

alphabet. These examples have value from a scientific standpoint and deserve study from the practical (or popular) one. His analysis is full and commonly correct. Both deliberate and colloquial speech is given. It is regrettable that he appears to accept a Londonese dialect which is about as bad English as Viennese is bad German. Its dropped *r*s are about as bad as dropped *h*s—the latter habit is tabooed, the former deserves it. March says

“The American Association . . . follows the pronouncing dictionaris. It abjures peculiar orthoepy. This position is essential. The Londoner has a different way of sounding many elements from that of a Scotchman or an American—a in man, for example, e in there, o in note. If an alphabet goes behind historic distinctions, and adds new characters which discriminate the speech of London from that of Edinburgh and of Boston, it will separate English into several dialects, and no Londoner will be able to read an American book. Londoners seem not to think of any such impending privation. They take for granted that natural unsophisticated Londonese, the speech of the gentleman and scholar of the metropolis, is what is meant by standard English; that if only it can be set forth in print with all its glides and finishes, all its runs of unaccented, indistinguishable murmurs, and varied droppings and insertions, the rest of the world will accept and try to imitate. We shall never be able to reform our spelling by substituting colloquial Londonese for the present standard spelling.”

THE NEW TESTAMENT translated into the language of the Ojibwa Indians. New York, 12mo, p. 717.

This is one of many such books issued by Amer. Bible Society. It is interesting on account of the values given the vowels. The sign for that in *but* is not quite *u* but more like *v* made upright, a character suggested fifty years ago by the well known filologist, Hon. John Pickering of Boston. It has been much used by Amer. missionaries, as Mr Horatio Hale of Clinton, Ont., tells us. Here is the vowel alphabet—

a as in *father* e as in *hate, fate*
 i as in *machine*, or e in *mete* o as in *note*
 u as in *pool* or *u* in *full* v as in *sun, but*.
 A and i have, in certain positions, a modification of the above sounds, as
 a in *what, was, all* i as in *pin, pit*.

PRONUNCIATION.

Grimsby Park now ranks among the pleasantest watering places in Canada. Amid other attractions, it is customary to have a pronouncing contest there annually. This is surely better than the spelling matches in vogue a few years ago—they but help perpetuate what Prof. Sayce calls ‘a mere series of arbitrary combinations, an embodiment of wild guesses, and etymologies of a prescientific age, the hap hazard caprice of ignorant printers.’ Good pro-

nunciation on the contrary, is a valuable accomplishment. In this year’s contest, the first prize was taken by Mr T. J. Parr, of Woodstock; second, Rev. Dr Withrow, of Toronto; third, Miss Edwards, of Seafort. Mr Parr furnishes the following account at our request:

The contest was held in the auditorium, competition open to all. This year there was an audience of about 600 who evinced great interest.—For a number of days preceding, careful preparation was made by those who intended to take a part. There were about 40 competitors. It was conducted by Prof. J. H. Bechtel, professor of Articulation in Philadelphia School of Oratory. An umpire was chosen. The words were printed on a long roll exposed to view. Contestants were divided into two parts, a word being given each side alternately. When a competitor mispronounced a word, he retired to the audience. The word was then pronounced correctly by Prof. B. When any peculiarity of sound was manifested or when accent was different from that commonly given, the professor remarked upon it and thus considerable information was conveyed. In fact, for days after, pronunciation was a leading topic. Many highly educated people found their usage faulty. The professor was guided chiefly by three points in deciding:—Clear and correct sounding of (1) vowels, (2) consonants, (3) proper placing of accent. If mistake were made in 1st and 3rd, either jointly or separately, this sent the candidate down. (2) was not adhered to so strictly. The standards of authority were Webster and Worcester. I give a list of words considered difficult or whose proper pronunciation differs from usage of majority. I shall append the pronunciation accepted.—*allies, almond, amateur*, (commonly accented on first syllable) *bestial, brigand, saison, camelopard, canine, carret, cayenne, coadjutant, coadjutor* (the different pronunciation of these similar words is remarkable) *condemning, congruent* (the first syllable should have special attention) *conversant, coquetry, coterie, cuirass, culinary, decade, defalcate, deficit, didactic, dishabille, dishevelled, disreputable, exemplary, facade, falcon, feoff, financier, frontier, gaour, gibbet*. Good sense was shown in selecting words in common use, thus showing the audience as well as competitors that their usage was faulty in the words most used. I wish you success in the noble work of revising the ‘phenomenal’ spelling that now holds current.

University College, }
 Toronto, Oct. '86. }

T. J. PARR.

(Accent first syllable unless marked otherwise.)

al liz' a mund am a tyur'
 best yal brig and ces'son ca-
 mel'o pard ca nin' ca ret ca-
 en' co ad'ju tant co ad'ju'tor
 con dem'ning con'gru ent con-
 ver sant co ket'ri co te re'
 kwe ras'or kwe'ras kyul'nari
 dec ad defal'cat defi sit di-
 dac'tic (not di dac tic) fran chiz
 disha bil' di shev'ld egz em-
 pla ri fasad'or fasad' fe kn
 fef fin an ser' fron ter er
 frun ter gal lus jour jib et.