

Referring to page 81, I may say that literal sympathy with persons long dead is not possible. But all language is more or less metaphorical; and in the very best company we perpetually say that "we feel with Plato," or, "we agree with Cicero," or, as before suggested, "we ask with Horace," and all this without regard to the more than eighteen centuries that have passed away since the men lived, with whom we express these various forms of mental association. I need hardly insist that nothing in the derivation of the word would preclude the use of it in reference to persons that one never saw, and at any conceivable distance of space or time. The late W. Edmundstone Aytoun, D.C.L., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh, is an admitted authority on the English Language. In the preface to his "Charles Edward at Versailles," where he is speaking of the sufferings of that unhappy Prince and his followers, after the defeat of Culloden in 1746, he says: "No feeling can arise to repress the interest and the SYMPATHY which is excited by the perusal of the tale narrating the sufferings of the Princely wanderer." This he wrote one hundred years after the event referred to. Possibly Professor Aytoun is as good an authority here as the author of the SEQUEL. In the works of the foremost writers of the present age may be found frequent instances of the use of the word "sympathy" in the same sense as that of the offending clause.

I am convicted, on page 81, of the serious charge of having used the word "more" thirteen times. In doing so, I was within my rights; and if I live long enough, I will use it thirteen times more, the author of the SEQUEL to the contrary, notwithstanding.

On page 82, I am bound to admit that I have, inadvertently, made use of a plural verb instead of a singular. I hope I will be believed by the men of Yarmouth when I say that I *am* acquainted with the rule of English Grammar that requires a verb to agree with its nominative in number.