

The Herald.

DEVOTED TO PRONUNCIATION AND AMENDED SPELLING.

VOL. II, 6.

TORONTO, CANADA, April, 1898.

N^R. 56.

SPEECH-DISTRICTS.

We shud aim at speech free from local color. Advocacy of London, Dublin or anywhere els shud ceas. Dr Lloyd, Liverpool, has givn his views (in *Neuere Sprachen*, July, 1895) on some points:—

“The time has gon by when any geografic standard of good English was posibl. The best English is that which avoids vulgaritis of evry clas and GIVS FEWEST SIGNS OF LOCALITY. Careful speakers naturally strive to divest themselvs of vulgarisms and localisms. Hence ther is a continual asimilating tendency in the pronunciation of careful speakers,—a tendency which never quite fulfils itself, but which nevertheles is now the actual, if imperfect, standard of corect English speech. Under these circumstances any local standard is sure to be false; and none more so than that of London, becaus no other place has more pronounced or more abhorrent localisms. The reason why London localisms ar particularly abhorrent is that they proceed from below. They ar the ofspring of Cokny corruption and hence convey sugestions of vulgarity such as ar not conveyd by the national localisms of an Irishman, a Scotsman or an American.”

Excluding localitis, ther ar some districts wherin prevails speech aproximatly uniform. Of this, Lloyd says:—

“The largest homogeneous body of English pronunciation which exists at the presnt moment is that which extends from the Ohio northwards, counting thirty milions of speakers. The next, les homogeneous, but very distinguishabl, is that of the Suthern States. The third, which also includes minor varietis, is Northern English educated speech extending from about the fifty-third to about the fifty-fifth paralel of north latitude. The London area comes fourth, and is in many ways unfited to furnish the standard of good English speech. It is neither central, nor homogeneous, nor stable, nor preponderant.”

Considering the population mentiond, thirty milions, Lloyd must mean residents north of the latitude of Cincinnati at the mouth of the Ohio; or, in other words, the northern United States and Canada (?), in which belt, except perhaps in New England, ther is remarkabl uniformity from Halifax to San Francisco, from Atlantic to Pacific. A Nova Scotian may travel a ful week by fast express, and, when he halts in California or British Columbia, be distinguisht with difficulty from a nativ.

As to how this came about Lloyd has elswhere (*Westminster Review* for March, 1897) said:—

“In Washington's time the ruling dialect was the suthern, and the hole Mississippi Vally and Canada took their English in the first instance from the south. But when settlers began to pour

into the Ohio Vally they came mostly by way of New York and Pennsylvania [yet largely by Quebec and the St Lawrence], bringing with them a northern dialect and pushing the suthern type continually farther west.”

We ar told that

“New England has always had peculiaritis of its own. Its rustic dialects, immortalized by Lowell, ar simply old rustic English transplanted to a western soil; while Boston, on the other hand, has been so sensitiv to English literary influences that its pronunciation is to-day nearer to that of London in some particulars than that of Liverpool or Manchester.”

Of the speech of the Suthern States we lern that it

“appears to hav been the most stable. It has striking resemblances to London-English of 100 or 120 years ago, and for that reason is very much les removed from our northern-English than it is from ordinary London-English of the presnt day. The reason for its stability may perhaps be the comparativ absence of great citis, the etiquette of a compact ruling clas and the markt segregation of the lower orders. In London the corruption of language seems to proceed chiefly from below.”

DIALECTLES SPEECH.

A communication with the title above is in the November number of our polyglot contemporary, *Le Maître Phonétique* (20 to 32 pages octavo monthly, 11 route de Fontenay, Bourg-la-Reine, Seine, France, 3 francs a year). The articl is by Prof. Kewitsch, Freiburg, Germany, with coments by Father Spiesser, Waldhambach, and by Prof. Vietor, Marburg. It is a plea that, instead of dialectic colougal, standard speech be givn in *Le Maître Phonétique*—so important that we quote largely from it. In the pages of *Le Maître Phonétique* (May, 1889), ably seconded by Rev. J. H. Kidder, Owego, N. Y., we urged this. The English part of *Le Maître Phonétique* has never been satisfactory, say others. Mr Kidder went so far as to say, “If English is spoken so anywhere on the face of the erth, may God hav mercy on the place and send a schoolmaster!” In July, 1891, after Doctor Sweet had ritn in German for Germans a primer of spoken English (*Elementarbuch des Gesprochenen Englisch*) we again calld attention to this, quoting with other things from a notice of the *Elementarbuch* in *The Athenæum* for 23d August, 1890:—

“The pronunciation noted seems somewhat slovenly, that is, to say, elisions appear more fre-