medical officers of schools in particular. The discreditable incident narrated therein should make every medical officer carefully inquire into the punishments inflicted in the school to which he is attached. In a properly organised school the system of punishments has been carefully thought out and the punishments graduated according to the gravity of the offence. Indiscriminate methods, such as boxing the ears, shaking by the shoulders, use of ruler, should be abolished. Your article does not mention the most valuable method of inflicting disciplinary punishment—namely, penal drill. This is performed under the supervision of the drill sergeant who sees that it is well and smartly taken. The advantages of this method are that it involves physical exertion and can be performed in the open air.

All disciplinary punishments of an ordinary class have to be entered in a public book, cause shown, and signature of the master inflicting the punishment inserted. In all cases penal marks are given which rank against the grant of extra half-holidays to the school and count against the individual in his petition for any privilege and appear in his terminal reports. Caning on the hands is prohibited and indeed should be made illegal. Caning elsewhere with a light cane only is permissible. It should be inflicted for a sufficient moral reason and not as a penalty for inferior work. The punishment is inflicted under the general authority of the headmasters by the masters and, in certain cases, school prefects. Right of appeal to the headmaster, if desired, is granted. Birchings are reserved for punishment where some idea of special disgrace is to be attended. Written punishment is set for deficiency of work and consists of definite set work, not "lines." All such is entered on public sheets. All written punishments have to pass inspection by the headmaster or his delegate and bear stamp as passed for decent writing and general neatness before being negotiable with the undermasters. Returned lessons must be learnt by heart. Written punishments are done in extra-school at fixed times. All written punishment is done on special paper of conspicuous pattern. The paper may not be brought into preparation or class.

By the above methods punishment is rendered effective and consequently much lessened in amount. By inter-connexion between work- and conduct-marks, which would take too long to state, but is simple and comprehensive in working, the control of discipline is greatly facilitated.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

EDWIN J. TOYE, M.D. Lond., F.R.C.S. Eng. &c.,

Medical Officer of the United Services College,
Westward Ho, Oct. 28th, 1901. Westward Ho.

A QUESTION OF SPELLING.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The consistent endeavour of THE LANCET to maintain correctness in the use of English is well known, at least to those who have contributed to its pages. I was therefore not surprised to find in my lecture published in THE LANCET of Nov. 2nd, p. 1173, that the adjective which I had written "faradic" was changed by the printer to "faradaic." I do not object. I was formerly accustomed to write the word in the latter way, which seemed more in harmony with its derivation from the name Faraday and with "Voltaic"; but a reviewer took me to task for doing so, on the ground of pedantry. Such a charge is indifferent to me, but I thought it well to ask Professor Skeat's opinion on the form. His answer is of sufficient interest to be quoted entire:—"Analogy with 'Voltaic' requires the form 'Faradayic.' The names were Volta and Faraday. I can well understand that 'Faradaic' is more convenient than 'Faradayic,' but it cannot be said to be 'correct,' as his name was not Farada. In the same way Faradic is still worse, as his name was not Farad. But language does not go by what is etymologically 'correct.' Only that is really correct or right which common consent accepts and declares to be the standard. Your question cannot be decided till one or other of the forms prevails over and kills off the other. I should think it very probable that 'Faradic' will ultimately win simply because it is the shortest. Though it cannot be contended that it is 'correct,' it can be strongly urged that it is convenient, especially when you come to 'Faradisation.' 'Faradayisation' seems too much."

Professor Skeat's remarks bring out the fact that what I said in the lecture on the vitality of words is true also of spelling. Besides "faradisation" we have "faradism."

Both "faradisation" and "faradism" are certain to disappear before the more convenient forms without the "a." Hence I felt that the analogy would assuredly determine in the long run the use of "faradic" and not "faradaic," and therefore I have since employed the former. If we can discern forms which must survive in the struggle for existence we may be saved useless effort.

In connexion with the subject of spelling it is worth while to consider whether it is desirable to attempt to preserve the "w" in "whooping-cough," which dates only from about 1500. But if the "w" continues in use in the common word "whoop" the effort may fail, since the word is in such common use.—I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Nov. 2nd, 1901.

W. R. GOWERS.

* * We are grateful to Sir William Gowers for recognising our endeavour to maintain correctness in the use of English. We admit the force of Professor Skeat's remarks and have no objection to substitute "faradic" for "faradaic," but we shall continue to refuse to sanction the use in our columns of such barbarous impossibilities as, e.g., "try and" for "try to." Unfortunately they are becoming quite common even in literary quarters where we should not expect to see them.—ED. L.

CHRISTMAS HAMPERS FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—May I once more ask the courtesy of your columns to bring before your notice the annual entertainment, &c., to poor children in the Guildhall of the City of London, and the distribution of Christmas hampers to 4000 or 5000 little cripples. It is my privilege to have received from His Majesty the King a subscription with an accompanying letter from the Keeper of the Privy Purse, in which Sir Dighton Probyn says:—

I have the pleasure to inform you that His Majesty will be very happy to continue his support to the Christmas and New Year's entertainment which you so kindly organise every year for the benefit of the ragged-school children of London.

It is, therefore, with confidence that I again appeal to you to assist me in raising the necessary funds. The balance-sheet, signed by Mr. W. H. Pannell, C.C., chartered accountant, honorary auditor, shows that last year £1434 1s. 6d. was collected, but year by year the number of crippled children registered increases, the difficulty of selecting the recipients for the hamper becomes greater, whilst the prolongation of the war makes my task still harder. I am making a special effort to mark the advent of the coronation year by extending the hamper distribution, and to that end would gratefully receive for the Children's Fund donations large or small, to be addressed to me as heretofore at 69, Ludgate-hill, London, E.C.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

W. P. TRELOAR,
Alderman.

Ludgate-hill, E.C., Oct. 31st, 1901.

THE HOME OFFICE ARBITRATION ON LEAD-POISONING.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I notice in THE LANCET of Oct. 26th a letter signed "A. Shadwell, M.D.," in which the writer says that "you are under some misapprehension" when you "speak of the manufacturers and workpeople as 'one side' and 'the other side' and imply that the Home Office is arbitrating between them, like the Board of Trade in industrial disputes," and he says that "the case is entirely different." May I ask where the difference lies? It is very evident to me that the writer has been misled by someone; the organised workers who have Lord James's permission to appear at the arbitration are certainly not on the side of the manufacturers in any sense. In eight or nine of the rules proposed we believe that they require strengthening; while Rule 6, which I believe was inserted at the request of employers, we feel we must object to so long as the Workmen's Compensation Act is not amended so as to include all cases of lead-poisoning. In reference to Rule 2, which is bound to provide a great deal of argument for and against on the part of the experts, our interests will be watched by counsel and we hope that some-

thing will be done to protect the health and lives of the lead-workers without in any way injuring the trade of the district. Dr. Shadwell would have been somewhere near the mark if he had said that the Home Office was between the two of us, the manufacturers saying that the proposed new rules are too stringent, while we (the workpeople) say that many of the rules are not stringent enough. Perhaps the best way of putting the case is to describe it as a three-cornered contest, in many portions of which the views of the operatives are directly antagonistic to the amendments of manufacturers. I am, Sirs, yours very sincerely,

N. PARKES,

General Secretary, Printers' and Transferrers' Trade Protection Society.

Burslem, Staffs, Oct. 29th, 1901.

EFFICIENT REVACCINATION.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Nothing will do so much harm to the credit of vaccination as the employment of inert or very feeble lymph. Complaints as to the quality of the lymph which ordinary practitioners are now able to get are very general, and it is not easy to see why the organisation of the Government supply of vaccine lymph should not be enlarged so to meet the demands of all practitioners, but till this is done other methods of improving the supply of trustworthy lymph may be considered. I venture to suggest two such methods. 1. The British Medical Association might employ inspectors of the commercial vaccine lymph manufactories. These inspectors should, of course, be familiar with the best methods employed in the Government laboratories here and in Germany and they should pay frequent and surprise visits to the manufactories and report at short intervals in the medical papers for the guidance of practitioners in need of lymph, grading the manufactories according to the excellence of the methods employed. 2. Reports as to the actual value of the various commercial lymphs as tested by experience might be published once a month in the medical papers, the name of the firm that supplied the lymph being given with each report. If a large number of general practitioners would take the trouble to send to THE LANCET and to the *British Medical Journal* month by month a record of all their vaccinations and revaccinations, mentioning for each case the source of the lymph used and the number of vesicles produced, the inducement to sell only active lymph would be materially increased. If Germany can efficiently revaccinate a population of 55,000,000 it ought not to be impossible to produce in England enough active lymph for our much smaller numbers.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,
E. GARRETT ANDERSON.

Upper Berkeley street, W., Nov. 2nd, 1901.

GUY'S WILL.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Reference to a copy of the first edition (1725) of Guy's will in my possession shows that the statement in the extract from the "Dictionary of National Biography" which appears in THE LANCET of Nov. 2nd, p. 1208, is slightly inaccurate; the four, six, or eight persons to be apprenticed or nursed ("or such like charitable deed") were "of the family of the Voughtons or Woods or proceeding therefrom." "Two or more such poor persons of the family of the Guys or proceeding therefrom" were to be similarly benefited. The Voughtons were Guy's cousins. The relationship to the testator of the Guys benefited under the will is not stated, but they received a smaller legacy than many of the other beneficiaries—viz., "Five Hundred Pounds a-piece." They were "Margaret Guy and Samuel Guy, the children of Samuel Guy, late of Egham in the county of Surrey."

My copy of the will contains a number of interesting manuscript notes, amongst them a statement that notices of Mr. Guy are to be found in "British Chronologist" (1789) under the year 1724, vol. ii., p. 94, and in Hughson's "London," vol. i., pp. 118, 119, and vol. iv., pp. 461, 462; also an alphabetical list in manuscript, dated Feb. 17th, 1744-5, of the "First and Present Presidents and Governors of Guy's Hospital." A marginal note, which bears evidence of having been written by a former owner of the book in 1835, states that the will is "now in prerog. office." I suppose this means the office of the Prerogative Court of

Canterbury. Is the original will now at Somerset House, or where? I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

HERBERT R. SPENCER, M.D. Lond.

Harley-street, W., Nov. 2nd.

RE SPASTIC PARAPLEGIA AND RETINITIS PIGMENTOSA: A CORRECTION.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—With reference to the account of the proceedings of the Society for the Study of Disease in Children in THE LANCET of Nov. 2nd, p. 1200, the report of my remarks is misleading and may give rise to confusion. De Amicis (of Naples),¹ in a paper on the Relationship of Spastic Paraplegia (Little's disease) with Syphilis, gives the details of a case of spastic paraplegia in a boy, aged three years, whose father and mother had undoubtedly suffered from syphilis. I did not say that in de Amicis's case there was retinitis pigmentosa. I referred to it as in favour of the syphilitic origin of the case of spastic paraplegia with retinitis pigmentosa shown for Dr. Garrod, in which the eye condition was considered to be suggestive of syphilis.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

GEORGE PERNET.

Upper Gloucester-place, N.W., Nov. 2nd, 1901.

ACUTE DILATATION OF THE STOMACH.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The letter of Dr. William Ewart in THE LANCET of Nov. 2nd, p. 1228, upon acute dilatation of the stomach has suggested another reference to the cases mentioned by me. It was not until I had left the post-mortem room, after examination of the more recent case, that I remembered having read of the theory that obstruction of the duodenum may be occasioned by pressure from the superior mesenteric artery, and the possibility of such a cause for the dilatation was, unfortunately, not definitely excluded. The duodenum was, however, less distended in the third part than in the first and second portions, and the jejunum, although not abnormally distended, was certainly not collapsed. In the other case mentioned in my letter it was also the first part of the duodenum which was most markedly distended.

The theory to which Dr. Ewart has drawn attention is interesting, but it is difficult to believe that so simple a form of obstruction can lead to a distension of the stomach which may bring the greater curvature as low as the pubes. Theories which attribute morbid conditions of the digestive tract to the influence of the nervous system are perhaps vague, but it is not easy to account for some of these conditions unless one believes that the nervous system has played some part in the causation. For example, I have seen in two instances extensive hæmorrhage into the coats of the small and large intestine extending without a break from the junction of the duodenum and the jejunum to the hepatic flexure of the colon. The fact that the transverse colon was unaffected showed that the whole of the area of the distribution of the superior mesenteric artery had not been involved in the hæmorrhage, and careful examination of the superior mesenteric artery and vein, together with their branches, revealed no trace of either embolus or thrombosis. The precisely similar distribution of the hæmorrhage in these two cases—a distribution which did not closely follow the area of supply of a blood-vessel—suggested that the nervous system had played some part in the causation of the bleeding. It also suggested that the jejunum and ileum possess an innervation which is presided over by centres which govern also the innervation of the cæcum and ascending colon. If this be true then the stomach and duodenum may also possess an innervation common to both, disturbance of which, while not primarily responsible for some morbid condition of these viscera, may occasionally determine its nature. In the two cases of acute dilatation of the stomach and duodenum mentioned by me the primary cause of the dilatation appears to have been the septicæmia which was present.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Clifton, Bristol, Nov. 2nd, 1901.

THEODORE FISHER.

¹ Archiv für Dermatologie und Syphilis, 1898, with bibliography.