

sert" (under Divisions of Land), "spi-rit," and "re-lic." But throughout the book we find that the same spirit of sciolism has been at work—a spirit which we have no notion will ever be altogether laid by criticism in these columns. Let us, however, give the publisher the benefit of our further critical investigation of his book, that, to quote the preface, he may feel we "leave no enemies in the rear." The following are a few instances of further eccentricity in syllabication:—"ratio," "Austrian," and "granular," are indicated as dissyllables; "victuals" occurs variably as a dissyllable and a trissyllable; "agreeable" and "urbanity" are given as words of three syllables, though "stupidity," in the same group as "urbanity," is correctly represented as of four. Here, of course, *stupidity* being the rule, it was sure to be right. It is impossible to consider these blunders as inadvertencies, even if that were any excuse for such portentous accidents in a work designed for spelling. We have reason rather to think them some of the fruits of immature, callow efforts in authorship, previous specimens of which we have had in abundance from the source from which the present text-book emanates. This view will seem the more tenable when the matter and literary form of the "Preface" is reviewed, and where other original (!) composition occurs, the presumed work of the Canadian editor. Our opinion will also find support in the absurdity of many of the definitions of terms which appear in the book, one instance of which we in passing may cite:—"Finance is the income of a state or ruler." But the incredible wildness and inconsistency of much of the syllabication, which we have not yet exposed, would suggest the theory that some "crank" or possibly a School Inspector had been set the task of compiling the book. Let us instance. Under the classification of "In the Kitchen," the word "basin" occurs, divided thus: "bas-in." At the foot of the same page, the name of this utensil appears in the inventory of "Chamber and Garret" as "ba-sin!" With like inconsistency we have "un-cle" and "unc-le," "ce-le-ry" and

"cel-e-ry," "bo-dice" and "bo-dice," "leopard" and "leopard," "ed-i-tor" and "ed-it-or," "cri-tique" and "crit-ique," "as-pa-ra-gus" and "as-par-a-gus," "govern-ess" and "gov-er-ness," and "pho-tog-ra-pher" and "pho-to-graph-er." On page 67 we find a couple of words alongside each other, syllabated as follows: "cur-a-ble" and "du-ra-ble"! On pages 33 and 44 the word "polish" occurs, in the one case in association with "blackening," and in the other under the classification of "Nationalities." Both are syllabated thus, "pol-ish," though in the latter instance with a big, big "P." Under the classification also of "Nationalities," we have such atrocities as "A-rab-i-an" and "Eu-rop-e-an." In other parts of the book we have "a-ca-de-my," "di-vi-ni-ty," "mil-li-ner," "en-ve-lope," "Prot-es-tant," "pot-ent-ate," with other evidences that the compiler will be no bond-slave of conventional syllabication. But, as if crimes against the purity of the language emboldened the perpetrator to impious excesses, we find him unabashed and unrestrained when he touches sacred things. From this ruthless tinkering and desecration of things secular he proceeds to mangle the Lord's Prayer, and to make a hash of the Decalogue. In the former, on page 100, we have the execrable so-called purism of "Our Father *who*," for "Our Father *which*," and the version given is cited as that of Matthew [vi., 9-13] instead of that of the English Prayer Book. The sacrilegious hand then turns to carve a clause out of the Second Commandment, and, a little way on, to take vulgar liberties with the text of Shakespeare. If we did not think that our readers would tire of this "glutting of the guillotine" of criticism, we could keep on with similar exposures of imbecility and licence on the part of the compiler of this wretched book to the end of the magazine. But we have perhaps said enough to expose this very prince of pedagogues, and to reveal to the teachers of Canada what "an *arbiter elegantiarum* of our vernacular speech" we have in the compiler of "Gage's Practical Speller." We have nowhere met with a book which more shamefully cuts and hews at the lan-