

PROFESSIONAL PESTS.

The orthographical and etymological cranks who busy themselves misspelling our language, and coining new words which express nothing new excepting the "newness" of their authors, might surely find a sedative to their conceited ignorance in the general resentment to their conclusions. The glaring errors of which these gentlemen have been convicted, seem to have no more effect than the exposure of the follies of the so-called "Christian Scientists," and they continue their idiomatic and orthographical fabrications with a glorious indefiniteness, which gives to their expressions the transparency and clearness of mud. An authoritative writer refers to the so-called reform that changes iodine to "iodin," iodide to "iodid," etc., and disapproves of the innovation. The termination "ine" should be retained for alkaloids as distinguishing them from principles, the names of which end in—in. We have been frequently amazed, if not amused, to discover the utter ignorance of the classical languages from which so much of our own have been derived, on the part of gentlemen who pose as authorities, and who tinker with our etymology, lay as well as scientific, with an arbitrary presumption as full of affectation as of ambiguity. The need for preciseness of expression and correct terms is keenly felt in our profession, but the reform must not be left to the Quixotic guessers, who think they are qualified to improve the speeches of Shakespeare and of science, by virtue of their ability to give us a jargon which is only intelligible to themselves. Our professional literature reveals the fact that we have many clear and correct writers; but, on the other hand, we have some prominent teachers who are free and independent orthographical and etymological democrats, who do not care a damper for any law and order not of their own conception in the construction of words. They may be terrible in terseness, or vapid in verbosity, but they are a confounded pest all the same, and should have their conceit and ignorance personally and publicly exposed. They make "ruin upon ruin, rout on rout, confusion worse confounded," and convey a sense of their personal vanity more than the desire to enlighten their readers. We have had quite too much of this fad. Let these parties expend their fantastic word-juggling in some sphere outside our special literature, and as scholars consent to leave to them the care of their teeth, let them leave to scholars the care of our professional language. When they aspire to reform our terms and technicalities, they succeed as well as a *chef* who would try to pass off sole leather for a fillet, and cultivate a taste among his patrons for a pudding of straw.