

for assistance. I ask him if he is entirely without means of his own, and he replies, "Yes, sir; I did have a little money, but I haven't a cent now." Does not the "did" in that case serve to emphasize to me his present destitute condition, and give force to his appeal for help?

Why not, then, leave us to "do" as we choose with this little word, and to make use of it as our own judgment shall point to its fitness, in each individual case? And the same with reference to "lesser" and many other words, about the liberal use of which the ultra-conservatives quarrel with us so much?

There are some more things in this connection that I should like to say, now that I have the *STANDARD* to support me, but *under the circumstances*, as I can claim to belong only to the *lesser* forces in this controversy, and as I wish to avoid the forfeiture of what standing I do have as a contributor to the *HOMILETIC*, I will bring this screed to a close, and wait for some other opportunity to continue the discussion.

I will simply add that I rejoice to see the *STANDARD* recognize as it does the flexibility and expansiveness of the English language, and I am sure it will for this as well as for many other reasons prove a great help to us poor scribblers, the poverty of whose vocabulary places us in need of all the aid we can get in this connection, and renders welcome to us all the liberty we can secure.

JAMES WOODWORTH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

### National Pride.

I READ THE *HOMILETIC REVIEW* devoutly and profit by it exceedingly, but there are certain sermons appear in it occasionally which are a little hard upon me, a poor unfortunate Britisher. In the January number the Rev. K. B. Tupper, D.D., preaches a national sermon, the very text of which savors somewhat of self-glorification. Now I question whether it is modest, to say

the least of it, to indulge in such panegyric when there are other civilized countries actually existing in the world; for the whole tone of the sermon in question would suggest that the other nations were all in the deepest darkness, and I do not think that such fulsome flattery can be healthy as a steady diet even for the greatest nation under the sun. Let me point out in the mildest way and with no desire to rouse an international dispute, or to ead Mr. Cleveland to give the British Ambassador leave to return home, that it is scarcely fair to contrast the present *golden age* in the United States with England under Elizabeth or Bloody Mary. I grant it has rhetorical advantages, but I think it would have been somewhat more satisfactory to some of your readers, if the comparison between the countries were made from the present condition of Great Britain, under the blessed Queen Victoria, and the freest and purest and most enlightened, etc., government in the world. Why, it is only necessary, in order to show the inconsistency of the eloquent orator, to contrast the introduction of his sermon with the actual facts as to the giant evils which mark the American golden age, to which he candidly alludes in the body of his discourse. If the United States is the model nation of the world we are in a very bad way, and may look for the final conflagration very soon. Do not mistake me: I am an honest admirer of all that is good and great in American institutions, but I find it exceedingly tiresome to hear continually, "We are the people, and wisdom will die with us." May I hint very modestly that there is a young nation to the north of Denver that has some advantages which are lacking in your great country? First, a law-abiding, homogeneous people who, though of different races, have been welded into a new national type. Second, a God-fearing people who respect the Sabbath, and, in fact, the whole of the ten commandments, not even leaving out the seventh. Third, a people who