where the parts of words differ only in the order of the letters. For before a clear image of the word is given another word is presented and its similar appearance is confused with the first. Consequently a blurred image results. Remember a visual image is like a photograph. If a number of similar objects be presented in quick succession before an exposed photographic plate, the result is an outline image with confused details. Now for good spelling, a distinct, clear and complete image is required, not an outline with confused details.

In the *purpos* group the visual image is defective. In the *spetacle* group the visual image is also defective, but there seems to be no auditory image. In the *harast* group, however, there seems to be no visual image.

To secure good results is it better to rely entirely on the eye?

It is a well established fact that people differ very greatly in their power of imaging. Some are good visualizers but poor audiles others are good audiles but poor visualizers. From crude enquiries made in large classes of students, I have come to the conclusion that about six or seven out of every twelve acquire more easily and retain more perfectly and longer visual images, and that one out of twelve acquires auditory images more easily. (For full information see Galton's "Human Faculty," pp. 83-114, or James' "Larger Psychology," Vol. II, pp. 50-68, or James' "Briefer Psychology," pp. 302-310.)

Now the teacher wishes to leave that image of the word which is most easily got, most complete and longest retained. If then some have the greatest difficulty in acquiring and retaining visual images, but much less (if any) difficulty with auditory images, is it not better to teach spelling to such through the ear?

My suggestion, however, is that the ear and eye assist each other, the eye in the majority of cases being principally relied on. Let us see how.

In the *harast* group probably the eye has never been trained. Certainly there was no visual image of *cisim.* Here it is not enough to write the letters which represent the sounds, until "fonetics" (spell it not phonotics) be the rule. The ear alone cannot be trusted. In the *spetacle* group the ear might readily check the eye. In olden times it was trained by syllabic spelling. Thus b-u-t, but b-u t-t-e r, butter, when spelt aloud and pronounced fixed the form of the word by sound as well as by sight. How could the ear assist the eye in the *period* and *purpos* groups? There are two ways in which the ear may check the eye. (1) By requiring a visual equivalent for each sound, *e.g.*, the *e* in *spetacle.* (2) By the retaining the image of the succession of sounds. Thus the ear could remember the order of the succession of the sounds of the letters p-e-r-i-o-d or b-r-e-a-k-f-a-s-t, in the same way that it remembers the order of the consecutive notes in a melody. In fact the order of a series of letters stands out more distinctly for the ear than for the eye, for the simple reason that the eye passes backwards and forwards in any order and the ear hears them, when spelt correctly, in one order—from left to right.

I never had much difficulty in spelling "similar," "familiar," until one of the teachers, in an attempt to help us, called our attention to resemblances and differences between the final syllable of "similar," and the last part of "familiar." I was never sure after that which had an *i* until I sounded it as *y*. The difficulty here arises from a comparison which confuses the visual images, and it vanishes only when I check the eye by the ear.