which her brave "enthusiasm of humanity" had carried her into. "The men will not come to the women, and the women do not know nor care to bring them; and they amuse themselves as if it were sin, and not a pleasant sin!" Here is indicated, perhaps, one great secret of the dullness of rural assemblies, — the notion of impropriety in the social intercourse of the sexes, particularly the married of both sexes. Only in an unclean novel are there such loathsome uncharitablenesses of opinion in regard to the impossibility of friendly reciprocity between men and women as run riot in some of our most respectable Puritan parishes; and society cannot even begin to be, fairly, until what a beloved old clergyman used to call "horizontal fractures," that is, the dissociation of the young from the middle-aged and old, and of the one sex from the other, be recognized as at the best hazardous. The second step will "count" also, being too long and high to be easily taken by our stiff sinews; the conviction must somehow be extirpated from our souls that gravity, no matter "whence it come or where's its home," is virtue, and vice versa. One of your Club has elsewhere told the story of a budding polemic who, coming from church, met a playmate who confessed that he had failed to put in an appearance there. "But, you see, I got to reading the Life of Napoleon Bonaparte, and forgot it was church time." "The Life of Napoleon, on Sunday!" cried the horrified little saint. "Well, I — I don't care," whimpered the sinner, "it made me feel most as bad as it does to read the Bible."

— As I perceive the "aching void" in our language that a common-gender pronoun should fill, the thought comes to me, "Why not make it correct to say, If Mr. or Mrs. Smith will come out on the train, I will meet them," — meaning one of the two, parsing them as singular number, common gender?

singular because it refers to a singular antecedent; that in "Boys, study your lessons," *your* is plural because it refers to a plural antecedent. Then why not *they*, used of course with a plural verb, in the singular, common gender?

Then to our declensions of personal pronouns would be added:

Third person, common gender, singular number.

Nom. They,
Poss. Their or theirs,
Obj. Them.

It would be easy to adopt this idiom, for we are continually struggling against its use, and how delightful it would be for once to make wrong right!

—I read Avis, and gave thanks. Its feverish intensity and occasionally vicious rhetoric did not escape me, but the brave, clear intent of the book was so all-engrossing to me, as to the author, that I was utterly bewildered by the hue and cry of the critics. Dare I confess it? Even yet I am not quite convinced that this book (of which I had said in my crass ignorance, "If ever I know a young man and maiden, worth saving, to be betrothed, I will present each of them with Avis, that they may see how sacred a thing is holy matrimony; not to be by any enterprised nor taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly," as the English service has it") bristles with hatred of marriage per se, disdain of homely duties, and all the other ugly ap purtenances of a presumably "woman's rights" creation — not quite convinced, I say, that these discoveries in Miss Phelps's book are not wholly evolved from the minds of the critics.

So, in regard to Mr. Henry James's Daisy Miller, I am shocked to find that what I gratefully accepted as an exquisitely loyal service to American girlhood abroad is regarded by some critical experts as "servilely snobbish" and "brutally unpatriotic."

Nevertheless, whenever Mr. James
My argument is this: We use you in both singular and plural, and our pupils understand by the context which number is meant. A scholar parsing "Mary, study your lesson," says that your is has occasion for a monument, which, however, I devoutly hope may not be while my reading-lamp holds out to burn, I will contribute my humble share towards perpetuating the memory of this