

not occur in either word. This is but one example of thousands that might be given. Again, in ph the confiding def-mute expects p to indicate complete closure of lips, followed by forcible expulsion of breath indicated by h. But ph represents f, not a labial, but a labio-dental, formed between lower lip and upper teeth. Another difference: there is no complete closure but narrowing only or approximat closure. To write f does not mislead and is truthful. Is it "too radical" to be truthful?

Come, Mr. *Observer*, help remove these stumbling-blocks and pit-falls, give up your prejudices, adopt sound principles, and you will do your noble work more nobly.

EDITOR.

Toronto, 20th March.

[\*The *Observer* is a little semi-monthly, published in Toronto, edited by tutors in the government school for the def-dum at Belvil, Ont. It is a sort of school journal for present and past pupils. The above was sent in six weeks ago in answer to an unprovoked attack in its issue of 15th March, and was not inserted. Its motto is "Be just and fear not." Its conduct shows that is put there "to look well," to be lip-profess, not practis! els it wud do justice where it had misrepresented.]

We ar sorry that "the Ontario Institution" shud hav givn indubitabl proof that it is behind the age in amendment of spelling. Elsewhere there is a different tone. At conventions of instructors of the def-dum, regret is expressed that the stumbling-block of arbitrarily irregular spelling is kept in the way. The *Amer. Annals of the Def and Dum* (Washington) for Oct., 1881, urges that teachers of the def-dum shud be specially interested in getting sp. mended, and says, "There ar abundant reasons, economic, filologic, moral and filanthropic, why every intelligent person shud favor improvement in orthog. There is peculiar reason why the moderat and practical efforts which our leading scolars ar now making in this direction shud hav earnest suport of all teachers and friends of the def." That is surely a different and more commendabl tone than the *Observer's*.

Between the manualists and oralists there is a conflict. We fear it may be as unending as that of the realists and nominalists in middle ages. If we ar to judge "the Ontario Institution" by its stick-in-the-mud orthographic proclivities, we fear that finding but 17 per cent. of pupils (40 in 240) suitable for oral instruction, and that more as an accomplishment, is hardly what is expected in these days. Of the 90 schools for the def-dum in Germany, all ar oral—no other method is pursued there. Of the 17 in Austria-Hungary, all ar oral. Of the 11 in Switzerland, all ar oral. Of the two schools in Genoa, one uses the combined

method. The other 34 schools in Italy all use the oral method. Now this is not a mushroom growth. It is the result of Heinicke's labors, and he flourished over a century ago. We had some knowledge of Van Praagh's early struggles and labors in London to introduce into the British Isles a system so general on the continent. How has he succeeded in his work as an apostle of a better way? Of the 11 schools in London, all ar oral (that at Clapton perhaps excepted,) an astonishing result in a country slow to change their old ways. For all that, the oral method shud hardly supersede altogether the manual and sign language. It is rather a question of their rightful division. For that, the careful examinations of Dr. De Rossi, at Rome, and of Dr. Roosa (pronounce Roza), in N. Y., furnish important data. The results of Hartmann's statistics in Berlin ar perhaps unreliable, founded as they ar on collections of answers, not on personal examination. We wait to see if the line is to stand at 17 per cent., which, where other methods ar in use simultaneously, wil give an actual use of less than 5 per cent.; perhaps 1 or 2 per cent.—a farce.

Æ AND Œ.—Some time ago we gave a quotation in which Prof. Skeat urged the general substitution of e for æ and œ. This was favorably commented on by the *British Medical Journal*. It, however, does not put it in practice: VIDEO MELIORA, PROBŒQUE; DETERIORA SEŒVOR (Ovid). Such words ar very common in medical literature, as hæmorrhage (from Greek haima), dysmenorrhœa, etc. For a long time past there has been going on a general abandonment of æ and œ. Thus in *economy* (from Greek oikos) œ has been superseded by e, altho in some very "old school" writers we wil occasionally find "œconomy" and a few like out-of-date spellings. We find that *The Medical World* of Philadelphia has adopted the change. In April issue we find hæmorrhage, œmenorrhœa, gonorrhœa, homœopathic, hyperæsthesia, hæmorrhoidal, œther (but properly Æther when Latin), hæmatoma, œdema, dyspnœa, diarrhœa, fetus, and so on thruout. *Anemia*, hypercœmia, urœmia, and many others hav been gradually coming into vogue. Altho these last ar found in the *World* we dont esteem them novelists. The *St. Louis Courier of Medicin* claims that it antedated the *World* in making the change. The *New York American Journal of Obstetrics* antedated both. The *St. Louis Weekly Medical Review* favors the change. When we consider the *British Medical Journal's* stupid conservatism and compare it with this evidence of cisatlantic progressiveness, we ar not surprised at another of Skeat's statements: "Whether we shal ever get a true sp. reform is doubtful. If so, it wil come from America."