We were asked the other day to coin a word, a new pronounal form to be used in such a case for instance as this: “Every man and woman should remain standing until his (or her) name has been called.” The idea was to devise a pronoun which would stand for both genders. The older grammarians fixed this and their rule is still observed by the best writers, using the masculine form of the personal pronoun to represent persons of both sexes, or as they said, the pronouns of the most “worthy gender.” We believe that modern text books on grammar, more gallant and chivalrous, as well as in the interest of accuracy, have dropped the expression “most worthy,” but the rule still prevails and in it is inclosed the insult to the softer sex. Ours is not much of an inductive language and we hesitate to make it more so by the introduction of a word denoting a common gender. “His or her” is an awkward combination. It has always been frowned upon and always will be. It may sometime be that we shall have a new word. We do not think the feminists will always stand for the discrimination involved in “his” when referring at the same time to both males and females.

Perhaps too there will come along soon as ingenious an individual as a young clerk of a large New York firm that used mailing lists for circularization purposes and found it difficult to decide what prefix to use before a woman’s name when there was nothing to indicate whether she was married or not.

Sarah Ann Jones might be a stead married woman, an aged and respectable spinster, or a short-skirted, bobbed-haired flapper. There was no way to decide except by the flipping of a coin, heads for “Miss” and tails for “Mrs.” The chances were just as even as that the addressing would be affected.

This bright young clerk solved the difficulty in so simple a way that it is a wonder that nobody ever thought of it before—by a compromise, the means of settling difficult and disputed points ever since the world began. He used the prefix “Ms.” equally applicable to married and single ladies. His salary was raised in consequence.

For a raise in salary we might be induced to supply a common gender pronoun; in fact, we are not sure that we would not undertake to alter the entire structure of the language.

The other day a man on trial for bigamy in a New York court pleaded drunkenness. He said he could not get drunk without getting married again.

We have often remarked it was not the first cost of drinking that was so ruinous; it was the upkeep, the money that one spent in frivolous and useless things while under the influence of liquor.

We were never a stickler for the word “obey” in the marriage service. It belongs among the exploded theories of kinergraft and slavery. There is no more reason why a woman should obey her husband than there is why servants should obey their masters, or why the king should be honored. But we would suggest in place of it, while we are remodeling the service, a pledge that the bride will not murder her husband as so many of them have been doing lately, or having it done in collusion with lovers or the hired help.

General Sherman was an authority on war. We wish he had also gone into politics so that he could have told us what he thought about it.

If people who are hard up, in need of food, clothing and shelter, could eat or wear advice or turn it in for rent, suffering in this world would be minimized.