

classes got a share of the benefits provided. Never shall we have a society worthy of the name until those who have—whether in a material or an intellectual sense—are actuated by a sense of duty toward those who have not. When that day comes we shall not hear it urged, as an argument for the retention of a difficult system of spelling, that it serves as a convenient mode of distinguishing the cultured from the uncultured classes. In that day, too, culture will probably mean something more than the ability to spell. It will be a thing of ideas and of real knowledge, a thing expansive by nature, and in the best sense of the word democratic. We should strongly advise the universities of to-day to prepare for the new culture of the future, and meantime to do their best to purge themselves thoroughly of that spirit of exclusiveness so plainly manifested in that passage quoted from *TheVarsity*, and of which it probably would not be difficult to glean examples in other similar quarters.—*Popular Science Monthly*.

In an article, which we reproduce elsewhere, the *Popular Science Monthly*, takes the *Varsity* over its neck and administers a richly merited castigation. The *Varsity* is "run" by University students, and consequently by young men who are getting their education at the expense of the taxpayers of Ontario. We don't care to enter into a controversy about spelling reform, but it will take something more than a correct knowledge of the intricate rules of English orthography, learned at the expense of the taxpayers, to transform the "culchawd" little dudes of the *Varsity* into a class superior to the rest of the community. Let us hope as they grow older they will get wiser.—*Labor Reformer*.

[We have often met silly arguments but that of *TheVarsity* is so far the silliest ever met. An undergraduate dude, with gown on, but with an ass' head surmounted by a fool's cap being well slipped across the neck of Dame Science, with *Labor* looking on approvingly, "his limbs stiffed with toil," of course, would make a rich cut for a comic journal.—ED.]

GARMENT AND SUBSTANCE OF THO'T.

BY L. R. KLEMM, PH.D., HAMILTON, OHIO.

Why is it, that the eight years' course of an American Common School yields far less fruit than a course of six or seven years in a German Volksschule? Why is it that pupils in the Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus and Hamilton schools, who have daily lessons in German beside their other English studies, are no whit behind their schoolmates who aim to a common English education only? It is no enigma for any one who comprehends the peculiar difficulties the English language affords. Reading and spelling English are very difficult to learn. After the first year, there is literally no more difficulty in the mechanical part of reading for a child in Germany. But think of the enormous amount of time and energy the English and American child has to expend in trying to master the mere garment of the *tho't* of others. It finds little time and energy left for the substance of *tho't*. The German language offers no obstacles in orthography, such as are found in English. The latter is full of pitfalls. Look at any of the numerous courses of study for

primary and intermediate grades. There we find reading, spelling, writing, grammar, and composition; all these have reference to the garment and the forms of *tho't*. Then we find geography, arithmetic and a small pelet of home history; these in a measure offer substance of or material for *tho't*. When any one suggests that natural history, physics, physiology and general history be inserted in the curriculum (all of which, by the way, are taught in the intermediate grades of German schools, only to a limited extent, of course), wiseacres raise the cry of overpressure, and justly so, perhaps. Are our children and children's children forever condemned to suffer from the iniquities of English orthography? Must they lose or waste precious years in early youth in learning to wield the un-erly instrument of English spelling? Think of the time and energy which might be saved if we rote as we pronounce no more and no less.—*The Carolina Teacher*.

ENGLISH AS SHE IS SPELT

He came to the sanctuary one night,
The place where the editors wrought;
He was hungry, he said,
And he wanted some bread,
Would be glad to get even a bight.

His case was a hard one, no doubt,
So some of the boys went about,
And raised him a sum
That for some time to eun
Would keep him, and then he went out.
—*Boston Courier*.

-- *B* is etymologically wrong in *debt*, *doubt*, *subtle*, which come from the Old French *dete doute, sutil*, these being also the older English spellings. The *b* in *-mb* is etymologically useless, having often been added without reason, as in *limb*, but Old English *lim*.

<i>bomb</i>	<i>bom</i>	<i>numb</i>	<i>nun</i>
<i>crumb</i>	<i>crum</i>	<i>plumb</i>	<i>pluu</i>
<i>debt</i>	<i>det</i>	<i>plumber</i>	<i>plummer</i>
<i>debtor</i>	<i>detter</i>	<i>redoubt</i>	<i>redout</i>
<i>doubt</i>	<i>dout</i>	<i>subtle</i>	<i>sutl</i>
<i>dumb</i>	<i>dum</i>	<i>succumb</i>	<i>succum</i>
<i>lamb</i>	<i>lam</i>	<i>thumb</i>	<i>thum</i>
<i>limb</i>	<i>lim</i>		

Detter is a frequent Tudor spelling; *b* is un-historical in *crumb* (O. E. *cruma*), *limb* (O. E. *lim*), *numb*, *plumb* (O. French *plum*, compare *plummet*), *thumb* (O. E. *thuma*).—*Transactions of Philologic Society*.

— Nothing is more common in filology than to see men, who have not taken the slightest trouble to make themselves acquainted with the rudiments of vocal physiology, making the boldest and most dogmatic statements about the pronunciation of dead languages—asserting, for instance, that certain sounds are unnatural, or even impossible, merely because they do not happen to occur in their own language. Such prejudices can only be got rid of by a wide and impartial training.—*Sweet*.

— *Sirup* and *Syrup* are both now current. Of the two, Webster prefers *Sirup*.