

Professor Conklin, of the University of Pennsylvania, has an article in the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* (September 16, 1899), entitled "Phenomena and Mechanism of Inheritance," that touches upon this question in no uncertain manner. It is splendidly concise, and seems splendidly consistent. The last few lines are in the nature of a climax: "The inheritance of acquired characteristics is inconceivable, because the egg is a cell and not an adult organism; and in this case there is no sufficient evidence that the thing which is inconceivable really does happen."

As to the transmission of irregularity, the following little argument would also seem to have some force: "The temporary teeth are rarely found other than in their normal relation. On the best authority it seems that there is no difference in the process of formation in the two sets, and also that the permanent teeth are developed from an extension into the depth from the original connection between the enamel organ (temporary set) and the epithelium of the surface of the gum." If, as it appears, both sets come from the same source, how can one set be normal and the next abnormal unless it be brought about by external means?

But to return to the article in question. In the next paragraph the word *extract* is surprisingly frequent. Why *extract* at all except from dental cause? If the lateral incisors are erupting in lingual occlusion (inferior maxilla), why not with a piece of "G" wire inserted between the temporary cuspids, and pinched every few days, gently widen the arch with no inconvenience to the little patient? If extraction, however, is resorted to, all right; but with band and spur *preserve the space*.

On page 885 is the first of a series of engravings showing the progress and eventual completion of a case. The lower arch, I take it, the author deems a scant factor, for there is no consideration given it whatever in its relation to the upper; no disclosure as to the treatment accorded (for there certainly was a bunching and overlapping), nor is there a single engraving of it in the series. We are therefore deprived of any reliable means of diagnosis; but it has the appearance of coming under Class 1 (Angle), in which the relative position of the jaws mesio-distally is normal; the first molars also being in normal occlusion.

Fig. 4 shows that the upper right first bicuspid has been sacrificed, but he does not account for such action in any way. If the facial lines indicated such a move it was of course justifiable but there is no mention of facial lines except where he says the little girl has a "decidedly hatchet-faced appearance," and that certainly argues against the advisability of it. On the con-