The second article, taken from The Truth, simply details some of the difficulties experienced by a considerable number of scholars in essaying to express themselves grammatically, in spite of the absence of any particular grammatical system as it is referred to in the English tongue. It is pointed out, however, in a rather technical vein, as though the writer were either of the school that the test of meaning is the unconfessed needed wood was a hopeless one, or because he was about to place himself on record as seriously proposing its adoption.

The writer of the present article several years ago addressed two communications upon the subject to an educational journal, in which, after referring to the grammatical errors so constantly occurring by reason of the lack of a pronoun of common gender, made mention of the fact that the late Josias Harper, of Yale, Chester, a raw botanist, mathematician and Latin scholar, had frequently touched upon this subject, and had suggested, as an article form, "he", "she", "it"—nearly the same, therefore, as the form now proposed by Professor Dacier.

Some months ago this matter of the desirability of a common gender pronoun was the subject of a discussion by some of the women of the Christian Temperance Union, and, being referred to a committee, they reported in favor of the word then, identified for the three cases. I am not aware that the recommendation has been acted upon.

It has been said by some that there need be no difficulty in the matter, as the plural pronoun can, in most cases, be brought into service so as to insure grammatical correctness, or, more frequent use can be made of "whom" and "such an one." But there may be good reason for objecting to either of these alternatives. Let us suppose a newly-engaged, illiterate doctor leaving word with the dominatrix: "If any call while I am away, tell her that I will soon be back." There might be some doubt as to whether or not an assumption in that sentence, he would refer to a specific person, or some one. The form "whom" would not be likely to express the thought. The form "such an one" is by no means likely to express the thought.

Part of a sentence in the Theobaldus relative to the Emperor William's obsequies, in yesterday's Ledger, reads: "Each arrival at once letting him off or herself in the ranks of those who pass through the Cathedral." This could have been stated according to the suggested Dacier form—"looking into the ranks." But "there's no use in talking about it," master-of-ject people will say, "it can't be done; too late in the day for any such philologistic importation or experiment." These objections may be disregarded. As the use of the English language is increasing rapidly in all parts of the globe to which Anglo-American commerce extends; and the claim is made by many that its is destined to become the universal language, and, further, that as there are other languages which possess the common gender pronoun which we, nevertheless, use, there is no good reason why we should not possess the same convenience. So, while our foreign friends seem not to mind the great progress in their chosen field, we know, at any rate, that they have definitely simplified the spelling of at least one word "programme" by dropping off the redundant "nne." There is now an opportunity to fill the void and permanently "enrich" the language by adopting into it that little word of a good deal of possible usefulness, the heretofore suggested "ze" or "si," together with what else properly belongs with it. Jostus W. Lentz.