

at all when we call to mind the position the teacher occupies, and what his example *ought* to be in the presence of either young or old. There are probably few sections in the whole Dominion without one or more tolerably well-educated persons resident in them, the respect of whom a teacher's vulgarity must necessarily forfeit, whilst no gain can accrue on the other side.

Reversing the order of importance it may be said there are three principal sources of error on our part (omitting slang), viz :

1st. Accent—in its widest sense.

2nd. Pronunciation.

3rd. Phraseology.

Space will only permit of glancing at each of these briefly.

With reference to *accent*, the assertion may be ventured that every teacher should be so free from it that, judged by his tongue, his nationality might not be easily settled. As already remarked, this may be regarded as of less consequence than pronunciation and phraseology, and does not materially unfit a teacher for the discharge of his duties; but there is probably no one labouring under this difficulty who will deny that it is a difficulty. Here and there you may meet with an individual—never, so far as I have known, a lady—who takes a foolish pride in the retention of that peculiar and indescribable twang or brogue, which unmistakably points him out as a John Bull, a Bannockburn Scot, or an exile from the “furst gim av the say.” A man with such a pride should never attempt to teach English, however well qualified he may be in other respects.

Passing to *pronunciation*, which is often intimately associated with *accent*, it will be the purpose of this paper to treat of it as being totally distinct. In so far as geographical names are concerned, there is a certain amount of latitude; but we find many of the pro-

fession who appear to act upon the assumption that a good deal of longitude may also be allowed. There cannot, for instance, be any valid reason why we should insist on calling our Dominion *Canadā*, instead of *Canadă*; neither should we say *Ontari* for Ontario, or *Quee-bec* instead of, shortly, Quebec, or Kebec. *Moun-treal* is not at all uncommon; *Cape Brēton* is as frequently given as the right way, no doubt, by those who prefer *prētty* to pretty, but always say *git* in place of *get*. The old-fashioned, and formerly correct *Rooshia* and *Prooshia*, we hear now and again, and, once in a while Germany. *Pāris* for *Pāris*, *Vienna* for *Vienna*, *Afghanis'tan* for *Afghanistan*, *Beloochis'tan* for *Beloochistan*, and even *New Westminster* are not far to seek. Perhaps worse than any of these is *Ītali-an* for *Ītalian*. Some years ago the standard pronunciation of teachers gave us *constitoot*, *institoot*, *redooce*, *noose* (for *news*), and others “of that ilk;” but, more recently, these have been relegated to the limbo of the unconfirmed. Some of us insist on speaking of the tea-kettle; this belongs to the same class as *pretty* and *get*, already referred to. *Once-t* is rarer, but survives, so does *across-t* and a few more of the same stamp, which it is eminently desirable we should banish immediately and forever from our vocabulary. But one would suppose no difficulty likely to arise with the names of studies pursued in the school-room; yet, how frequently we hear *jometry*, *jography*, *arethmetic*, and *pronounciation*, as if these were according to authority. A very common error consists in dropping the sound indicated by “g” at the end of present participles, and this word participle itself is often half blinded; the same is true of nominative. In mere pronunciation there is hardly anything more objectionable to an English ear than giving to the