doctor Murray's opinions, on which the ninth plank in our Platform is bilt, Kewitsch coincides in efect: for in maters international

"One shud not be permitted to talk therin just as one's tung is twisted—as thoslouchin; in dressing-gown and slippers; rather as if clothed in dres-suit—but rite in the method believed to be standard. Dropping and sluring sounds come of themselvs in quik speech; we can from distinct, slow speech slide off into fast speech, not vice versa. Ocasionaly short exampls of dialectic colloquial speech may be givn, but in the main text standard alone."

As to what is standard and its rigidity:

"Evrybody feels that ther is a standard speech consisting of precise forms; otherwise each acter on the stage cud speak as he pleasd. The speech considerd standard by each nation rests on custom, inclination, taste, imitation, compromise and—fasion. The language of the stage is not by any means at all times and at all places the same. With the idea of standard pronunciation is not necessarily asociated rigid uniformity. [That pertains to orthografy, rather.] One can, e g., pronounce g in Freiburg either as k or A without ofending."

His prescription is:

"Place responsibility for the standard on the management of Le Maitre Phonetique. Whoever caris greater responsibility is more careful to find the corect. Therby we obtain word-forms uniform and more easily red. . . . It is posibl that a sub-editer for any language may er; wel, errors may be disclosed and verified. At any rate, I prefer uniform pronunciation and print, even with errors in unimportant maters, to caos."

Altogether, Kewitsch has made out his case; which Spieser and Viotor do not controvert—nor any one els up to Februa-ry—but appear rather to endors.

The noble service done by our polyglot contemporary wil be nobler stil by leav- ing dialects to dialect societis for each language. Tel us what is "receivd" French, German, Italian, Spanish, English, etc.—Select what we ar to "aim at" (*Murray*) and copy, not embaras and hinder us with bewildering variety.

REVIZING A HYMNAL.—The Presbyteri- an Church in Canada some years ago de- termind to hav a revized hymnal. Much work has been done and expens incurd in selecting and printing specimen colec- tions, etc. In June, 1896, "copy" was about completed, when a motion was carid in- structing the hymnal comitte to uze spel- ing authorized by *A Standard Dictionary*. The succesful tenderer for printing was the Oxford University Press, over which presides Mr Horace Hart, whom readers of these pages for January, 1897, p. 3, wil recognize as highly conservativ in spel- ing. It is wonderful that his pres did not "all go to everlasting smash" when endings *or*, for *our*, went thru it. Printers ar too inflexibl in this. Mr Hart yielded: end- ings in *or* ar uniformly carid out—not so preterits in *-t*. Spellings like "distrest" ar not uncomon, but preterits in *-ed* prevail. We wud rather hav seen them carid out consistently, which is not the case even in the same hym. Thus, we find,

"Art thou weary, art thou languid,  
Art thou sore distrest?" Hym 132

and, a few lines lower, in hym 132,

"Sorrow vanquished, labor ended."

but again, in hym 81,

"By power oppressed, and mocked by pride,"

This long line givs the singer the mis- leading idea that it has elevn sylabls, the meter requiring but eight—an important fault in vers, especially if it is to be sung. The foloing wil lead the singer aright:

"By pow'r opprest, and mockt by pride,"

which Tennyson wud hav put, or perhaps:

"By pow'r oppress'd and mock'd by pride,"

Conversly, tho, when *-ed* itself is a separat sylabl it shud be preservd as a guide to the singer; as in the same hym:

"The hills their fixed seat forsake,"