

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the director or president to prosecute any offence occurring under this Act, and any director or president neglecting to prosecute for such fine within ten days after a written notice has been served on him by any tax-payer in said district, unless the person so complained of shall be excused by the district board, shall be liable to a fine of not less than twenty or more than fifty dollars, which fine shall be prosecuted for and in the name of the assessor of said district, and the fine when collected shall be paid to the assessor, to be accounted for as in section three of this Act.

2. DEAF MUTE EDUCATION.

"Providence helps those who help themselves" is a maxim of authority, and one the truth of which we often see exemplified. It is a piece of philosophy, too, which probably furnishes people sometimes with a plausible excuse for refusing aid to those who apparently will not exert themselves in their own behalf. But a maxim of this sort entirely fails in its application when the objects appealing for assistance are persons deprived of some of the faculties which are indispensable to success in the battle of life. The deaf and dumb, and the blind, enter upon the race heavily burthened, and the awakening and development of their intellectual powers bring the melancholy conviction that to them the struggle must ever be an unequal one, and success but comparative. This portion of the community can never fail to awaken the sincerest feelings of compassion, and the best method of assisting them to make the most of their limited powers must claim the most earnest consideration. We are glad, therefore, to see increasing attention given to the class thus thrown upon the kindness of their more amply endowed fellows.

One of the most interesting matters connected with the education of deaf mutes is the greater degree of attention given to articulation, as a medium of education. From the observations of a lady connected with an institution for deaf mutes in the State of Massachusetts, who recently paid a visit to Europe, it appears that the use of signs is giving place in many instances to the practice of articulation. Miss Rogers, the lady referred to, visited twenty-two European establishments for deaf mutes, of which fifteen taught by articulation, or what is commonly called the German system, and seven by signs, or the French system, which is the one that has been generally used in this country. In three or four of the seven schools, articulation is also taught. The schools visited were one each in Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy, six in England and twelve in Austria and Germany. To such an extent has articulation been adopted in Germany that Miss Rogers could hear of no school in Germany using the French system; and but one in Belgium, where formerly it was used in all the schools. In England also articulation is gaining ground. Most of the schools visited were small; none of the German schools that she saw containing more than 130 pupils. Several had only day pupils; as, for example, Mr. Hirsch's celebrated Dutch school at Rotterdam, with 100 day pupils; one at Weissenfels with 52, and one at Osnabruck with 50. We believe that it is contemplated to devote more attention to the same point in the Institution at Belleville, Ontario.

Miss Rogers also made some observations upon the management of schools abroad, which are of interest. At the schools visited all the pupils board in private families, selected by the directors, and there, as in Berlin, where about half the pupils board out in this way, the arrangement has long worked well. At the Rotterdam school, during the last two or three years of the course, the boys are apprenticed to trades in the city and devote the afternoons to their work,—an arrangement of which Miss Rogers thought very favourably. The average age of pupils she thinks is less in Europe than in the United States, and the teaching is much more generally done by men. She found no women teaching in the German deaf mute schools, but several such teachers in Switzerland and England—*Monreal Gazette*.

3. SYLLABUS OF LATIN PRONUNCIATION.

DRAWN UP AT THE REQUEST OF THE HEAD-MASTERS OF SCHOOLS.

The Head-masters of Schools, at their Conference held in 1871, declared the system of Latin pronunciation prevalent in England to be unsatisfactory, and agreed to ask the Latin Professors of Oxford and Cambridge 'to draw up and issue a joint paper to secure uniformity in any change contemplated.' This request they repeated at their meeting of 1872. As we are ourselves agreed in all essential points, and find that there is a considerable body of opinion in the Universities and elsewhere in harmony with our views, we beg to offer the following brief suggestions.

If it were thought advisable to adopt any existing pronunciation, we should be inclined for many reasons to recommend the Italian,

with perhaps a few modifications. But not to speak of other difficulties, the tyranny of accent over quantity is at least as marked in the Italian as in the English reading of Latin; and we hold with the most experienced teachers that to distinguish between long and short syllables is an essential part of a reform in pronunciation. At the same time Italian appears to us to offer many valuable aids which should not be neglected; as English in its tones and vocalisation seems so different from old Latin, that often it is not easy to find in it even single sounds to give as adequate representations of an old Latin sound. The Italian of literature has been fixed for six centuries, and manifestly approximates to the Latin of the 7th or 8th century.

There can be little doubt that during the best ages the writing, as seen in inscriptions, was meant to represent exactly the sounding of words, and that a difference of spelling implied so far a difference of pronouncing.

We propose then that the letters of Latin should be sounded as follows:

Vowels and diphthongs:

ā, as accentuated Italian *a*: i. e. as the middle *a* of *amata*, or as the *a* of *father*:

â, as the unaccentuated Italian *a*: i. e. as the first and last of *amata*. It is not easy to represent this sound in English: we know nothing better than the first *a* in *away*, *apart*, *aha*.

ē, as the Italian closed *e*: *arena*; nearly as *ai* in English *pain*:

æ, as the Italian open *e*: *secolo*: nearly as the first *e* in English *there* or French *père*.

ē, the same sound shortened; nearly as in English *men*. A wide induction, extending from classical lines to the present, would support what is said of *e*, *æ*: thus Italians represent Latin *ae* always by their open *e*, and as a rule *ē* by closed *e*, *ē* by open *e*.

ī, as accentuated Italian *i*: i. e. as the first *i* of *timidi*, or the *i* of *machine*: *ī* as unaccentuated Italian *i*: i. e. as the two last *i*'s of *timidi*, or the *i* of *pity*. The way in which Italian *i* is represented in Greek on the one hand, and in Italian on the other, and its history in Latin itself, would tend to show that its actual sound approximated to that of *e*, and was something between the *i* of *pity* and the *e* of *petty*.

ō, as Italian closed *o*; nearly as in German *ohne*, English *more*.

ô, as Italian open *o* shortened: nearly as in German *gold*; less nearly as in English *corn*. The English and English-Latin *o* is very peculiar, in most cases hardly an *o* at all: compare our *honor*, *domos*; and our *non*, *bos*, *pons* on the one hand, with *nos*, *hos*, *domum* on the other.

Perhaps, comparing Italian, we should pronounce *ô*, when it precedes *r*, or when it represents *au*, as the Italian open *o*: *gloria*, *Victoria*, *plastrum*, *Clodius*.

ū, as accentuated Italian *u*: as the first *u* of *tumulo*, the second of *tumulto*, or as *u* in *rule*, *lure*.

û, as unaccentuated Italian *u*: as the second *u* of *tumulto*, the first of *tumulto*, the *u* of *fruition*.

au, as Italian *au*; nearly as *ow* in English *power*.

In genuine Latin words the other diphthongs are very rare, except in archaisms where *ei*, *oe*, *oi* or *ou* are common enough.

eu, as Italian *eu*, or Latin *ē* quickly followed by Latin *ū*. Of Latin words we find perhaps only *heu*, *ceus*, *seu*; and we do not feel competent to propose a different sound for it in the many Greek words adopted into Latin.

æ is also very rare in Latin words: for them, as well as for Greek words, we should prefer a sound like the German *ö*: as an alternative we propose the open Italian *e* for *æ*, as before for *æ*.

ei too as a diphthong is very rare: we would give it the Latin *ē* sound quickly followed by a Latin *ī* sound.

But in a large class of words containing *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, *ui*, the *i* is a semiconsonant, and should be sounded like English *y*: pronounce *Grains*, *maior*, *Troia*, *eius*, *Pompeius*, *Scianus*, *cuius*, as *Grā-yus*, *mā-yor*, *Trō-ya*, *ē-yus*, *Pompē-yus*, *sē-yanus*, *cū-yus*: *ecit*, *reicit*, as *ē-yicit*, *rē-yicit*. The *o* or *e* of *proin*, *prout*, *dein*, *deuide*, when not forming a distinct syllable, does not form a diphthong, but is elided, before an initial vowel: so in *neūtiqum*, *e* is elided.

In a fuller discussion more might be said of the consonants: a few remarks must suffice for the present.

c, always as *k*: in *Cicero*, *facies*, as well as *Cacus*.

g, always as *g* in *get*: in *gero*, *gingiva*, *gyrus* as well as *gaudio*.

s, at the beginning and end of words, and at the beginning of syllables, and before consonants, is always sharp, (as the *s* of *sin*) in Italian and should be so in Latin: *sol*, *stella*, *de-sero*, *ni-si*, *nos*, *sonus*.

z, between two vowels, has in Italian a soft *z* sound, as in our *rose*: we should thus sound in Latin *rosa*, *musa*, *miser*. But words of this kind in Latin are but few: much more numerous are those where *s* might also be written *ss*, a lost consonant having been assimilated and the vowel always lengthened *causa*, *casus*, *visus*, *odiosus*,