



EX LIBRIS



FRASER



La Trobe University



THE BORCHARDT LIBRARY

Presented by

PROFESSOR STEWART FRASER

A

PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL

GRAMMAR

OF THE

English Language.

BY NOAH WEBSTER, ESQ.

“Antisthenes being asked, what learning was most necessary for man’s life, replied, “To unlearn that which is naught.”

Bacon’s Aphorisms.

“Authority keeps in ignorance and error more people than all other causes.—No opinion is too absurd to be received on this ground.”

Locke.

NEW-HAVEN:

Printed by Oliver Steele & Co.

FOR BRISBAN & BRANNAN, BOOKSELLERS, NEW-YORK.

1807.

425

W 382 P

SPEC COPIES

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, *to wit* :

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the twelfth day of March, in the thirty-first year of the Independence of the United States of America, NOAH WEBSTER, Esq. of the said District, hath deposited in this office the title of a Book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words following, to wit :

“ A Philosophical and Practical Grammar of the English Language. By NOAH WEBSTER, Esq.”

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, intituled “ An act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts and Books to the authors and proprietors of them, during the times therein mentioned.”

H. W. EDWARDS,

Clerk of the District of Connecticut.

March 12, 1807.

P R E F A C E.

WHAT, another Grammar of the English Language! says the man of letters, upon the publication of this work. Have we not Grammars enough already? No, it may be answered; for if the theory of the particles unfolded in Horne Tooke's "Diversions of Purley," is well founded, we have not hitherto had *any* correct Grammar of our language. A Grammar, to deserve the title, must contain a true explanation of the several species of words, a correct classification of them, and a developement of the real principles of combination in the structure of sentences. If such a work has hitherto appeared, it has not come to my knowledge. Indeed, without understanding the etymologies of the indeclinable parts of speech, those eminent scholars, Harris, Lowth and Johnson, could no more construct an English Grammar upon the true principles of the language, than Lord Bacon or Sir Isaac Newton could compose a system of chemistry, upon the principles of Lavoisier.

The "Diversions of Purley" first caught my attention in the year 1787. Not willing to rest my belief on the authorities cited by Mr. Tooke, I entered upon an investigation of his principles, for the purpose of obtaining full evidence of their

correctness; and my inquiries, while they have detected some errors in his work, have resulted in full persuasion of mind, or rather in absolute certainty, that his general theory is well founded. It is now an ascertained and a received fact, that the indeclinable words, in our language, (and probably in all others) are derived from declinable words, and were primitively significant, as verbs, nouns, adjectives or participles. Many of them may yet be traced to their roots, and their significations ascertained; and their present meanings, faithful to the original ideas, expressed by their radicals, cannot be defined, without resorting to the sense of the primitive words.

I have long expected that some English scholar would attempt to reduce these discoveries to practical use, by framing a system of rules to illustrate the construction of sentences, upon the genuine principles of the language. Being hitherto disappointed, and seeing nothing issue from the press but new compilations of old rules, and fresh editions of the same errors; I have at length undertaken to construct a Grammar, upon what my own researches into the ancient English, or Saxon language, with various and extensive reading in modern books, have proved, to my full satisfaction, to be its only legitimate principles, and established usages.*

* Since the days of Wallis, who published a Grammar of the English Language, in Latin, in the reign of Charles II. from which Johnson and Lowth borrowed most of their rules, little improvement has been made in English Grammar. Lowth supplied some valuable criticisms, most of which however respect obsolete phrases; but many of his criticisms are extremely erroneous, and they have had an

In examining this subject with attention, I soon found it difficult, or rather impracticable, to exhibit the true state of the language, without altering some of the usual names, and the present distribution of the parts of speech. These names and this distribution have the sanction of antiquity; some of the classes of words still bearing the names assigned to them in the days of Aristotle; and I am no stranger to the power of custom. But in the sciences prescription cannot legalize error; and I fully accord with the sentiment in my motto, that the most necessary learning is, "to unlearn that which is naught." From a minute and careful survey of this subject in all its bearings, I am firmly persuaded that, with the present classification of English words, under the usual names, the true construction of sentences, with the force and effect of the words composing them, cannot be explained, so as to be clearly understood by a student. That the language has not hitherto been understood, so as to be grammatically explained, will probably appear evident to the readers of this work. Even the origin and uses of the two little words, *an* and *the*, have escaped the inquisitive researches of Grammarians;

ill effect, in perverting the true idioms of our language. Priestley furnished a number of new and useful observations on the peculiar phrases of the English Language. To which may be added some good remarks of Blair and Campbell, interspersed with many errors. Murray, not having mounted to the original sources of information, and professing only to select and arrange the rules and criticisms of preceding writers, has furnished little or nothing new. Of the numerous compilations of inferior character, it may be affirmed, that they have added nothing to the stock of grammatical knowledge.

so that, at the very threshold of our rudiments, we stumble upon most palpable error.

The term *article*, which signifies a *joint*, is unmeaning and inapplicable to the words in question.

An or *a* and *the* are not a distinct part of speech in our language. *An* is simply the old English or Saxon orthography of *one*; as the latter, is an awkward spelling of the French *une*, from the Latin *unus*; and *the* is the same word, or at least has the sense of the Saxon pronoun *tha*, *that*, *the*, *them*, *thy*. These words belong to the same class.*

The term *substantive*, is not sufficiently distinctive, nor intelligible; and *noun*, being merely technical, is not readily understood by learners. Nothing facilitates the study of the sciences more effectually than the use of plain intelligible terms; and whenever such can be found, they are always to be preferred, that the difficulty of using new and unknown terms, may not be added to that of learning new principles. *Name*, for things which exist, being a literal translation of the Greek *onoma*, and the Latin *nomen*, and a word which every child understands, is the term which obviously suggests itself as most proper to designate that numerous and important class of words.

Pronoun, that is, *in the place of a noun*, is a more exceptionable term; for most of the words called by this name, are often used in the place of

* *An*, the Latin *unus*, the Greek *en*, the Celtic *aon*, *uynun* or *yunan*, are derived by Whiter from the element *an* or *en*, denoting *being*; the root of the Hebrew *ani*, *I*, the Latin *ens*, *being*, and of the participial terminations in *amans*, *timens*—P. 475.

sentences and *adjectives*, as well as of nouns. The term does not comprehend the words arranged under it. I have therefore used, in lieu of it, *substitute*, a term which describes the use of the words of this class, and comprehends the whole number, whether the particular words stand for nouns, adjectives or sentences.

The term *adjective* denotes something *added* or *to be added*; a term equally applicable to the adverb, or even to other parts of speech.—The name is not sufficiently significant and descriptive; and being merely technical, I have substituted in the place of it, *attribute*, a term which describes intelligibly the nature and uses of this class of words.

The *verb*, or word by way of eminence, is not sufficiently descriptive of the important class of words which it is intended to include. But I know of word in the language which is adequate to this purpose. *Affirmation* is a correct term for verbs in the indicative mode; but is not sufficiently comprehensive. I have therefore retained the present name.

To the term *adverb*, there is the same objection as to *pronoun* and *adjective*. *Adverb* is significant of position only, and not of the nature and use of the words it comprehends. Nor does it include the same words in every situation; for the words so called as often qualify adjectives as verbs; as *extremely* cold.

I have therefore given to this class of words the appellation of *modifiers*, a word well formed like *magnifier*, and happily expressive of their use, which is to *modify* the sense of verbs and

attributes. No word perhaps in any language could be equally well adapted to its use.

Preposition is also a word significant of *position* only ; but I know of no single term in the language which will describe its uses ; and as new words ought not to be introduced without a peculiar fitness for their purpose, the old name is retained. These words however, where they follow verbs as their essential adjuncts, as in the following examples, to *go up*, *come to*, *break out*, are classed with the modifiers ; as they modify the verb, and give it a new sense.

To the term *conjunction*, there is this single objection ; it denotes *a joining* instead of what it is meant to signify, which is, *a joiner*. I have adopted the term *connective*, which has been used by many writers, and is more appropriate.

If men cavil at this nomenclature of Grammar, there is an answer at hand, which an attentive inquirer will find to be true, that with the present names and distribution of the several classes of words, there is no possibility of resolving many well formed sentences which are found in every English book.

In the confusion which has proceeded from an ignorance of the real origin of the English particles, and the construction of sentences, words have been called by wrong names, and arranged in classes to which they have no relation. The substitutes, *as* and *that*, have been called *conjunctions*, altho they have no more connecting power, than *who* or *which*. They are not conjunctions in any legitimate English sentence ; and

by classing them with conjunctions, verbs often occur, which are left without a nominative.

In the same confusion, some verbs and participles have been ranked with adverbs, conjunctions and prepositions; and the object after a verb has been supposed to be governed by a preposition. Adjectives, when used to qualify the action of verbs, have been denominated *adverbs*; and the connection of verbs and attributes with sentences and clauses of sentences, one of the most general and essential idioms of the language, has been almost totally overlooked. In the conjugation of verbs also, there is some error, and much imperfection; the definite tenses, as useful and important to be understood, as the others, having been neglected, or very partially displayed.

In short, the science of Grammar is nearly in the condition in which chemistry stood, about thirty years ago. The terms employed, like the *spiritus sylvestris*, the salt of Sylvius, the sugar of Saturn, the putty of tin, and the *luna cornea* of the old chemists, serve only to show the obscurity of men's ideas on the subject, and to bewilder the student. For the honor of our native tongue, the key to every science, it is presumed this subject will hereafter receive more attention; that a language, distinguished for its strength and copiousness, and in which all the arts and sciences are cultivated and illustrated with success, will no longer lie buried in the rubbish of unmeaning terms.

If it should be objected that a change of the names of the parts of speech, will create a difficulty in the learning of other languages, let it be

observed that some differences exist between different languages, which cannot be obviated; and it is not expedient to *force* an agreement between things, which nature or art has made dissimilar. The better way is, to explain every language just as it is, and frame a grammar of each language upon its own idioms.

But it would be easy to prove that many of the alterations here made, a. e. as applicable to other languages as to the English. For instance, the Latin neuter pronoun, *id*, is translated *it*, and referred to a *thing*, as its noun or antecedent; when in fact, it is the substitute for a sentence or series of narration preceding, like the English *it* and *that*, as explained in this work.—And what idea does a youth obtain by referring *id* to a thing, to any thing, he knows not what? A young learner may repeat, for years, rules of which he has not any clear ideas, and even apply them in most cases, without knowing the principles on which they are founded.

For the outline of the system here offered to the public, I am indebted to the “Diversions of Purley.” The author of that work has pointed out the way to the temple of knowledge on this subject, unlocked the gate and presented a general view of the structure.* I have penetrated into the building, surveyed the interior apartments, and attempted a delineation of their several forms, with their dependencies, and the symmetry of the whole edifice.

* “Mr. Horne Tooke has unfolded, by a single flash of light, the whole theory of language, which had so long lain buried beneath the learned lumber of the schools.”

A PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL

GRAMMAR.



Of Language.

LANGUAGE, in its most extensive sense, is the instrument or means of communicating ideas and affections of the mind and body, from one animal to another. In this sense, brutes possess the powers of language; for by various inarticulate sounds, they make known their wants, desires, and sufferings. Thus the neighing of the horse, the lowing of the ox, the cackling and chirping of birds, constitute the language of those animals; and each respective species understand instinctively their own peculiar language. The signs made by deaf and dumb people form also a kind of imperfect language; and even the looks when made to express ideas or affections, speak an intelligible language.

As brutes have few affections or ideas, and little necessity for communicating them, their language consists in a few *inarticulate* sounds; that is, sounds uttered without much aid from the tongue or other organs of modulation, and of course, with little variation. But man, being a rational animal, capable of acquiring, and of learning to communicate, numberless ideas, is furnished with suitable organs for uttering an indefinite variety of sounds to express his ideas; and the modulations of his voice, in the distinct utterance of sounds, constitute what are denominated *articulate* sounds.

Division of Language.

LANGUAGE is of two kinds, *spoken* and *written*. The elements of spoken language are articulate sounds uttered by the voice, which is formed by the air issuing through the glottis, a small aperture in the wind pipe, and modulated by the action of the throat, tongue, palate, teeth, lips, and nostrils. This is the original and proper sense of the word, *language*.

But as sounds are fleeting, and not capable of being communicated to a great distance, if men had no other means of communicating their thoughts, their intercourse would be limited to a small compass, and their ideas would be entrusted to memory and tradition only; by which they would soon be obscured, perverted, or forgotten. Hence the invention of characters to represent sounds, exhibit them to the eye, and render them durable. This was the origin of *written* language. The elements of this language are letters or characters, which, by consent of men, and common usage, are combined into words, and made to represent the articulate sounds uttered by the voice. These characters being easily inscribed or engraved upon durable substances, as paper, parchment, wood and stone, render language permanent, and capable of being transmitted from age to age, and of being communicated over the habitable globe. Of this art, it is not easy to decide which deserves to be most admired, the difficulty, the ingenuity, or the usefulness of the invention.

Of Grammar.

GRAMMAR, as a science, treats of the natural connection between ideas, and words which are the signs of ideas, and develops the principles which are common to all languages. These principles are not arbitrary, nor subject to change, but fixed and permanent; being founded on facts and distinctions established by nature. Thus the distinction between the sexes; between things and their qualities; between the names of substances and of their actions or

motions; between unity and plurality; between the present, past and future time, and some other distinctions are founded in nature, and give rise to different species of words, and to various inflections in all languages.

The grammar of a particular language is a system of *general principles* derived from natural distinctions of words, and of *particular rules* deduced from the customary forms of speech in the nation using that language. These usages are mostly arbitrary, or of accidental origin; but when they become common to a nation, they are to be considered as established, and received as rules of the highest authority.

A *rule* therefore is an established form of construction in a particular class of words. Thus the usual addition of *s* or *es*, to a noun, to denote plurality, being a general practice, constitutes a *rule*.

An *exception* to a rule, is, the deviation of certain words from the common construction. Thus, *man*, if regularly formed in the plural, would be *mans*; but custom having established the use of *men* as its plural, the word is an *exception* to the general rule.

Grammar is commonly divided into four parts—orthography, etymology, syntax and prosody.

Orthography treats of the letters, their powers and combinations in syllables; or, it teaches the true manner of writing words, called spelling.

Etymology treats of the derivation of words from their radicals or primitives, and of their various inflections and modifications to express person, number, case, sex, time and mode.

Syntax explains the true *mode* of constructing sentences.

Prosody treats of the quantity or accent of syllables and the laws of versification.

NOTE.....In this compilation, the only subjects treated, are, a part of etymology, and syntax and prosody.

Etymology.

CLASSIFICATION OF WORDS.

WORDS are naturally divided into two CLASSES, PRIMARY and SECONDARY.

The *first class* consists of words which are essential to the language of men; on which other words depend, or to which they are added as auxiliaries. In this class are included the *Noun* or *Name*, and the *verb*. These two species of words are so necessary to a communication of ideas, that no complete sentence or proposition can be formed without the use of both, unless when a substitute is used for a name. Thus, the *sun shines*, is a complete sentence, containing a name and a verb; but remove either of them, and the proposition is destroyed. From the importance of these words, as well as from their being, in all languages, primitive radicals, from which, many or most other words are formed, they are here denominated *Primary*, or the PRIMARY PARTS OF SPEECH.

The *second class* consists of words of secondary or subordinate use, or of such as are dependent on other words in construction. Of these there are several species.

1st. Words which supply the place of other words and of sentences, which are here called *substitutes*.

2d. Words which express the qualities of things, and which therefore are attached to the names of those things. These are here called *attributes* or *attributives*. These are *primary* words in point of importance; but being necessarily dependent on other words in construction, they are here ranked with the *secondary*.

3d. Words which modify the sense of other words by expressing the manner of action, or degree of quality. These are here called *Modifiers*.

4th. Words which are *placed before* other words, and show the relation between them and those which precede. These are called *Prepositions*.

5th. Words which join together the parts of a sentence

or of discourse, in a regular construction. These are called *connectives* or conjunctions.

These five species of subordinate or dependent words are denominated *secondary*.

There are therefore *two classes* of words containing *seven species* or *parts of speech*. The first class contains two species.

I. *Names* or *nouns* which are the signs of our ideas of whatever we conceive to exist, material and immaterial

II. *Verbs* which express affirmation, action or being.

The *second class* contains five species.

III. *Substitutes*, words which are used in the place of other words or of sentences. [pronouns.]

IV. *Attributes*, which express the qualities of things, and qualify the action of verbs, or the sense of other attributes and modifiers. [adjectives.]

V. *Modifiers*, which qualify the action of verbs, and the sense of attributes. [adverbs.]

VI. *Prepositions*, which show the relation between words, and also the condition of things.

VII. *Connectives*, which unite sentences in construction. [conjunctions.]

NOTE.....Participles are, by some grammarians, considered as a distinct part of speech; and they certainly have some claims to be so considered, but I have chose to follow the common arrangement, which is attended with no inconvenience.

Names or Nouns.

A NAME is a word which expresses the idea of that which exists, material or immaterial.—Of material substances, as man, horse, tree, table—of immaterial things, as faith, hope, love. These and similar words are, by customary use, made the *names* of things which exist, or the symbols of ideas, which they express without the help of any other word.

Division of Names.

NAMES are of two kinds; *common*, or those which represent the idea of a whole kind or species; and *proper* or *appropriate*, which denote individuals. Thus *animal* is a name common to all beings, having organized bodies and endowed with life, digestion, and spontaneous motion. *Plant* and *vegetable* are names of all beings which have organized bodies and life, *without* the power of spontaneous motion. *Bird* and *fowl* are the common names of all feathered animals which fly—*fishes*, of animals which live wholly in water.

On the other hand, Thomas, John, William, are *proper* or *appropriate* names, each denoting an individual of which there is no species or kind. London, Paris, Amsterdam, Rhine, Po, Danube, Massachusetts, Hudson, Patomac, are also proper names, being appropriate to individual things.

Proper names however become common when they comprehend two or more individuals; as, the Capets, the Smiths, the Fletchers....“*Two Roberts* there the pagan force defy'd.” *Hoolc's Tasso*, b. 20.

Limitation of Names.

PROPER names are sufficiently definite without the aid of another word to limit their meaning, as Boston, Baltimore, Savanna. Yet when certain individuals have a common character, or predominant qualities which create a similitude between them, this common character becomes in the mind *a species*, and the proper name of an individual possessing this character, admits of the definitives and of plural number, like a common name. Thus a conspirator is called *a Cataline*; and numbers of them, *Catalines*, or *the Catalines* of their country. A distinguished general is called *a Cesar*—an eminent orator *the Cicero* of his age.

But names, which are common to a whole kind or species, require often to be limited to an individual or a certain number of individuals of the kind or species. For this purpose the English language is furnished with a number of

words, as *an*, or *a*, *the*, *this*, *that*, *these*, *those*, and a few others, which define the extent of the signification of common names, or point to the particular things mentioned. These are all *attributes*, having a dependence on some noun expressed or implied; but some of them are used also as substitutes. Of these, *an* or *a* and *the* are never employed as substitutes, but are constantly attached to some name, or an equivalent word; and from their peculiar use, have obtained the distinctive appellation of *articles*. But *definitive* is a more significant and appropriate term; as they are *definitive attributes*, and have, grammatically considered, the like use, as, *this*, *that*, *some*, *none*, *any*.

An is simply the Saxon *ane*, or *an*, one. It was formerly written *an* before a consonant;* but for the ease and rapidity of utterance, it is written and pronounced *a* before a consonant, and before a vowel, which includes the sound of a consonant; as, a pen, a union. It retains its primitive orthography *an*, before a vowel, and a silent consonant; as, an eagle, an hour.

The is used before vowels and consonants; but in poetry, *e*, for the sake of measure, may be omitted, and *th* made to coalesce with a succeeding vowel as "th' embroidered vest." Sometimes we find an elision of *e* before *h*, as

"Far in th' horizon to the north appeared." *Milton.*

"Sits on th' horizon round a settled gloom." *Thompson.*

But this elision usually renders the line harsh; and before the word *horizon*, with a false unnatural accent, creates a disagreeable hiatus.

RULE I.

A noun or name, without a preceding definitive, is used either in an unlimited sense, extending to the whole species, or in an indefinite sense, denoting a number or quantity, but not the whole.—

"The proper study of mankind is *man*." *Pope.*

Here *man* comprehends the whole species.

"In the first place, *woman* has, in general, much strong-

* "And thas eares wærun of gsligene IX eorlas and *an* cyning." And this year were slain nine earls and *one* king.—*Saxon Chron.* p. 82.

er propensity than *man* to the perfect discharge of parental duties." *Life of Cowper.*

Here *woman* and *man* comprehends each the whole species of its sex.

"From whom also I received *letters* unto the brethren."
—*Acts 22.*

"The men were overwhelmed by the waves, and absorbed by the eddies. *Horses, baggage* and *dead bodies*, were seen floating together."

In these passages, letters, horses, and dead bodies, without a definitive, denote *some*, an *indefinite number*, but not *all*. So in the following sentence :

A house is consumed by *fire*—*fire* is extinguished by *water*.

NOTE....The rule laid down by Lowth, and transcribed implicitly by his followers, is general. "A substantive without any article to limit it, is taken in its *widest sense*; thus *man* means *all mankind*." The examples already given prove the inaccuracy of the rule. But let it be tried by other examples.

"There are *fishes* that have wings, and are not strangers to the airy regions."—LOCKE, b. 3. ch. 6. 12. If the rule is just, that *fishes* is to be "taken in its widest sense," then *all fishes* have wings!

"When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with *armies*"—What! *all armies*? "There shall be *signs* in the sun"—What! *all signs*? "*Nation* shall rise against *nation*"—What! every nation? How the rule vanishes before the test!

RULE II.

The definitive *an* or *a*, being merely *one*, in its *English* orthography, and precisely synonymous with it, limits a common name to an individual of the species—Its sole use is to express *unity*, and with respect to number, is the most definite word imaginable—as *an ounce*, *a church*, *a ship*, that is, *one ship*, *one church*. It is used before a name which is indefinite, or applicable to any one of a species; as

....."He bore him in the thickest troop,

As doth *a lion* in *a herd* of neat." *Shakspeare.*

Here *a* limits the sense of the word *lion*, and that of *herd* to *one*—but does not specify the particular one—"As *any lion* does or would do in *any herd*."

This definitive is used also before names which are definite and as specific as possible: as, "Solomon built a temple." "The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden." London is a great commercial city. A decisive battle was fought at Marengo. The English obtained a signal naval victory at the mouth of the Nile.*

NOTE.

* *A* respects the primary perception and denotes individuals as *unknown*—*the* respects our secondary perceptions and denotes individuals as *known*. *A* leaves the individual unascertained, whereas the article *the* ascertains the individual also.

Harris Hermes, 215. 217.

"*A* has an indefinite signification and means *one*, with some reference to more."

Johnson Dict. Grammar.

"*A* is used in a vague sense to point out one single thing of the kind, in other respects *indeterminate*"—"a determines it to be one single thing of the kind, leaving it still *uncertain which*."

Lowth's Introduction.

"*A* is styled the indefinite article; it is used in a vague sense to point out one single thing of the kind, in other respects *indeterminate*."

Murray. Gram. p. 29.

So great scholars write, and so their disciples copy! But let us try this rule. Harris wrote, or rather compiled from Greek Grammarians, "*A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Universal Grammar*"—Johnson compiled "*A Dictionary of the English Language*"—Lowth wrote "*A short Introduction to English Grammar*"—Now I request some of the gentlemen, who teach the rules of these Grammars, to inform the world whether *a*, in the titles recited, denotes *one* thing of the kind, in other respects, *indeterminate*. This request I presume to be a reasonable one, as it certainly is a *determinate* one.

Suppose *a* man to have received *a* severe wound, *a* fracture of the leg, or of the skull; however *indeterminate* the man may be, his grammars will hardly convince him that *a* broken head or leg is *a* very *indeterminate* thing.

Chares erected *a* huge Colossus at Rhodes—Romulus built *a* City in Italy and called it *Rome*—Great-Britain has *a* navy superior to any on the ocean—Love to God is *an* indispensable duty—Virgil composed *an* epic poem—The Earl of Chatham was *an* eminent statesman—Oxygene is *a* substance which forms acids—the carbonic acid is *a* combination of oxygene and carbon—the air is *an* invisible, elastic fluid—Lisbon was destroyed by *an* earthquake in 1755—that is, according to our grammars, *any earthquake, uncertain which*.

The history of this word is briefly this. *An* and *one* are the same word—*an*, the Saxon or English orthography, and *one* a corruption

NOTE.....When the sense of words is sufficiently certain, by the construction, the definitive may be omitted, as "*Duty to your majesty, and regard for the preservation of ourselves and our posterity, require us to entreat your royal attention.*"

It is also omitted before names whose signification is general, and requires no limitation—as "*wisdom is justified of her children*"—"*anger resteth in the bosom of fools.*"

of the French *un* or *une*. The Greek *en*, the Latin *unus*, that is, *un* with the usual ending of adjectives, and the Saxon *an* or *ane*, are mere dialectical differences of orthography, as are the German *ein*, and the Dutch *een*. Before the conquest, *an* was used in computation or numbering—*an, twa, three—one, two, three, &c.*; and the *n* was used before consonants, as well as before vowels—"Ac him sæd hyra *an*"—But to him said one of them.—*Alfred Orosius, lib. 6. 30.* "*An cyning*"—one king.—*Sax. Chron. p. 82.* This word was also varied to express case and gender, like the Latin *unus*. "*And thæs ymb anne monath*"—And within this one month.—*Sax. Chron. 82.* "*The on tham anum scipe wæron*"—Who were in that one ship.—*ibm. 98.* *An* therefore is the original English adjective or ordinal number *one*; and was never written *a* until after the conquest.

The conquest, with other innovations, introduced into books the French *un, une*, from the Latin *unus*; the French being the only court language for three or four centuries. But the English *an* was retained in popular usage; and both words, or rather both orthographies, maintained their ground—but the meaning of both is precisely the same. The only differences between the words are these—*an* is no longer used in arithmetic or as an ordinal number—tho its only signification is *unity*—nor can we use *an* as a substitute, without a noun, as we do, *one*—John is *one* of them. But altho *an* cannot, in these applications, be used for *one*, the latter can always be used for *an*.

Hence we see that *an* or *a* is a mere adjective; or as I should call it, an attribute expressing *unity*, and, grammatically considered, it has no character which is not common to every ordinal number in the language. It has not the smallest effect in marking the indeterminateness of names. So far is this word from affecting the noun, in regard to its definitness, that its own character of definitness or indefinitness, depends, like that of other attributes, upon the name to which it is prefixed. "*Bring me an apple,*" is indefinite—any apple; "*Solomon built a temple*"—is definite, as he built but *one*, and that is known or determinate. "*Bring me two oranges,*" is indefinite; "*Christ was crucified between two thieves,*" is definite—and so of every number in the language.

Hence also we observe the mistake in all English grammars, that *a* becomes *an* before a vowel. The fact is the reverse; *an* becomes *a* before a consonant—*an* being the original word.

In the German, Dutch and French, this word is called an article also, but the article and the ordinal number are not distinguished in

The definitive *a* is used before plural names, preceded by *few* or *many*—as *a few days, a great many persons*.* It is also used before any collective word, as, *a dozen, a hundred*, even when such words are attached to plural nouns; as, *a hundred years*.

It is remarkable that *a* never precedes *many* without the intervention of *great* between them—but follows *many*, standing between this word and a name—and what is equally singular, *many*, the very essence of which is to mark plurality, will, with *a* intervening, agree with a name in the singular number; as

“Full *many a gem* of purest ray serene.” Gray.

“Where *many a rose* bud rears its blushing head.” Beattie.

RULE III.

The definitive *the* is employed before names, to limit their signification to one or more specific things of the kind, discriminated from others of the same kind. Hence the person or thing is understood by the reader or hearer, as, *the twelve Apostles, the laws of morality, the rules of good breeding*.

This definitive is also used with names of things which exist alone, or which we consider as single; as, *the Jews, the Sun, the Globe, the Ocean*—And also before words when used by way of distinction, as, *the Church, the Temple*.

RULE IV.

The is used rhetorically before a name in the singular number, to denote the whole species, or an indefinite number; as “*the fig-tree putteth forth her green figs*.”

Sol. Songs.

orthography, and the word, even when absurdly called an article, is varied to express gender and case—German *ein, eine, ein*—Dutch *een, eene*—French *un, une*.

* The origin of this use of *a* before *many* is to be sought in the primitive character of *many*, which was a noun in the Gothic and Saxon, synonymous with *multitude*. *A many* was therefore correct. Its use as an attribute is secondary or derivative; but this use carries with it the definitive *a*, in anomalous phrases.

"The almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden."—"Or ever the silver cord shall be loosed—or the golden bowl be broken," &c. *Ecclesiastes*.

"There loaded camels move in solemn state,
And the huge elephant's unwieldy weight."

Hoole's Tasso, b. 15.

"For here the splendid treasures of the mine,
And richest offspring of the field combine." *Lusiad* 2.

"The christian, who, with pious honor, avoided the abominations of the circus or the theater, found himself encompassed with infernal snares, &c." *Gib. Rom. Emph.* ch. 15.

"The heart likes naturally to be moved and affected."

Campbell's Rhet. ch. 2.

NOTE 1.....This definitive is also used before names employed figuratively in a general sense, as

"His mates their safety to the waves consign." *Lusiad* 2.

Here *waves* cannot be understood of any particular *waves*; but the word is a metaphor for a particular thing, the *ocean*.

NOTE 2.....Names are also restricted in their signification by other definitives, by various attributes, and any words of description which discriminate one thing from another, as

"See barbarous nations at thy gates attend,
Walk in thy light, and in thy temples bend." *Pope's Messiah*.

"From every face he wipes off every tear." *ibm.*

"The tender lambs he raises in his arms." *ibm.*

"These swell their prospects and exalt their pride."

Rape of the Lock.

"For spirits, freed from mortal laws, with ease
Assume what sexes and what shapes they please." *ibm.*

In addresses and exclamations, the definitive may be, and usually is, omitted—as "Sink down, ye mountains, and ye vallies rise"—

"Be smooth, ye rocks; ye rapid floods, give way." *Pope Mes.*

"Granville commands; your aid, O Muses, bring." *Wind forest*.

NOTE 3.....The definitive *the* is used before an attribute, which is selected from others belonging to the same object; as "The very frame of spirit proper for being diverted with the laughable in objects, is so different from that which is necessary for philosophizing on them." *Campbell Rhet.* 1. 2.

NOTE 4....The definitive *the* has been classed with *a*, as an article or part of speech, distinct from *this* and *that*, but evidently without good reason. If we attend to the uses of these words, we shall find very little difference between *the* and *this* or *that*. The Saxon definite article *se* is no longer used, but it was also used for the pronoun *he*. The Saxon *the* was our present relative *which*—and the Saxon *tha, thes, that, thy*, were used indifferently for the article *the* or a substitute, *he* or *who*—and *the*, in modern English, has the sense of *that* or *this*, as in the phrases, “this sinks *the* deeper, or rises *the* higher”—for in the Saxon, *the* was a pronoun, in such phrases; *the bet, eo melius*, the better—*the swithor*, the more, that is, *that better, that more*. From examining Saxon authors, it appears evident that *the* was originally a pronoun or substitute—and it retains the sense of *that* in most cases. But as *one* has in modern times, gained a use which *an* has not, so *that* and *this*, (tho before names they have the sense of *the*, for the man you saw and *that* man you saw, are of the same import) are often used as substitutes and for emphasis in cases where *the* cannot be employed. *The* and *that* are the Hebrew intensive particle *at*, which the Greeks formed into *to* and *tauton*, and which the Saxons expressed by *se, so, the, them, tha, thy* and *that*. In German *the* and *that* are the same—*der, die, das*, in the three genders. In the Celtic also, the article *an* signifies *the* and *that*—nor is there the shadow of a reason for considering the article as a distinct part of speech, either in our own language, or in any other with which I am acquainted. In the Saxon *se, that* and *them* are classed together, inflected together, and called by the learned Hickes the *article* or *pronoun demonstrative*.

Number.

As men have occasion to speak of a single object, or of two or more individuals of the same kind, it has been found necessary to vary the name, and usually the termination, to distinguish plurality from unity. The different forms of words to express one or more are called in Grammar, *numbers*; of which there are in English, two, the *singular* and the *plural*. The *singular* denotes an individual, or a collection of individuals united in a body; as, a man, a ship, an office, a company, a society, a dozen. The *plural* denotes two or more individuals, not considered as a collective body; as, men, ships, offices, companies, societies. The plural number is formed by the addition of *s* or *es* to the singular.

RULE 1. When the terminating letter of a name will admit the sound of *s* to coalesce with the name or the last syl-

lable of it, *s* only is added to form the plural ; as sea, seas ; hand, hands ; pen, pens ; grape, grapes ; vale, vales ; vow, vows.

2. When the letter *s* does not combine in sound with the word or last syllable of it, the addition of *s* increases the number of syllables ; as, house, houses ; grace, graces ; page, pages ; rose, roses ; voice, voices ; maze, mazes.

3. When the name ends in *x*, *ss*, *sh*, or *ch*, with its English sound, the plural is formed by adding *es* to the singular ; for a single *s* after those letters cannot be pronounced ; as, fox, foxes ; glass, glasses ; brush, brushes ; church, churches. But after *ch* with its Greek sound, like *k*, the plural is formed by *s* only ; as monarch, monarchs.

4. When a name ends with *y* after a consonant, the plural is formed by dropping *y* and adding *ies* ; as, vanity, vanities. *Alkali* has a regular plural, *alkalies*.

But after *ay*, *ey*, and *oy*, *s* only is added ; as, delay, delays ; valley, valleys ; joy, joys ; money, moneys.

NOTE 1.....We sometimes see valley, chimney, money, journey, and a few others, with like terminations, written in the plural with *ies*—vallis, chimnies, &c. But this irregularity is not to be vindicated. Either the singular number should be written *vally*, or the plural *valleys*. The latter is preferable.*

NOTE 2.....A few English nouns deviate from the foregoing rules in the formation of the plural number :—

Class I. In some names, *f* in the singular, is, for the convenience of utterance, changed into *v* ; as,

life	lives	self	selves	sheaf	sheaves
knife	knives	half	halves	shelf	shelves
wife	wives	beef	beeves	wolf	wolves
leaf	leaves	staff	staves	wharf	wharves
calf	calves	loaf	loaves	thief	thieves

* The change of *y* into *ies* to form the plural number, may seem to a foreigner an odd irregularity ; but the cause is very obvious. Formerly the singular number of this class of words, ended with *ie*, as, glorie, vanitie, energie, and the addition of *s* made the plural, *glories*. But whether from caprice, negligence, or a desire to simplify the orthography, the termination *ie* was laid aside for *y* in the singular number, while the old plural *ies* was retained. A strange inconsistency, but by no means the only one which the progress of our language exhibits.

CLASS 2. The second class consists of words which are used in both numbers, with plurals irregularly formed; as

child	children	hypothesis	hypotheses
foot	feet	brother	brothers or brethren
tooth	teeth	penny	pennies or pence
man	men	die	dies or dice
woman	women*	pea	peas or pease
ox	oxen	criterion	criteria or criterions
louse	lice	focus	foci or focuses
goose	geese	radius	radii or radiuses
bean	beans	index	indexes or indices
thesis	theses	calx	calces or calxes
emphasis	emphases	phenomenon	phenomena
antithesis	antitheses		

Pennies is used for real coins; *pence* for their value in computation.—*Dies* denotes stamps for coining; *dice*, pieces used in games.—*Peas* denotes the seeds as distinct objects; *pease* the seeds in a mass.—*Brothers* is the plural used in common discourse; *brethren*, in the scripture style, but is not restricted to it.

Cherubim and *Seraphim* are real Hebrew plurals; but such is the propensity in men to form regular inflections in language, that these words are used as in the singular, with regular plurals, cherubims, seraphims. In like manner, the Hebrew singulars, *cherub* and *seraph*, have obtained regular plurals.

The influence of this principle is very obvious in other foreign words, which the sciences have inlisted into our service; as may be observed in the words *radius*, *focus*, *index*, &c. which now begin to be used with regular English plural terminations. This tendency to regularity is, by all means, to be encouraged; for a *prime excellence in language is the uniformity of its inflections*. The facts here stated will be evinced by a few authorities.

“Vesiculated corallines are found adhering to rocks, shells and *fucuses*.” *Encyc. art. Corallines*.

“Many *fetuses* are deficient at the extremities.” *Dar. Zoon. Sect. 1. S. 9.*

* *Women*, is one of the grossest errors in our language. The true original plural is *wimmen*.

"Five hundred *denariuses*." *Baker's Livy*, 4. 491.

"The radiations of that tree and its fruit, the principal *focuses* of which are in the Maldivia islands." *Hunter's St. Pierre*, vol. 3.

"The reduction of metallic *calxes* into metals." *Ency. art. Metallurgy*.

See also *Medums* Campbell's Rhetoric, 1, 150—*Calyxes* Darwin's Zoon, 1, 74, *Caudexes*. Phytologia, 2, 3. *Irisces* Zoon, 1, 444. *Reguluses* and *residuums*. *Encyc. art. Metal.*

In authorities equally respectable, we find *stamens*, *stratum*, *funguses*; and in pursuance of the principle, we may expect to see *lamens* for lamina; *lamels* for lamellæ; *baryte*, for barytes; *hyrite* for pyrites; *strontite* for strontites; *stalectite*, or as the original would rather indicate, *stalecty*, and the plural *stalecties*. These reforms are necessary to enable us to distinguish the singular from the plural number.

CLASS 3. The third class of irregulars consists of such as have no plural termination; some of which represent ideas of things which do not admit of plurality; as rye, barley, flax, hemp, flour, sloth, pride, pitch, and the names of metals, gold, silver, tin, zinc, antimony, lead, bismuth, quicksilver. When, in the progress of improvement, any thing, considered as not susceptible of plurality, is found to have varieties, which are distinguishable, this distinction gives rise to a plural of the term. Thus in early ages our ancestors took no notice of different varieties of *wheat*, and the term had no plural. But modern improvements in agriculture have recognized varieties of this grain, which have given the name a plural form. The same remark is applicable to fern, clay, marl, sugar, cotton, &c. which have plurals, formerly unknown. Other words may hereafter undergo a similar change.

Other words of this class denote plurality, without a plural termination; as cattle, sheep, swine, kine, deer, hose; trout, salmon, carp, perch, and many other names of fish. *Fish* has a plural, but is used in a plural sense, without the termination; as,

"We are to blame for eating *these fish*."

Anarcharsis 6. 272.

"The *fish* reposed in seas and crystal floods,
 "The beasts retired in covert of the woods."

Hoole T. 2. 726.

Cannon, shot and *sail* are used in a plural sense, as
 One hundred *cannon* were landed from the fleet."

Burchett Naval Hist. 732.

"Several *shot* being fired" *Ibm. 455.*

"Several *sail* of ships" *Ibm. 426.*

In the sense in which these words are here used, they hardly admit of a plural ending.

Under this class may be noticed a number of words, expressing time, distance, measure, weight and number, which, tho admitting of a plural termination, are often, not to say generally, used without that termination, even when used with attributes of plurality; such are the names in these expressions, two year, five mile, ten foot, seven pound, three tun, hundred, thousand, or million, five bushel, twenty weight, &c. Yet the most unlettered people never say, two minute, three hour, five day, or week, or month; nor two inch, yard or league; nor three ounce, grain, dram, or peck.

We observe this practice in the Saxon Chronicle. "He heold that Arcebisceop-ric 18 year."—p. 59. He held that archbishop-ric *eighteen year*. In that work, *winter* is used in the same manner; *forty-one winter*—p. 41. Yet *year* and *winter* had, in the Saxon, plural terminations.

A like singularity is observable in the Latin language. "Tritici quadraginta millia modium." *Liv. lib. 26. 47.* Forty thousand modium of wheat. "Quatuor millia pondi auri," four thousand pound of gold. *Ibm. 27. 10.*

Here we see the origin of our *pound*. Originally it was merely *weight*—four thousand of gold *by weight*. From denoting weight generally, *pondo* became the term for a certain division or quantity; retaining however its signification of unity, and becoming an indeclinable in Latin.—*Twenty pound* then, in strictness, is twenty divisions *by weight*; or as we say, with a like abbreviation, *twenty weight*. These abbreviations are the wings of Mercury.

The words *horse, foot* and *infantry*, comprehending bo-

dies of soldiers, are used as plural nouns and followed by verbs in the plural. Cavalry is sometimes used in like manner.

CLASS 4. The fourth class of irregular nouns consists of words which have the plural termination only. Some of these denoting plurality, are always joined with verbs in the plural; as the following:

Annals	drawers	lees	customs
archives	downs	lungs	shears
ashes	dregs	matins	scissors
assets	embers	mallows	shambles
bettors	entrails	orgies	tidings
bowels	fetters	nippers	tongs
compasses	filings	pincers or	thanks
clothes	goods	pinchers	vespers
calends	hatches	pleiads	vituls
breeches	ides	snuffers	virtuals

Letters in the sense of literature, may be added to the foregoing list. *Manners*, in the sense of *behavior*, is also plural.

Other words of this class, tho ending in *s*, are used either wholly in the singular number, or in the one or the other, at the pleasure of the writer.

Amends	wages	conics	economics
alms	billiards	catoptrics	mathematics
bellows	fives	dioptrics	mechanics
gallows	sessions	acoustics	hydraulics
odds	measles	pneumatics	hydrostatics
means	hysterics	statics	analytics
pains	physics	statistics	politics
news	ethics	spherics	
riches	optics	tactics	

Of these, *pains*, *riches* and *wages** are more usually considered as plural—*news* is always singular—*odds* and *means* are either singular or plural—the others are more strictly singular; for *measles* is the name of a disease, and in strictness, no more plural than gout or fever. Small *pox*, for

* Originally *wagis*, and really singular.

flocks, is sometimes considered as a plural, but it ought to be used as singular. *Billiards* has the sense of *game*, containing unity of idea; and *ethics*, *physics* and other similar names, comprehending each the whole system of a particular science, do not convey the ideas of parts or particular branches, but of a whole collectively, a unity, and hence seem to be treated as words belonging to the singular number.

AUTHORITIES.

Pre-eminent by so *much odds*. *Milt. P. L.* 4. 474.

With *every odds* thy prowess I defy.

Hoole Tas. 6. 19. 40.

Where the *odds is* considerable. *Camp. Rhet.* ch. 5.

The *wages* of sin *is* death. *Bible.*

Much pains has been taken. *Enfield Hist. Phil.* ch. 2.

Let a *gallows* be made of fifty cubits high. *Bible.*

Here he erected a fort and a *gallows*. *Lusiad* 1. 134.

The *riches* we had in England *was* the slow result of long industry and wisdom, and *is* to be regained, &c. *Davenant.* 2. 12.

Mathematics informs us. *Encyc. art. strength of Materials.*

Politics is the art of producing individual good by general measures. *Beddoes' Hygeia.* 2. 79.

Politics contains two parts. *Locke*, vol. 2. 408.

Locke however uses a plural verb with *ethics*. "The ideas that *ethics are* conversant about."—*B.* 4. 12. 8.

Pains, when preceded by *much*, should always have a singular verb.

Means is so generally used in either number, every means, all means, this means, and these means, that authorities in support of the usage are deemed superfluous.

Gender.

GENDER, in grammar, is a difference of termination, to express distinction of sex.

There being two sexes, *male* and *female*, words which denote males are said to be of the *masculine* gender; those which denote females, of *feminine* gender. Words expressing things without sex, are said to be of neuter gender.— There are therefore but *two* genders; yet for convenience the neuter is classed with the genders; and we say there are *three*, the masculine, feminine and neuter. The English modes of distinguishing sex are these:

1. The regular termination of the feminine gender, is *ess*; which is added to the name of the masculine; as lion, lioness.* But when the word ends in *or*, the feminine is formed by retrenching a vowel, and blending two syllables into one; as actor, actress. In a few words, the feminine gender, is represented by *ix*, as testatrix, from testator; and a few others are irregular. The following are most of the words which have a distinct termination for the feminine gender:

Actor	actress	count	countess
abbot	abbess	deacon	deaconess
adulterer	adultrress	duke	duchess
baron	baroness	ambassador	ambadressess
benefactor	benefactress	emperor	empress
governor	governess	tiger	tigress
hero	heroine	songster	songstress
heir	heiress	seamster	seamstress
peer	peeress	viscount	viscountess
priest	priestess	jew	jewess
poet	poetess	lion	lioness
prince	princess	master	mistress
prophet	prophetess	marquis	marchioness
shepherd	shepherdess	patron	patroness
sorcerer	sorceress	protector	protectress
tutor	tutress	executor	executrix
instructor	instructress	testator	testatrix
traitor	traitress	elector	electress
		administrator	administratrix

* This ending, *ess*, is the Hebrew *essa*, a female, as *or* and *er* are contradictions of *vir* and *wer*, a man.

2. In many instances, animals, with which we have most frequent occasions to be conversant, have different words to express the different sexes; as man and woman; brother and sister; uncle and aunt; son and daughter; boy and girl; father and mother; horse and mare; bull and cow.

Man however is a general term for the whole race of mankind; so also, *horse* comprehends the whole species. A law to restrain *every man* from an offense would comprehend *women* and *boys*; and a law to punish a trespass committed by *any horse*, would comprehend all mares and colts. In like manner, *goose*, tho originally the name of the female, is used generally for the whole species; as is the plural *geese*.

3. When words have no distinct termination for the female sex, the sexes are distinguished by prefixing some word indicating sex; as a male rabbit, a female opossum; a he goat, a she goat, a man servant, a maid servant; a male-coquet; a female-warrior; a cock-sparrow, a hen-sparrow.

4. In all cases, when the sex is sufficiently indicated by a separate word, names may be used to denote females without a distinct termination. Thus, altho females are rarely soldiers, sailors, philosophers, mathematicians or chemists, and we seldom have occasion to say, she is a soldier, or an astronomer; yet there is not the least impropriety in the application of these names to females, when they possess the requisite qualifications; for the sex is clearly marked by the word *she* or *female*, or the appropriate name of the woman; as "Joan of Arc was a warrior." "The Amazons, a nation of female warriors." *Ency. art. Amazons.**

5. Altho the English language is philosophically correct in considering things without life as of neither gender, yet by an easy analogy, the imagination conceives of inanimate things as animated and distinguished by sex. On this fiction, called *personification*, depends much of the descriptive force and beauty of poetry. In general, those objects which are remarkable for their strength, influence,

* The termination *or* in Latin, is a contraction of *vir*, a man; as *er* in English is of *wer*, the same word in Saxon. But in common understanding, the idea of gender is hardly attached to these terminations; for we add *er* to words to denote an agent, without life, as grater, heater.

and the attribute of imparting, take the masculine gender; those which are remarkable for the more mild and delicate qualities, for beauty and the attribute of producing, become feminine; the sun darts *his* scorching rays; the moon sheds *her* paler light.

“Indus or Ganges rolling *his* broad wave.” *Akenside*.

“There does the soul
Consent *her* soaring fancy to restrain.” *ibm*.

“Now morn *her* rosy steps in th’ eastern clime
Advancing—” *Milton P. L. b. 5.*

“The north east spends *his* rage.” *Thompson*.

Case.

CASE in Grammar denotes a variation of words to express the relation of things to each other. In English, most of the relations are expressed by separate words; but the relation of property, ownership or possession, is expressed by adding *s* to a name, with an apostrophy; thus, John’s book; which words are equivalent to “the book of John.” This is called the *Possessive Case*. In English therefore names have two cases only, the *nominative* or simple name, and the *possessive*. The *nominative* before a verb and the *objective* after a verb are not distinguished by inflections, and are to be known only by position or the sense of the passage.

When the letter *s*, added as the sign of the possessive, will coalesce with the name, it is pronounced in the same syllable; as *John’s*. But if it will not coalesce, it adds a syllable to the word, as Thomas’s bravery, pronounced as if written *Thomasis*—the Church’s prosperity, *Churchis* prosperity. These examples show the impropriety of retrenching the vowel; but it occasions no inconvenience to natives.

When words end in *es* or *ss*, the apostrophy is added without *s*; as on eagles’ wings; for righteousness’ sake.

Substitutes.

SUBSTITUTES are of two kinds; those which are used in the place of the names of persons only, and may be called *personal*; and those which represent names, attributes, a sentence or part of a sentence, or a series of propositions.

The substitutes which are appropriate to persons, are, I, thou, he, she, we, ye, and who.

I is used by a speaker to denote himself, and is called the *first person* of the singular number.

When a speaker includes others with himself, he uses *we*—This is the *first person* of the plural number.

Thou and *you* represent the person addressed—*thou* in solemn discourse, and *you*, in common language.* Those are the *second person*. In the plural, *ye* is used in solemn style and *you* in familiar language.

* As *you* was originally in the plural number, grammarians insist that it must still be restricted to that number. But national usage rejects the arbitrary principle. The true principle, on which all language is built, rejects it. What fundamental rule have we to dispose of words, but this, that when a word signifies *one*, or *unity*, it belongs to the singular number? If a word, once exclusively plural, becomes, by universal use, the sign of individuality, it must take its place in the singular number. That this is the fact with *you*, is proved by national usage. To assign the substitute to its verb, is to invert the order of things. The verb must follow its nominative—if that denotes unity, so does the verb.

“When *you was* at Athens you attended the schools of the philosophers.” *Cicero Tusc. Quest. Trans.* b. 2.

“On that happy day when *you was* given to the world.” *Dodd’s Massillon Serm.* 1.

“Unless *you was* ill.” *Boswell’s Life of J. Æ.* 68.

“*You was* on the spot where your enemy was found killed.” *Guthrie’s Quintilian.* b. 2.

“*You was* in hopes to have succeeded to the inheritance.” *Ibm.* b. 5.

“When *you was* here comforting me.” *Pope Let.*

“I am as well as when *you was* here.” *Gay’s Let. to Swift.*

“Why *was you* glad?” *Boswell’s Life of Johnson.*

These

He represents the name of a male, and *she*, that of a female, who is the subject of discourse, but not directly addressed. These are called the *third person*.

It is a substitute for the name of any thing of the neuter gender in the third person, and for a sentence.

They is a substitute for the names of persons or things, and forms the third person of the plural number.

Who is also a personal substitute, used to introduce a new clause or affirmation into a sentence, which clause has an immediate dependence on the preceding one; so that *who* is a connective, as well as a substitute, and may be called a *connective substitute*.* *Who* is also used to ask questions, and hence is called an interrogative.

Which is also a connective substitute, but is of neuter gender. It is also interrogative.

These substitutes have two cases; the nominative which precedes a verb, and the objective which follows it. They are inflected in the following manner.

	Sing.	Plu.		Sing.	Plu.
Nominative	I†	we	Nom.	- -	thou ye
Objective	me	us	Obj.	- - -	thee you

These writers did not commit mistakes in the use of the verb after *you*—they wrote the language as established by national usage—the foundation of all language. So is the practice in the United States—not merely popular usage, tho this, when general, is respectable authority; but the practice of men of letters.

“Where *was you* standing during the transaction?”

“How *for was you* from the defendant?”

“How *far was you* from the parties?” *Judge Parker. Trial of Selfridge. p. 58.*

“*Was you* acquainted with the defendant at College?” *Mr. Dexter. Ibm. p. 60.*

“*Was you* there when the pistol was fired?” *Mr. Gore. Ibm. 65.*

“*Was you* in the Office?” *Att. Gen. ibm. 68.*

* *Who* is called a *relative*, because it *relates* to an antecedent. But this is also true of *he, she, they* and most of the substitutes. They all *relate* to the words which they represent.

† *Me* is also used in the nominative, in popular practice—it is *me*.
This

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plu.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plu.</i>
Nom. - -	you	you	Nom. - -	it	they
Obj. - - -	you	you	Obj. - -	it	them
Nom. * - -	he	they	Nom. - - -	who	who
Obj. - - -	him*	them	Obj. - -	whom	whom
Nom. - - -	she	they			
Obj. - - -	her	them			

NOTE.....*Mine, thine, his, hers, yours and theirs*, are usually considered as the *possessive case*. But the three first are either attributes and used with nouns, or they are substitutes. The three last are always substitutes, used in the place of names which are understood, as may be seen in the note below.†

Its and *whose* have a better claim to be considered as a possessive case; but as they equally well fall under the denomination of attributes, I have, for the sake of uniformity, assigned them a place with that part of speech.

But it must be observed, that although *it* and *who* are real substitutes, never united to names, like attributes—it day—who man; yet *its* and *whose* cannot be used detached from a name expressed or implied—as, *its* shape, *its* figure—*whose* face—*whose* works—*whose* are they? that is, *whose* works. These are therefore real attributes.

This is condemned as bad English; but in reality is an original idiom of the language, received from the primitive Celtic inhabitants of England and France, in whose language *mi* was the nominative case of the first personal pronoun. The French language retains the same word, from the same original, in the phrase *c'est moi*.

* *Eum* in Latin was, by the early Romans, written *im*, which orthography exhibits the identity of the words.

† That *mine, thine, his, yours, hers* and *theirs*, do not constitute a possessive case, is demonstrable; for they are constantly used as the nominatives to verbs and as the objectives after verbs and prepositions, as in the following passages. "Whether it could perform its operations of thinking and memory out of a body organized as *ours* is."—*Locke*, b. 2. 27. "In referring our ideas to those of other men, called by the same name, *ours* may be false." "It is for no other reason but that *his* agrees not with *our* ideas."—*ibm.* ch. 32. 9 and 10.

"You may imagin what kind of faith *theirs* was. *Bacon. Unity in Religion.*

"He ran headlong into his own ruin, whilst he endeavored to precipitate *ours*." *Bolingbroke. Let. to Windham.*

"The reason is, that his subject is generally things; *theirs*, on the contrary, is persons." *Camp. Rhct.* b. 1. ch. 10.

"Yours of the 26th Oct. I have received, as I have always done yours, with no little satisfaction."—*Wycherley to Pope.*

"Therefore leave your forests of beasts for *ours* of brutes, called men." *Ibm.*

"These return so much better out of your hands, than they went from mine." *Ibm.*

"Your letter of the 20th of this month, like the rest of yours—tells me with so much more wit, sense and kindness than mine can express," &c. *Ibm.*

"Having good works enough of your own besides to ensure yours and their immortality." *Ibm.*

"The omission of repetitions is but one, and the easiest part of yours and of my design." *Pope to Wycherley.*

"My sword and yours are kin." *Shakspeare.*

It is needless to multiply proofs. We observe these pretended possessives uniformly used as nominatives or objectives. To say that, in these passages, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs* and *mine*, form a possessive case, is to make the possessive perform the office of a nominative case to verbs, and an objective case after verbs and prepositions—a manifest solecism.

Should it be said that a noun is understood; I reply, this cannot be true, in regard to the grammatical construction; for supply the noun for which the word is a substitute, and the substitute is dissolved into an attribute of correspondent sense. "*Yours* of the 26th of October," becomes *your letter*—"he endeavored to precipitate *ours*," becomes *our ruin*. This shows that the words are *real* substitutes, like *others*, where it stands for *other men* or *things*.

Besides, in three passages just quoted, the word *yours* is joined by a connective to a name in the same case; "to ensure *yours* and *their immortality*," "The easiest part of *yours* and of *my design*," "My sword and *yours* are kin." Will any person pretend that the connective here joins different cases?

Another consideration is equally decisive of this question. If *yours*, *ours*, &c. are real possessives, then the same word admits of two different signs of the case; for we say correctly, "an acquaintance of *yours*, *ours* or *theirs*"—*of* being the sign of the possessive; but if the words in themselves are possessives, then there must be two signs of the same case, which is absurd.*

Compare these words with a name in the possessive case—"My house is on a hill; my father's is on a plain." Here *father's* is a real possessive case; the word *house* being understood; and the addition of the noun makes no alteration in the word *father's*; "my father's is," or "my father's house is."

* This case does not compare with that of names. We say a "soldier of the king's"—or a soldier of the king's soldiers—but we cannot say, "an acquaintance of your's acquaintance."

In the use of substitutes, it is to be remarked, that *I*, *thou*, *you*, *ye* and *we* are generally employed, without an antecedent name. When *I*, and the name of the person are both employed, as they are in formal writings, oaths and the like, the substitute precedes the name; as "I, Richard Roe, of Boston." In similar language, *you* and *we* also precede the name; as "You, John Doe, of New-York." "We, Richard Roe and John Doe, of Philadelphia."

You is used by writers very indefinitely, as a substitute for any person who may read the work—the mind of the writer *imagining* a person addressed.

He and *they* are used in the same indefinite manner; as "He seldom lives frugally, *who* lives by chance." "Blessed are *they* that mourn, for *they* shall be comforted."

He and *they*, in such sentences, represent any persons who fall within the subsequent description.

Who and *whom* are always substitutes for *persons*, and never for things or brutes. *Whose* is equally applicable to persons as to things.*

* "*Whose* is rather the poetical, than the regular genitive of *which*." Johnson. Lowth also condemns the use of *whose*, in the neuter gender, citing, at the same time, the most respectable authorities for this use—Dryden, Milton and Addison. "The question *whose* solution I require"—"the tree *whose* mortal taste"—But these critics seem not to have penetrated to the bottom of this usage. The truth is, *who* and its inflections are a part of the primitive language. The Latin *qui*, *cui*, *quo*, *qua*, are the English *who*—*quem* and *quod* are *whom* and *what*—*cujus* is *whose*. The Scots formerly wrote *quha*, *quhat*, the Saxons, *hwa*.—The Germans still use *wer*, *wessen*, *wem*; the Dutch, *wie*, *wiens*, *wien*. In a fragment of the Laws of Numa, *cujus* is spelt *quouis*—We have this word in *whose*. From the time of Numa, at least this genitive has been of *all genders*, and I believe, remains so, in all branches of the Teutonic. It is better classed with adjectives or attributes, like *his*.

Since the foregoing note was written, I find this substitute in the Celtic—the oldest language in Europe.—In the Galic or Erse, the nominative is *ca*, *cia*, *ciod*—pronounced *ko* or *quo*—*hia*, *kiod*—*qui*, *qua*, *quod*.—It is certain also that this word is the Greek article *o*, pronounced with an aspirate. It had its origin in the Hebrew *eua*. This word furnishes an additional reason for classing the articles and pronouns together: for what in one language is called an article, in another is called a pronoun.

Whoever is often employed as the nominative to two verbs; as "*Whoever expects* to find in the scriptures a specific direction for every moral doubt that arises, *looks* for more than he will meet with." *Paley. Phil. ch. 4.*

Mine, thine and *his* are equally well used as substitutes, or as attributes. "The silver is *mine*, and the gold is *mine*." *Hag. 2. 8.* "The day is *thine*, the night also is *thine*." *Ps. 74. 16.* "The lord knoweth them that are *his*." *2 Tim. 2. 19.* In these examples the words, *mine, thine, his*, may be considered as substitutes—"The silver is *mine*," that is, *my silver*.

In this character the words usually follow the verb; but when emphatical, they may precede it; as "*His* will I be." *2 Sam. 16. 18.* "*Thine*, O Lord, is the greatness, the power and the glory." "*Thine* is the kingdom." *2 Ch. 29. 11.**

These words are also used as attributes of possession; as "Let not *mine* enemies triumph." "So let *thine* enemies perish." "And Abram removed *his* tent." *Mine* and *thine* are however not thus used in familiar language; but in solemn and elevated style, they are still used as attributes.

"*Mine* eyes beheld the messenger divine." *Lusiad. B. 2.*

* In addition to the proofs already alleged, that these words are not a possessive case, according to the usual acceptation of the word, we may remark, that *mine, thine* and *his*, in the passages used in the text, do not stand in the place of *of me, of thee, of him*. The silver is *of me*, the gold is *of me*, the day is *of thee*, the Lord knoweth them that are *of him*, do not convey the same ideas, as the present form of expression. *Of*, in these expressions, would rather imply *proceeding from*.

Besides, the same words admit of the sign of the possessive; as, "And the man *of thine*, whom I shall not cut off from mine altar." *1 Sam. 2. 33.* "Sing to the Lord, all ye saints *of his*." *Ps. 30. 4.* "He that heareth these sayings *of mine*." *Matt. 7.* When we say "a soldier of the king's," we mean *one* of the king's soldiers; and in the passage here cited from Samuel, "the man of *thine*," has a like sense—"the man of thy men," that is, any one of them. But in the passages from Psalms and Matthew, the words, "all ye saints of *his*," "these sayings of *mine*," are evidently meant to include the whole number. It is therefore impossible to resolve these passages, without considering *mine, thine*, and *his* as substitutes, in the same case, as the nouns would be, which they represent.

There is another class of substitutes, which supply the place of names, attributes, sentences or parts of a sentence.

It.

In the following sentence, *it* is the substitute for a name. "The sun rules the day ; *it* illumines the earth ;" here *it* is used for *sun*, to prevent a repetition of the word.

In the following passage, *it* has a different use. "The Jews, *it* is well known, were at this time under the dominion of the Romans." *Porteus. Lect. 8.* Here *it* represents the whole of the sentence, except the clause in which it stands. To understand this, let the order of the words be varied. "The Jews were at this time under the dominion of the Romans, *it* [all that] is well known.

"*It* is a testimony as glorious to his memory, as *it* is singular, and almost unexampled in his circumstances, *that* he loved the Jewish nation, and *that* he gave a very decisive proof of *it*, by building them a synagogue." *ibm.*

To discover what is represented by the first *it*, we must inquire, what is a glorious testimony? Why clearly, that he loved the Jewish nation, and gave them a decisive proof of *it*, by building them a synagogue. *It* then is a substitute for those clauses of the sentence. The second *it*, refers to the same clauses. In the latter part of the sentence, he gave a magnificent proof of *it*—of what? of what is related in a preceding clause—*He loved the Jewish nation*—of *that* he gave a decisive and magnificent proof. Here *it* represents that member of the sentence.

"As for *the pulling of them down*, if the affairs require it." *Bacon on Ambition.* Require what? "The pulling of them down"—for which part of the sentence, *it* is a substitute.

"Shall worldly glory, impotent and vain,
That fluctuates like the billows of the main ;
Shall this with more respect thy bosom move
Than zeal for crowns that never fade above ?
Avert *it* heaven." *Hoole's Tasso. 6. 5.*

Avert what? All that is expressed in the four preceding lines, for all which, *it* is a substitute.

“And how could he do this so effectually, as by performing works, which *it* utterly exceeded all the strength and ability of men to accomplish.” *Porteus. Lect. 5.*

What utterly exceeded? To what does *it* refer? Let us invert the order of the words—“as by performing works *to accomplish* which *exceeded* all the strength of men.” Here we find *to accomplish*, a verb in the infinitive, is the nominative to *exceeded*, and for that verb, *it* is a substitute.

This inceptive use of *it* forms a remarkable idiom of our language, and deserves more particular illustration. It stands as the substitute for a subsequent member or clause of a sentence; and is a sort of pioneer to smooth the way for the verb. Thus “*It* is remarkable, *that*, the philosopher Seneca makes use of the same argument.” *Porteus. Lect. 6.* If we ask, what is remarkable? The answer must be, the fact stated in the last clause of the sentence. That this is the real construction, appears from a transposition of the clauses “The philosopher Seneca makes use of the same argument, *that* is remarkable.” In this order, we observe the true use of *that*, which is also a substitute for the preceding clause of the sentence, and *it* becomes redundant. The use then of the inceptive *it* appears to be to enable us to begin a sentence without placing a verb as the introductory word; and by the use of *it* and *that* as substitutes for subsequent members of the sentence, the order is inverted without occasioning obscurity.

It is to be noticed also that this neuter substitute, *it* is equally proper to begin sentences, when the name of a *person* is afterwards used; as “*It* was John who exhibited such powers of eloquence.” But if we transpose the words, and place *who* or *that*, the substitute which begins the new clause, next after the inceptive word, we must use *he* for the inceptive—“*He*, *who* exhibited such powers of eloquence, was John.”

In interrogative sentences, the order of words is changed, and *it* follows the verb. Who is *it* that has been thus eloquent?

There is a sentence in Locke, in which the inceptive, *it*, is omitted “Whereby comes to pass, that, as long as any uneasiness remains in the mind. *B. 2. ch. 21.* In strictness, this is not a defective sentence, for *that* may be con-

sidered as the nominative to *comes*. Whereby *that* comes to pass which follows. Or the whole subsequent sentence may be considered as the nominative—for all that comes to pass. But the use of the inceptive *it* is so fully established as the true idiom of the language, that its omission is not to be vindicated.

This and that, these and those.

This and *that* are either definitive attributes, or substitutes. As attributes, they are used to specify individuals, and distinguish them from others; as, “*This* my son was dead and is alive again.” “Certainly *this* was a righteous man.” “The end of *that* man is peace.” “Wo to *that* man by whom the son of man is betrayed.” *This* and *that* have plurals, *these* and *those*.

The general distinction between *this* and *that*, is, *this* denotes an object to be present or near in time or place; *that*, to be absent. But this distinction is not always observed. In correspondence however with this distinction, when, in discourse, two things are mentioned, *this* and *these* refer to the last named, or nearest in the order of construction; *that* and *those* to the most distant; as

“*Self love* and *reason* to one end aspire,
Pain their aversion, pleasure their desire;
But greedy *that* [self love] its object would devour,
This [reason] taste the honey and not wound the flower.”
Pope.

“Some place the bliss in action, some in ease,
Those call it pleasure, and contentment *these*. *ibm.*”

The poets sometimes contrast these substitutes in a similar manner, to denote individuals acting or existing in detached parties; or to denote the whole acting in various capacities; as

“’Twas war no more, but carnage through the field,
Those lift the sword, and *these* their bosoms yield.”

Hoole's Tasso, b. 20.

“Nor less the rest, the intrepid chief retain’d;
These urged by threats, and *those* by force constrain’d.”
ibm.

There is a peculiarity in the use of *that*; for when it is an attribute, it is always in the singular number; but as a substitute for persons or things, it is plural as well as singular; and is used for persons as well as things more frequently than any word in the language; as

“I knew a man *that* had *it* for a bye word, when he saw men hasten to a conclusion, “Stay a little *that* we may make an end the sooner.” *Bacon of Despatch.*

Here *that* is the representative of *man*, and *it* stands for the last clause of the sentence or bye-word.

“Let states *that* aim at greatness take heed how their nobility and gentlemen multiply too fast. *Bacon.*

Here *that* is a substitute for a plural name. So also in the following. “They *that* are whole need not a physician, but they *that* are sick.” “They *that* had eaten were about four thousand”—“they *that* are in the flesh”—“they *that* weep”—“bless them *that* curse you.”*

* “*That* as a relative is often used to prevent the too frequent repetition of *who* and *which*.” *Murray’s Grammar.*

This remark, like a considerable part of our grammar rules, is a proof that men can easily *imagin* reasons to explain what they do not understand. On recurring to ancient writers, it appears that the *converse* of Murray’s observation is the truth—that *who* and *which* as relatives have, in our language, intruded upon the province of *the* and *that*. In the Saxon, *who* was rarely or never used as a relative after an antecedent, but always in the sense of the Latin *quispiam*, or *aliquis*, whoever or any one; as “*gif hwa eow withstente*”—“if any one shall oppose you”—“*gif hwa this to breketh*”—“if (who) any one or whoever breaketh this.” *Sax. Ch.* 1. 38.

On the other hand, the Saxon *tha*, *that*, *this* and *the* are constantly used as the relative after antecedents. And this use appears in all our ancient authors. In the present translation of the bible, and in our best writings, *that* is most commonly used as the relative. This is also the common popular usage. The attempt therefore to repress this use of *that*, is to attack the fundamental idioms of the language.

The Teutonic *that* is the same as the Greek *tautou*, *tauton*, *tauta*, which is of the masculine gender in all cases except the nominative. The radical of these words is probably the Hebrew *at*, denoting *that* or *the very thing*.

Another very common use of *this* and *that*, is, to represent a sentence or part of a sentence ; as

“ It is seldom known *that*, authority thus acquired is possessed without insolence, or *that*, the master is not forced to confess *that*, he has enslaved himself by some foolish confidence. *Rambler*, No. 68.

In this sentence, the first *that* represents the next member—“ Authority thus acquired is possessed without insolence, *that* is seldom known,” *it* represents the same clause. The second *that* represents all which follows, including two clauses or members—the third *that* is the substitute for the last clause. In strictness the comma ought always to be placed after *that* ; which punctuation would elucidate the use of the substitute and the true construction, but the practice is otherwise—For *that*, in this and like sentences, is either a nominative or an objective. The first *that* in the foregoing sentence is the nominative, coinciding with *it*, or in apposition to it ; and when the clauses are transposed, the inceptive *it*, being redundant, is dropped, and *that* becomes the nominative. The same remark is applicable to the second *that* ; the verb and first clause, *it is seldom known*, being understood. The third *that* is the objective after *confess*. “ The master has enslaved himself by some foolish confidence—he is forced to confess *that*—all that is seldom known.”

Such is the true construction of sentences—the definitive *that*, instead of being a conjunction, is the representative of a sentence or distinct clause, preceding that clause, and pointing the mind to it, as the subject which follows.—And it is as definitive or demonstrative in this application to sentences, as when it is applied to a name, or noun.

The following sentence will exhibit the true use of *that* as a substitute—“ He recited his former calamities ; to which *was* now to be added *that* he was the destroyer of the man who had expiated him.

Beloe's Herodotus. Clio. 45.

According to our present grammars, *that* is a conjunction ; if so, the preceding verb *was*, has no nominative word. But the sense is, “ to which was to be added *that*” which is related in the following words.

The use and importance of this substitute are more clearly manifest, when it denotes purpose or effect; as in this passage "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; *that* it might be fulfilled *which* was spoken by the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene." *Matt. 2. 23.* Here *that* is equivalent to *that purpose or effect*.—He came and dwelt in Nazareth, *for the purpose expressed in what follows.* *It* and *which* represent the last clause of the sentence—"He shall be called a Nazarene." The excellence and utility of substitutes and abbreviations are strikingly illustrated by this use of *that*.

This substitute has a similar use in this introductory sentence. *That we may proceed*—*that* here refers to the following words. The true construction is, *But that we may proceed*—*but*, as will be hereafter shown, denoting *supply or something, more or further*—So that the literal interpretation of the expression is—*More that*—or *further that, we may proceed.* It is the simple mode our ancestors used to express addition to what has preceded, equivalent to the modern phrase. *Let us add, or we may add* what follows, by way of illustrating or modifying the sense of what has been related.

That, like *who* and *which*, has a connecting power, which has given to these words the name of *relative*; in which character, it involves one member of a sentence within another, by introducing a new verb; as "He, *that* keepeth his mouth, keepeth his life." *Prov. 13.* In this passage, *that keepeth his mouth*, is a new affirmation, interposed between the first nominative and its verb; but dependent on the antecedent nominative.

"The poor of the flock, *that* waited upon me, knew *that*, it was the word of the Lord." *Zech. 11. 11.* In this passage we have *that* in both its characters—the first *that* is a substitute for *poor* of the flock; the second, for the last clause of the sentence, *it was the word of the Lord.*

This exposition of the uses of *that*, enables us to understand the propriety of *that that* joined in construction.

"Let me also tell you *that*, *that* faith, which proceeds from insufficient or bad principles, is but little better than infidelity." In this passage, the first *that* is a substitute for the whole subsequent part of the sentence; the second

that is an attribute agreeing with *faith*—"That faith which proceeds from bad principles is little better than infidelity—let me tell you *that*." Hence it might be well always to separate the two words by a comma. We now distinguish these words by a stronger emphasis on the last.

"He, whom thou now hast, is not thy husband; in *that* saidst thou truly." *John* 4. 18. That is, in that whole declaration.

From these passages and the explanation, we learn that *that* is a substitute—either for a single word or a sentence; nor has it any other character, except when an attribute.

This is much less frequently a substitute for sentences than *that*; but is used in this character, as well as in that of an attribute; as "Let no prince measure the danger of discontents by *this*, whether they be just or unjust; for *that* were to imagin people to be reasonable, who do often spurn at their own good; nor yet by *this*, whether the griefs whereupon they rise be in fact great or small.

Bacon on Kingdoms.

Here *this*, in each part of the sentence, is the representative of the clause in Italics succeeding.

"Can we suppose that all the united powers of hell are able to work such astonishing miracles, as were wrought for the confirmation of the christian religion? Can we suppose that they can control the laws of nature at pleasure, and that with an air of sovereignty, and professing themselves the Lords of the universe, as we know Christ did? If we can believe *this*, then we deny, &c. We observe here, *this* represents a series of sentences.

In some cases, *this* represents a few words only in a preceding sentence, as in the following—"The rule laid down is in general certain, that the king only, can *convoke a parliament*. And *this*, by the ancient statutes of the realm, he is bound to do, every year or oftener, if need be." *Blacks. Comment. B. 1. ch. 2.*

If we ask, what is the king bound to do? The answer must be, *convoke a parliament*; for which words alone *this* is the substitute, and governed by *do*.

The plurals *these* and *those*, are rarely or never used as substitutes for sentences.

Which.

Which is also a substitute for a sentence, or part of a sentence, as well as for a single word; as "If there can be any other way shown, how men may come to that universal agreement, in the things they do consent in, *which* I presume may be done." *Locke on Und. B. 1. 2.*

Which, in this passage, represents all which precedes—*which* or *all that is above related*, may be done.

"Another reason that makes me doubt of any innate practical principles, is, that I think there cannot any one moral rule be proposed, whereof a man may not justly demand a reason; *which* would be perfectly ridiculous and absurd, if they were innate, or so much as *self-evident*, *which* every innate principle must needs be."

ibm. Chap. 3.

In this passage the first *which* represents the next preceding part of the sentence, *a man may justly demand a reason*—*which power of demanding a reason* would be ridiculous—The second *which*, is a substitute for *self-evident*, *which*, that is, *self-evident*, every innate principle must be.

"Judas declared him *innocent*, *which* he could not be, had he, in any respect, deceived the disciples." *Porteus, Lect. 22.* Here *which* represents the attribute *innocent*.

That would equally well represent the same word, with a connective. "Judas declared him *innocent*, and *that* he could not be," &c.

"We shall find the reason of it to be the *end of language*, *which* being to communicate thoughts"—that is, *end of language*, and for those words, is *which* the substitute.

What.

This substitute has several uses. *First*, it has the sense of *that which*, as "I have heard *what* has been alleged."

Secondly—*What* stands for any indefinite idea, as "He cares not *what* he says or does." "We shall the better know *what* to undertake." *Locke on Und. 1. 6.*

Thirdly—*What* is an attribute, either in the singular or plural number, and denotes something uncertain or indeterminate ; as “ In *what* character, Butler was admitted into that lady’s service, is unknown.”

Johnson’s Life of Butler.

“ It is not material *what* names are assigned to them.”

Camp’s Rhet. 1. 1.

“ I know not *what* impressions time may have made upon your person.” *Life of Cowp. Let.* 27.

“ To see *what* are the causes of wrong judgment.”

Locke. 2. 21.

Fourthly—*What* is used by the poets preceding a name, for *the* or *that* *which*, but its place cannot be supplied by these words, without a name between them ; as

“ *What* time the sun withdrew his cheerful light,
And sought the sable caverns of the night.”

Hoole’s Tasso. b. 7.

That is, at the time *when* or *in which*.

Fifthly—A principal use of *what* is to ask questions ; as “ What will be the consequence of the revolution in France ?”

This word has the singular property of containing *two* cases ; that is, it performs the office of a word in the nominative and of another in the objective case ; as “ I have, in *what* goes before, been engaged in physical inquiries farther than I intended.” *Locke.* 2. 8. Here *what* contains the object after *in* and the nominative to *goes*.

What is used with a name as an attribute and a substitute ; as “ It was agreed that *what* goods were aboard his vessels, should be landed.” *Mickle’s Discovery of India.* 89. Here *what* goods, are equivalent to the goods *which* ; for, *what* goods include the nominative to two verbs, *were* and *should be landed*. This use of the word is not deemed elegant.

As and *so*.

As is a substitute of *as* general use as any in the language. It represents either a single word or a sentence; and serves as a nominative or an objective case in both numbers. It is equivalent to *who, that, which, or what*.*

1. *As* is a nominative; as "We have been accustomed to repose on its veracity with such humble confidence *as* suppresses curiosity." *Johnson. Life of Cowley*.

Here *as*, is a substitute for *confidence*, and the nominative to *suppresses*. It is simply *such confidence, which* suppresses curiosity. The latter substitute was used, in such cases, until a late period—"Of *such* qualities *which* are capable of producing simple ideas in us," says *Locke* 2. 23. and grammar-makers have condemned this mode of using *which*—not knowing that *as* is precisely its equivalent.

"All the punishment which God is concerned to see inflicted upon sin, is only *such as* answers the ends of government."

"Do every thing *as* was said about mercury and sulphur." *Encyclopedia. art. Metallurgy*. That is, do every thing *which* was said.

2. *As* is a substitute in the plural number and objective case. "The malcontents made such demands *as* none but a tyrant could refuse." *Boling. on Hist. Let. 7*. Here *as* is a substitute for *demands*, and the object governed by *refuse*, and like other connective substitutes, preceding its governing verb.

"Many wise men contented themselves with such probable conclusions, *as* were sufficient for the practical purposes of life." *Enfield. Hist. Phil. 2. 11*.

* To what unaccountable negligence shall we ascribe the utter misconception of the character and uses of this word? A conjunction! When the word is a substitute in the German tongue, and never has had any other use in our own! It is the same word *as* *es* in Greek.

Here *as* is a substitute for *conclusions*, and the nominative to *were*.

“From whence might *contest* spring and mutual *rage*,
As would the camp in civil broils engage.”

Hoole's Tasso. 6. 5.

In this passage, *as* represents *contest* and *rage*, and is the nominative to *would engage*. In prose, *such* would precede *contest*.

“The same arguments are applicable, *as* were applied to the theory of uniformity of perceptions.” *Ward's Law of Nations*. 1. 98. Here *as* is precisely synonymous with *which*; it refers to *arguments* and is the nominative to *were applied*.

3. *As* is also a substitute for sentences. “We shall find, in treating of the barbaric philosophy, that, *as* might be expected, in the infancy of the world, it *was simple in its nature and office*.” *Enfield's Hist. Ph.* 1. 12.

Here *as* represents the last clause of the sentence, *as* will appear, by changing the order. “We shall find that in the infancy of the world, the barbaric philosophy *was simple in its nature and office*, *as* [which] might be expected.”

“On his return to Egypt, *as* I learned from the same authority, he levied a mighty army.”

Beloe's Herod. Uterpe.

In this sentence, *as* represents the first and last members—“On his return to Egypt, he levied a mighty army—*as* [which or all that] I learned from the same authority.

“As to the three orders of pronouns already mentioned, they may be called *prepositive*, *as* may indeed, all substantives.” *Harris' Hermes*. p. 77.

Here *as* is the substitute for, *be called prepositive*, and is the nominative to *may* [be called.] They may be called *prepositive*, *which* all substantives may be called. At the beginning of the sentence, *as* is equivalent to *that* or *which*—the phrase being an abbreviation.—To explain *that which* respects the three orders, &c.

“Order and distribution are the life of despatch, *so as* the distribution be not too subtil.”

Bacon of Despatch.

Here *as* is a substitute for the following member of the sentence, and is synonymous with *that*. This use of *as* after *so*, is condemned by critics, evidently because they have not understood it. Like *such which* before mentioned, it is correct, and is a true idiom of the language, but now obsolete.

In the foregoing passage from Bacon, we have a Saxon mode of introducing a condition or proviso. *So* was primitively a pronoun relative or substitute, as it is still in the German, the elder sister of our language. It often retains the sense of a substitute in English. *So as* therefore are equivalent to *which that*—or *that in this manner*. We now use a Latin word *provided*, or *on condition*. The Saxon mode was very simple. Order and distribution are the life of despatch, *so as*, [that which follows being this, or being granted,] the distribution be not too subtil.

4. *As* is often a substitute for an adjective or an attribute. “*Short as* was this proposition of our reasonable demands, and *apparent as* it must have been, that we could not recede from it, it was not accepted.” Here *as* represents the attributes *short* and *apparent*, in a manner similar to the use of *which* for *innocent* in a passage before cited—*Short, which was—apparent, which* it must have been—This is the precise original signification of *as*.

5. *As* has the sense of *that* in its definitive or demonstrative sense. In this sense, it is often used before and after attributes to ascertain their meaning. Thus we say, “Paris is not *as* large *as* London,” or not *so* large *as* London. In this form of expression, which is one of the most common, *so* and *as* are precisely equivalent, and I have just observed that *so* was originally a substitute. Both of these words are definitives, and synonymous with *that*—“Paris is not *that* large *that* London is,” is the precise phrase on primitive principles.

In a like sense, these words precede the infinitive mode or radical verb—“Have every thing in readiness, *so as* to

march at a moment's warning." The sense is, in *that* manner or condition *that*—or to *that* effect—to march at a moment's warning.

This simplicity of language marks the state of the men who invented it. Illiterate and furnished with few words, our ancestors devised modes of expression corresponding to their degree of knowledge; and we, while we have their language constantly in our mouths, overlook the steps by which it has advanced to its present richness and dignity.*

So is denominated an adverb; but originally was an article or pronoun—in the Celtic *so*, he; in the Gothic, *sa* and *so*, the, an article or demonstrative pronoun, masculine and feminine—in the Saxon, *se* and *seo*; in the modern German *so*, which: In English it retains the same character and use, and is therefore a substitute.

"'Tis true we lost the day, *so* fate ordained."

We are accustomed to explain *so* by *thus*, or in this or that manner. But this is really an error; for men in the early stages of society, do not invent such artificial modes of expression. In the line recited, the meaning of *so* is *that* or *which*.

* "The phrase, *as follows*, forms an impersonal verb, and therefore it should always be in the singular; as, "the rules are *as follows*;" similar to the scriptural expression, "As becometh women professing godliness;" that is, *as it becometh*. If we give the sentence a different turn, and instead of *as*, say *such as*, the verb is no longer impersonal. The pronoun *such* is the nominative, whose number is determined by its antecedent."

Murray's Grammar.

On this passage, which is an error from beginning to end, I will just remark, that had it been written in the days of Johnson and Lowth, the errors it contains must have been pardoned, like others which distinguished writers have committed. But to frame such an explanation of *as follows*, after the publication of the "Diversions of Purley," admits of no apology. In the familiar phrase, *as follows*, *as* is a substitute [pronoun] with the sense of *that* or *which*—it is without inflection; but retains its true primitive sense, and in both numbers. The insertion of *it*, *as it follows*, would render the phrase nonsense—*which it follows*. In the passage from Timothy, the author has cited some old translation. In my bible, the words are "*with becometh*." But *as becometh* is as correct a phrase, and as common, as *which becometh*. They mean the same thing, and either of them is an exact translation of *o prepei*.

We lost a day ; *that* or *which* fate ordained, or fate ordained *that*—*that* being a substitute representing the preceding clause. Thus in the German, *so* has the same sense, “Die liebe *so* ich zu ihnen trage”—the love *that* or *which* I bear you.”

If we examin closely, we shall see that the pretended adverbial sense of *so*, which is expressed by *thus*—or *in this manner*—is nothing more than the definitive sense, *that*—“*As* with the people, *so* with the priest”—is simply *which* or *that* with the people, *that* with the priest. That is, the condition of the one is precisely the same as of the other. The modern idea is an artificial one, deduced by inference from the precision of the definitive.

“And *as* thy days, *so* shall thy strength be.” “*As* my strength was then, even *so* is my strength now.” That is, *what* thy days, *that* shall thy strength be—*What* my strength was then, even *that* is my strength now. These examples are sufficient to show the force of these definitives ; and how flat and feeble the sentences become, when *as* and *so* are translated into *thus* and *this manner* !

“And God spake unto Moses—Say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord, and I will bring you,” &c. And Moses spake *so* unto the children of Israel.” *Ex.* 6. Here *so* is a substitute for all which Moses was commanded to say—that is, for several verses preceding. The command was, say unto the children of Israel what follows—And Moses spake *so* ; that is he spake *that*, which had been commanded him. But explain *so*, by *thus*, in *that manner*, not only the force, but the strict propriety of the expression, is abandoned. In strictness, *sō*, is a substitute in the objective case after *spake*. This criticism is applicable to innumerable passages in scripture, as well as in every profane author.

In the phrase, “if *so* be,” *so* is the nominative to *be* ; “if *that* be.” *Matth.* 18. 16. *Hosea* 8. 7.

“The conclusion is said to be probable, and more or less *so*, according to the proportion,” &c. *Campbell's Rhet.* ch. 5. Here *so* is a substitute for *probable*.

“And he was astonished at the draught of fishes—and *so* was also James and John.” *Luke* 5. 10. Here *so* is a substitute for *astonished*. It is needless to multiply examples. Any person of observation may, as he reads, find and apply

the definition of *so* and *as*. However deflected from the primitive sense these words may appear to be, a close inspection will enable us to discover, in all cases, a near alliance of their signification to the definitive use here explained.

“The tenth part of her riches, whoever pleases may ascertain, and they will not be found *so* great *as* has been represented.” *Beloe’s Herodotus. Euterpe. 135.*

Here *as* is a substitute for *great*, and is the nominative to *has*—and *so* has its original sense of *that*—“They will not be found *that* great *which* great has been represented.” This is the precise signification of *so* and *as*.*

In many cases, we observe *so that* used together, noting *end* or *effect*. This duplication of words of the same import may be ascribed to the poverty of the language in early ages, or the words may have been used in senses somewhat different. It is however remarkable that the Saxons repeated the same word, *so*, to express what the Latins expressed by *sicut*, and we express by *so that*. “*Swa swa ic habbe.*” *So so* I have; or as we now say, *so as* or *that* I have. “*Ac eal swa swa hit ys on than gewrite.*” And all *so so* it is in that writing. *Saxon Chronicle, p. 67.*

We also unite *all* and *so*, in *also*—in Saxon *eal swa*, “*eal swa his faeder Athewulf hine thider sende and baed.*” *p. 77.* “*All as* his father Athewulf had sent him and asked.” The sense of *also* is now precisely the same. “For where your treasure is, there will your heart be *also*.” That is, *all that*, which is equivalent to, *in the same manner or degree*,

* In the Gothic and Saxon, the pronoun and the adverb were written differently—the pronoun in Gothic was *so* or *sa*—and the adverb, *swa*—in Saxon, the adverb was written in the same manner; and the pronoun *se* masculine, and *seo* feminine. These words in the Saxon grammars of Hickes and Lye, are given as the masculine and feminine genders of the article *that*. In the German, as in English, they are now blended in orthography. It is probable that they all sprung from one radical word, for in these Saxon words, *swa hwile swa*—the adverbial orthography is given, yet the English is *whoso* or *whosoever*—or literally, *so who so—he who that—quisquis*, in which Latin word, the pronoun is also repeated.

or to the full effect. We now use *likewise*, for the same purpose, and in origin and effect, this word differs little from *also*.

Such are the ingenious devices of men to express their ideas, during the imperfection of language, in the early stages of society.

Thus is a word of like import with *so*. "*Thus* saith the Lord"—"if they say *thus*." And it deserves notice, that as the English and Germans prefix *all* to *so*, in *also*; the Dutch prefix *all* to *thus* in a like sense, *aldus*, that is, *all thus*. *Thus* was originally a definitive.

So, when used with verbs and attributes, is really a definitive with the like force and effect as in other cases. "*So* shall ye perish,"—"so foolish was I." "In *that way* ye shall perish" *that* foolish, or *in that degree* foolish was I, is the true sense of *so*, in these phrases. Notwithstanding the true origin of this word, it may in many cases be classed with adverbs, or modifiers, in conformity to the usual practice.

Both.

Both is an attribute of number, but it is a substitute also for names, sentences, parts of sentences, and for attributes.

"Abraham took sheep and oxen, and gave them unto Abimelech, and *both* of them made a covenant."

Genesis 21. 27.

Here *both* is the representative of *Abraham* and *Abimelech*.

"If the blind lead the blind, *both* shall fall into the ditch."

Matt. 15. 14.

"A certain creditor had two debtors—and when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them *both*."

Luke 7.

"He will not bear the *loss of his rank*, because he can bear *the loss of his estate*; but he will bear *both*, because he is prepared for *both*." *Boling, on Exile.*

In the last example, *both* represents the parts of the sentence in Italics.

When it represents two attributes, it may and usually does precede them; as "He endeavored to render commerce *both* disadvantageous and infamous."

Mickle, p. 159.

As an attribute, it has a like position before names; as "Tousa confessed he had saved *both* his life and his honor." *ibm.* 160.

"It is *both* more accurate, and proves no inconsiderable aid to the right understanding of things, to discriminate by different signs such as are truly different."

Campbell's Rhet. 1. 33.

In this passage, *both* represents *more accurate*, and the following member of the sentence; but the construction is harsh.

"The necessity which a speaker is under, of suiting himself to his audience, *both that*, he may be understood by them, and *that*, his words may have an influence upon them." *Campf. Rhet. ch. 10.*

Here *both* represents the two following clauses of the sentence.—The definitive *the* is placed between *both* and its noun; as "To *both* the preceding kinds, the term *burlesque* is applied." *Campf. Rhet.* 1. 2.

Same.

The attribute *same* is often used as a substitute for persons and sentences or parts of a sentence; as "Nothing appears so clearly an object of the mind or intellect only, as the *future* does, since we can find no place for its existence any where else. Not but the *same*, if we consider, is equally true of the *past*." *Hermes. p. 112.*

In this ill constructed sentence, [for in opposition to Lowth's opinion, I consider Harris as a most inelegant writer] *same* has reference to all which is predicated of the

future tense—that is, *that it is an object of intellect only, since we can find no place for its existence any where else—*The same, *all this*, is true of the *part* also.

“For *brave* and *generous* ever are the *same*.”

Lusiad. 1.

Many, few, all, any.

These words we often find used as substitutes for names; “For *many* shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive *many*.” *Matth.* 24. 5. “*Many* are called, but *few* chosen.” 20. 16. “*All* that come into the tent, and *all* that is in the tent shall be unclean seven days.” *Num.* 19. 14. “If a soul shall sin against *any* of the commandments.” *Lev.* 4. 2. “Neither is there *any*, that can deliver out of my hand” *Deut.* 32. 39.

First, last, former, latter, less, least, more, most, are often used as substitutes.

“The victor’s laurel, as the martyr’s crown,
The *first* I hope, nor less the *last* I prize.”

Hoolc’s Tasso. 6. 8.

“The *last* shall be *first*, and the *first* *last*.”

Matth. 20. 16.

“It will not be amiss to inquire into the cause of this strange phenomenon; *that*, even a man of discernment should write without meaning, and not be sensible that he hath no meaning; and *that* judicious people should read what hath been written in this way, and not discover the defect. *Both* are surprising, but the *first* much more than the *last*.” *Camp’s Rhet.* 2. 7.

Here *both* represents the two clauses of the sentence, preceded by *that*—*both* of those propositions are surprising. *First* and *last* stand in the place of the same clauses.

“Sublimity and vehemence are often confounded, the *latter* being considered as a species of the *former*.

Camp. Rhet. 1. 1.

Here *latter* and *former* are used for names which are near in construction, and no obscurity is occasioned by the substitutes. But these words, when placed far from the words which they represent, obscure the sense, and compel the reader to peruse a sentence the second time, which is always a fault in style. For example; “As to the *Ætolian*, it is frequently confounded with the *Doric*; and as this union takes place also in other essential points, it is only between the *Dorians* and *Ionians* that a kind of parallel can be drawn. This I shall not undertake to perform; I shall only make one general observation; the manners of the *former* have ever been severe, and the characteristics of their architecture, language and poetry, are grandeur and simplicity. The *latter* more early made a progress in refinement.” *Anarch. ch. 72.*

In every case, where the antecedent word or sentence is not obvious, so that the mind instantly applies the substitute to its principal, the use of a substitute is a fault. For example, “When a speaker addresseth himself to the understanding, he proposes the instruction of his hearers, and that *by explaining* some doctrine unknown or not distinctly comprehended by them, or *by proving* some position disbelieved or doubted by them. In other words, he proposes to dispel ignorance or to vanquish error. In the *one*, his aim is their *information*; in the other their *conviction*. Accordingly, the predominant quality of the *former*, is *perspicuity*; of the *latter*, *argument*. By *that*, we are made to know; by *this*, to believe.”

Camp. Rhet. 6. 1. ch. 1.

To what antecedent words or clauses, do all these substitutes refer? In the *one*—and the *other* what? Doubtless, the antecedents must be the two parts of the sentences, beginning with, *by explaining* and *by proving*. That is, in explaining an unknown doctrine, his aim is instruction—in proving a doubted point, his aim is conviction. The predominant quality of the *former*—former what? unques-

tionably the same sentences are the antecedents to the *former* and *latter*. These words cannot refer to *information* and *conviction*; for altho *perspicuity* may be predicated of *information*, yet it cannot be a *predominant* quality of it; and *argument* cannot be predicated of *conviction*. But the whole passage is perplexed and obscure.*

“Leonis refused to go thither with *less* than the appointed equipment.” *Mickle*, l. 181. Here *less* supplies the place of *equipment*, and prevents the necessity of its repetition.

“To the relief of these, Noronha sent some supplies, but while he was preparing to send *more*, an order from Portugal arrived.” *Mickle*, l. 180.

Here *more* is sufficiently intelligible without a repetition of the name—*supplies*.

“And the children of Israel did so, and gathered some, *more*, some *less*.” *Excd.* 16. 17.

“I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord, my God, to do *less* or *more*.” *Num.* 22. 18.

“Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein *most* of his mighty works were done.” *Matt.* 11. 20.

“Was not this love indeed ?

We men say *more*, swear *more*, but indeed

Our shews are more than will.” *Shakes. Twelfth Night*.

Such.

“Jubal was the father of *such* as dwell in tents.”

Gen. 4.

“Thou shalt provide able men, *such* as fear God.”

Ex. 18.

* This criticism is the more necessary, as the use of *former* and *latter* in our best writers, is indulged to a fault. There are few places in which it is not better to repeat the antecedents than to use them. The injudicious use of these and other substitutes is a great blemish in Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*.

“Objects of importance must be portrayed by objects of importance; *such* as have grace, by things graceful.”

Campt. Rhet. 1. 2.

Such here supplies the place of a name or noun, but it retains its attributive sense and the name may be added.

Self and *own*.

Self is said to have been originally an attribute; but is now used as an intensive word to give emphasis to substitutes and attributes.* Sometimes it is used as a noun. In the plural, it forms *selves*. It is added to the attributes *my*, *your*, *own*; as *myself*, *yourself*, † *ourselves*; and to *him*, *her*, *them*, as *himself*, *herself*, *themselves*. And tho annexed to substitutes in the objective case, these words are indifferently in the nominative or objective. *Self* is never added to *his*, *their*, *mine*, or *thine*.

The compounds *himself*, *herself*, *thymself*, *ourselves*, *themselves*, may be placed immediately after the personal substitute, as *he himself* wrote a letter to the minister; or immediately after the following verb or its object; as “He wrote a letter *himself*,”—“he went *himself* to the admiralty.” In such phrases *himself* not only gives emphasis to the affirmation; but gives to an implied negative, the force

* *Self* has the force of the Latin *ipse*, and was in Saxon, added to all cases, *he-self*, *his-self*, *him-self*. So in Latin *tu te ipse*, was used in the nominative.

† In this compound, we have a strong confirmation of what I have alleged respecting the arrangement of *you* in the singular number, when used of a single person. *Self* is invariably in the singular—*selves* in the plural. Now if *you* is to be classed with plurals in all cases, we must, to be consistent, apply *yourselves* to a single person. Yet we make the proper distinction—*yourself* is applied to one person—*yourselves* to more. But upon the principle of our grammars, that *you* must always be joined to a verb in the plural, we are under the necessity of saying “*You yourself were*,” when we address a single person—which is false construction. Whatever verb therefore is used with *you* when applied to an individual, must be considered as a verb in the singular number.

of one expressed. "He went himself to the minister," carries with it a direct negation that another person went. In negative sentences, it has a different effect. "He did not write the letter himself," implies strongly that he wrote it by an agent, or had an agency in procuring it to be written.

These compound substitutes are used after verbs when reciprocal action is expressed; as "They injure themselves."

Itself is added to names for emphasis; as "this is the book *itself*."

Own is an attribute denoting property, used with names to render the sense emphatical; as "this book is my *own*."

Own is sometimes a substitute; as "He came unto his *own* and his *own* received him not." *John* 1. 11.

"This is an invention of his *own*."

One, other, another, none.

The attribute *one* is very often a substitute—*other* is used in the same manner, and often opposed to *one*. "All rational or deductive evidence is derived from *one* or the *other* of these two sources." *Camp. Rhet. ch. 5.* To render these words more definite, and the specification of the alternatives more explicit, the definitive *the* is placed before them—"as either he will hate *the one* and love *the other*."

Another has sometimes a possessive case; as "the horse is another's," but this form of speech is but little used.

Another is the Saxon *an*, one, and *other*—*one other*. It is an attribute; but often used as a substitute. "Let *another* praise thee and not thine own mouth."

Prov. 27. 2.

None is a contraction of *no one*, or rather of the Saxon *na an*, and is often a substitute; as "Ye shall lie down and *none* shall make you afraid." *Lev.* 26. 6. It is used in the plural as well as the singular number.

The cardinal numbers are all used as substitutes, when the things to which they refer are understood by the train

of discourse, and no ambiguity is created by the omission of the name ; as " The rest of the people also cast lots, to bring *one* of *ten* to dwell in Jerusalem." *Neh.* 11. 1.

One has sometimes the possessive form ; " One's person is to be protected by law ;" and frequently the plural number ; as " I have commanded my sanctified *ones*, and I have called my mighty *ones*. *Isa.* 13. 3.

One, when contrasted with *other*, sometimes represents plural names, and is joined with a plural verb, as in this passage ; " The reason why *the one* are ordinarily taken for real qualities, and the *other*, only for bare powers, seems to be," &c. *Locke. b. 2. ch. 8. 25.*

One and *another*, have a peculiar distributive use in the following and the like expressions ; " Brethren, let us love *one another*." The effect of these words seems to be, to separate an act affirmed of a number collectively, and distribute it among the several individuals—" Let us love—let each one love the other." " If ye have love one to another"—" by love serve one another." *One another* in this phraseology, have the comprehensive sense of *every one*. " By love serve"—every one serve the other. *Each* is used in a like sense—They loved each other—that is—they loved—each loved the other.

Several.

Several is an attribute, denoting originally one thing severed from others. But this sense seems to be now confined to technical law language ; as a " joint and *several* estate." In common use, it is always plural, expressive of an indefinite number, not very large. It is frequently a substitute ; as " *Several* of my unknown correspondents."

Spectator. 281.

Some.

The attribute *some* is often used as a substitute; as "Some talk of subjects they do not understand; others praise virtue who do not practice it." *Johnson.*

Each, every, either, neither.

Each is a distributive attribute, used to denote every individual of a number, separately considered; as "The king of Israel and the king of Judah sat *each* on his throne." "Thou also and Aaron, take *each* of you his censer." "The *four* beasts had *each* of them six wings."

In these passages, *each* is a substitute for the name of the two persons, one separate from the other.*

Every denotes all the individuals of a number considered separately; it is therefore a distributive attribute, but sometimes a substitute, chiefly in the law style; as "*every* of the clauses and conditions." It is generally followed by the name to which it belongs, or by the cardinal number *one*.

We sometimes see *every* separated from its name by the definitive *the* and an attribute of the superlative degree; as "every the least variation." *Locke.*

Either and *neither* are usually classed with the conjunctions; but in strictness, they are always attributes or substitutes. Their correllatives *or* and *nor*, tho considered as conjunctions, belong to the latter class of words—*or* being merely an abbreviation of *other*, and *nor* being the same word with the Saxon negative prefixed *ne-other*; as will be hereafter shown.

* *Each* is often applied to *two* only, but its original sense in the Celtic and Saxon, and its present sense is *every one of any number individually considered*. "Hwat oththe hu mycel *ælc* mann hafde the land-sittende was innan Engla-lande." What or how much *each man* had that was resident in England. *Saxon Chron.* 186.

Either and *or* denote an alternative ; as “ I will take *either* road at your pleasure.” That is, I will take one road or the other. In this use, *either* is an attribute.

Either is also a substitute for a name ; as “ *Either* of the roads is good.” It also represents a sentence or a clause of a sentence ; as “ No man can serve two masters, for *either*, he will hate the one and love the other, or else,” &c. *Mat.* 6. 24. To understand the true import of *either*, let *or* be also reduced back to its original orthography, “ for *either*, he will hate the one and love the other ; *other* else he will hold to the one and despise the other.” Here we are presented with the sentence as it would have stood in the Saxon ; and we see two distinct affirmations, to the first of which is prefixed *either*, and to the last *other*. These words then are substitutes for the following sentences, when they are intended to be alternative. *Either* and *or* are therefore signs of an alternative, and may be called *alternatives*.

Either is used also for *each* ; as “ Two thieves were crucified—on *either* side one.” This use of the word is constantly condemned by critics, and as constantly repeated by good writers ; but it was the true original sense of the word, as appears by every Saxon author.

Either is used also to represent an alternative of attributes ; as “ the emotion must be *either*, not violent *or* not durable.” *Camf. Rhet.* 1. 2.

Neither is not *either*, from the Saxon *ne-either* ; and *nor* is *ne-other*, not *other*. As *either* and *or* present an alternative or a choice of two things ; so *neither* and *nor* deny both or the whole of any number of particulars ; as “ Fight *neither* with small *nor* great.” 1 *Kings.* 22. 31. Which sentence when resolved stands thus ; “ Fight not *either* with small, not *other*, with great.” Such is the curious machinery of language !

Neither is also used as an attribute and as a substitute for a name ; as “ *Neither* office is filled, but *neither* of the offices will suit the candidate.*

* As in English *or* is a mere contraction of *other* ; so in Latin, *aut* is a contraction of *alter* ; and what is equally observable, both are the same word, or from the same radical. *Alter*, with the *a* broad, and suppressed, is the Saxon *ofter* or *outher*.

NOTE.....*Or, either, nor* and *neither* are here explained in their true original character; but when they stand for sentences, it is more natural to consider them as *connectives*, under which head I have arranged them.

In general, any attribute [adjective] which describes persons or things with sufficient clearness, without the name to which it strictly belongs, may be used as a substitute; as "The *rich* have many friends"—"Associate with the *wise* and *good*"—"The *future* will resemble the *past*"—"Such is the opinion of the *learned*."

Hereby, thereby and whereby.

In these words and some others formed in like manner, the substitute has the preposition annexed to it, forming a part of the word. *Here, there* and *where*, in these compounds are not *adverbs*, as commonly supposed, but substitutes or pronouns; and the practice of annexing the preposition to them, in *hereby, thereto, whereof*, &c. is of Saxon origin.

"Gif hit sy *her inne*; gif hit sy *east inne*; gif hit sy *north inne*—If it shall be *here in*—if it shall be *east in*—if it shall be *north in*—that is, in this part of the country—in the east or in the north. *L. L. Edw. Conf. 8.*

Here is not given as a noun or pronoun in the Saxon Dictionaries; but was certainly one or the other, originally, like the Latin *hic*. But *there* and *where* stand in the character of substitutes. *There* is the Saxon pronoun *thaer*, he, this or that used in all genders—*Where* is the Gothic relative or substitute, *wharga*, written also *whargis* and *whargo*, who, what or which. *Thereby, whereof, hereto*, are literally *by that—of which—to this*, in an inverted order.

It has been customary to ridicule this class of words as barbarous and inelegant. But nothing is more common than for men to affect contempt for what they do not understand. Contempt of antiquity is generally the offspring of ignorance, and perhaps always so in language. The words here explained are peculiar in their form, but composed of genuine English words, legitimate, and at times, indispensable.

Attributes or adjectives.

The attributes of things are their qualities, the properties which belong to them, or which are ascribed to them, and cannot exist in the abstract. In grammar, the words which express these qualities are usually called *adjectives*, but they may, with much more propriety, be denominated *Attributes* or *Attributives*; as expressing whatever *belongs* to or is *attributed* to things.

Attributes then in grammar are words which denote the qualities inherent in or ascribed to things; as, a *bright* sun; a *splendid* equipage; a *miserable* hut; a *magnificent* house; an *honest* man; an *amiable* woman; *liberal* charity; *false* honor; a *quiet* conscience.

As qualities may exist in various degrees, which may be compared with each other, suitable modes of speech are devised to express these comparative degrees. In English, most attributes admit of *three* degrees of comparison, and a few admit of *four*. There are therefore *four* degrees of comparison.

The *first* denotes a slight degree of the quality, and is expressed by the termination *ish*; as *reddish*, *brownish*, *yellowish*. This may be denominated the *imperfect* degree of the attribute.

The *second* denotes such a degree of the attribute as to constitute an absolute or distinct quality; as *red*, *brown*, *great*, *small*, *brave*, *wise*. This is called the *positive* degree.

The *third* denotes a greater or less degree of a quality, than exists in another object, with which it is compared; as, *greater*, *smaller*, *braver*, *wiser*. This is called the *comparative* degree.

The *fourth* denotes the utmost or least degree of a quality; as, *bravest*, *wisest*, *poorest*, *smallest*. This is called the *superlative* degree.

The imperfect degree is formed by adding *ish* to an attribute; as *yellow*, *yellowish*. If the attribute ends in *e*, this vowel is omitted; as *white*, *whitish*.

The comparative degree is formed by adding *r* to attributes ending with *e*; as *wise, wiser*—and by adding *er* to words ending with a consonant; as *cold, colder*—or by prefixing *more* or *less*; as *more just, less noble*.

The superlative degree is formed by adding *st* to attributes ending with *e*; as *wise, wisest*—and *est* to those which end with a consonant; as *cold, coldest*—or by prefixing *most* and *least*; as *most brave, least charitable*.

Every attribute susceptible of comparison, may be compared by *more* and *most*, *less* and *least*. *

All monosyllables admit of *er* and *est*, and dissyllables when the addition may be easily pronounced; as *happy, happier, happiest*; *lofty, loftier, loftiest*. But few words of more syllables than one will admit of *er* and *est*. Hence most attributes of more syllables than one are compared by *more* and *most*, *less* and *least*; as *more fallible, most upright, less generous, least splendid*. †

* In all our grammars, we find *more* and *most*, *less*, *least*, and *very*, when prefixed to attributes, denominated *adverbs*. If we urge that the adverbs of *most* and *very*, are *mostly* and *verily*, we are told, that *most* and *very*, are used *adverbially*, and are therefore to be classed with adverbs. Such are the mistakes of *false names* and a *false theory*! Had our critics never learnt the grammar of any language but our own, they never would have formed such a distinction; for nothing can be more groundless. The words under consideration, wherever placed, whether before nouns, adjectives, or adverbs, have but *one* use only—which is, to *qualify the sense of the words* to which they are prefixed. Before nouns they denote an increase or diminution of the *thing* expressed: as *more men, less honesty*. Before attributes, they mark an increase or diminution of the *quality*; as *more brave, less profligate*. Before adverbs or modifiers, they denote an increase or diminution of the *degree* or *manner* expressed by the words; as *more wisely, most generously, less bravely, least viciously*. Thus these words have a uniform character and use—that is, they *qualify* the sense of names, attributes, and modifiers—they are the *attributes* or *attributives* of the words to which they are prefixed; and as they have but *one use*, so they are entitled to but *one name*.

† It is well known to antiquaries and philologists that our language and the Latin had a common origin. In the use of *more* and *most*, we have a remarkable proof of this fact, which seems to have escaped notice. The fact is, that *more* and *most*, or the radical words, form the terminations of the regular comparative and superlative

When attributes end in *y* after a consonant, this letter is dropped, and *i* substituted before *er* and *est*; as lofty, loftier, loftiest.

perlative degrees of attributes in the Latin language. *Tristior* is simply an abbreviation of *tristis-more*, and *tristissimus* of *tristis-most*. It appears from the place which these qualifying words occupy, that the primitive arrangement was the natural one—that is, the attribute, being the most important word, was uttered first, and the qualifying term was subjoined—*tristis-more*. In the rapidity of a familiar utterance, these words were incorporated into one; the last letters of the attribute being retrenched or varied, as ease or melody distated—pulcher-more, pulchrior—pulcher-most, pulcherrimus—recens, recentis, recentis-more, recentior—recentis-most, recentissimus. We probably see the same words in the terminations of irregular attributes—*minimus*, *maximus*—*pejor*, *pessimus*, &c.

It is equally worthy of our notice, that the English language has preserved a few words, in which the qualifiers are annexed to the end of the attribute; as fore-most, hind-most, upper-most, under-most, nether-most, ut-most, utter-most, northern-most, southern-most, eastern-most, western-most.

But what will the English student say, when he is informed, that the regular terminations of the comparative and superlative degrees of English attributes, *er* and *est*, are mere contractions of *more* and *most*? *Wiser*, *wisest* are mere abbreviations of *wise-more*, *wise-most*.

To perceive the reason of the contraction into *er* and *est*, rather than into *or* and *est*, we must refer to the Saxon, in which the words were spelt *mere* and *mæst*. We have not however managed these qualifiers so advantageously as the Romans did; for they modified their orthography in such a manner as to incorporate them with words of any number of syllables, without impairing the melody of the pronunciation; whereas we are limited in the use of the terminations *er* and *est* to monosyllables and a very few dissyllables.

These modifying words must have been coeval with the original language, which was the parent of the Greek and Latin, and all the Teutonic dialects; for we see *more* or *mo* in the Latin *major*, and the French *mais*; and we see *more* and *most* in the Saxon *mere* and *mæst*; the German *mehr*, *meist*; the Dutch *meer* and *meest*. The Germans and Dutch also use these words to form the comparative and superlative attributes; as gross, grøsser, grøst—great, greater, greatest—*ryk*, *ryker*, *rykest*, rich, richer, richest.

More and the ancient *mo*, are supposed to be derived from the Hebrew *mæe*, to dilate or extend. The word *more* is found in all the Celtic and Teutonic dialects. In the Celtic it had the sense of great, and was united to names to augment their signification, as in the Irish *fionmhur*, abounding with wine—*mordhalach*, arrogance;

A few attributes have different words or irregular terminations for expressing the degrees of comparison; as *good, better best; bad or evil, worse, worst; fore, former, first; little, less or lesser, least; much, more, most; near, nearer, nearest or next; old, older, oldest or eldest; late, later, latest or last.*

When qualities are incapable of increase or diminution, the words which express them do not admit of comparison. Such are the numerals, *first, second, third, &c.* attributes of mathematical figures, as *square, spherical, rectangular*—for it will readily appear, that if a thing is *first* or *square*, it cannot be more so.

The sense of attributes however is not restricted to the modification, expressed by the common signs of comparison; but may be varied in an indefinite number of ways, by other words. Thus the attribute *very*, which is the French *vrai*, true, formerly written *veray*, is much used intensively to express a great degree of a quality, but not the greatest; as *very wise or learned.* In like manner are used *much, far, extremely, exceedingly*, and most of the modifiers in *ly.*

Some attributes, from particular appropriate uses, have received names, by which they are distinguished. But the usual classification is by no means correct. The following distribution seems to result from the uses of the words named.

An or a, the, this, that, these, those, other, another, one, none, some, may be called *definitives*, from their office, which is to limit or define the extent of the name to which they are prefixed, or to specify particulars.

My, thy, her, our, your, their; and mine, thine, his, when used as attributes, with names, are *possessive attributes*, as they denote possession or ownership. *Its* and *whose*, if ranked with attributes, belong to the same class.

Each and *every* are *distributives*, but they may be classed with the *definitives*.

gance; and probably from continued use, in this manner, it came to express comparison. *Most*, in the Icelandic, signifies *greatest*; *mikil, meire, mest*, great, greater, greatest. *Better* and *best* are from the Celtic *mat*, good; *m* and *b* being convertible.

Either is an *alternative*, as is *or*, which is now considered merely as a connective.

Own is an *intensive* attribute.* The words to which *self* is affixed, *himself*, *myself*, *themselves*, *yourself*, *yourselves*, *ourselves*, *thysself*, *itself*, may be demominated *intensive substitutes*, or for brevity, *intensives*. Or they may be called *compound substitutes*.

Who, *which*, *what*, may be called *connective substitutes*, for sake of distinction; tho they are interrogatives also. *Who* is always a substitute. *Which* and *what* are either substitutes or attributes.

Verbs.

The verb is a *primary* part of speech, and next to the *name* or noun, is of the most importance. The uses of the verb are,

1st. To affirm, assert or declare; as the sun shines; John loves study; God is just; and negatively; avarice is not commendable.

2d. To command, exhort or invite; as go, attend, let us observe.

3d. To pray, request, entreat; as O may the spirit of grace dwell in us.

4. To inquire, or question; as does it rain? Will he come?

From the various uses and significations of verbs, have originated several divisions or classes. The only one in English which seems to be correct and sufficiently comprehensive, is, into *transitive* and *intransitive*. To these may be added a combination of the verb *be*, with certain auxiliars and verbals, which is called a *passive verb*.†

* *Own* is a corruption of *agenne*, or *agen*, from the Saxon verb *agan*, to possess.

† The common distribution into *active*, *neuter* and *passive*, is very objectionable. Many of our neuter verbs imply action in a pre-eminent degree, as to *run*, to *walk*, to *fly*; and the young learner cannot easily conceive why such verbs are not called *active*.

1st. A *transitive* verb denotes action or energy, which is exerted upon some object, or in producing some effect. In natural construction, the word expressing the object, follows the verb, without the intervention of any other word, tho' the order may be sometimes varied. Thus "ridicule provokes anger," is a complete proposition—*ridicule* is the agent or nominative word, which causes the action—*provoke* is the verb, or affirmation of an act—*anger* is the object or effect produced, following the transitive verb *provoke*.

"The wind propels a ship," is the affirmation of an act of the wind exerted upon a ship. *Wind* is the agent, *propels* the verb, and *ship*, the object.

2. An *intransitive* verb denotes simple being or existence in a certain state; as *to be, to rest*: Or it denotes action, which is limited to the subject. Thus, "*John sleeps*," is an affirmation, in which *John*, the nominative to *sleeps*, is the subject of the affirmation; *sleeps* is a verb intransitive, affirming a particular thing of *John*, which extends to no other object.

3. The *passive* verb in English is formed by adding certain auxiliars and participles to the verb *be*. It denotes passion or suffering; that is, that the subject of the affirmation or nominative is affected by the action affirmed; as "John is convinced." "Laura is loved and admired."

In this form of the verb, the agent and object change places. In the transitive form the agent precedes the verb, and the object follows; as "John has convinced Moses." In the passive form the order is changed, and the agent follows the verb preceded by a preposition; as "Moses is convinced by John."

To correspond with their nominatives, verbs are used in both numbers, and with the three persons in each.

As action and being may be mentioned as present, past and future, verbs have modifications to express time, which are called *tenses*. And as action and being may be represented in various ways, verbs have various modifications to answer these purposes, called *modes* or *moods*. Hence to verbs belong person, number, tense and mode.

The persons, which have been already explained, are, I, thou or you, he, she, it, in the singular number ; in the plural, we, ye or you, they. The numbers have been before explained.

Tenses.

There are *six tenses* or modifications of the verb to express time. Each of these is divided into two forms, for the purpose of distinguishing the *definite* or *precise* time from the *indefinite*. These may be thus explained and exemplified.—

Present tense, indefinite.

This form of the present tense affirms or denies action or being, in present time, without limiting it with exactness to a given point. It expresses also facts which exist generally, at all times, general truths, attributes which are permanent, habits, customary actions, and the like, without reference to a specific time ; as God *is* infinitely great and just ; man *is* imperfect and dependent ; plants *spring* from the earth ; birds *fly* ; fishes *swim*.

Present tense, definite.

This form expresses the present time with precision ; usually denoting action or being which corresponds in time with another action ; as *I am writing*, while *you are waiting*.

Past tense, indefinite.

This form of the past tense represents action which took place at a given time past, however distant and completely past ; as “ In six days, God *created* the heavens and the

earth." "Alexander *conquered* the Persians." "Scipio *was* as virtuous as brave." "The Earl of Chatham *was* an eloquent statesman."

Past tense, definite [imperfect.]

This form represents an action as taking place and unfinished in some specified period of past time; as "I *was standing* at the door when the procession passed."

Perfect tense, indefinite.

This form of the perfect tense represents an action completely past, and often at no great distance, but not specified; as "*I have accomplished my design.*" But if a particular time is named, the tense must be the *past*; as "I accomplished my design last week." "I have seen my friend last week," is not correct English. In this respect, the French idiom is different from the English, for "J' ai vu mon ami hier" is good French, but "I have seen my friend yesterday," is not good English. The words must be translated "I saw my friend yesterday. No fault is more common than a mistranslation of this tense.

It is to be noted however that this perfect indefinite tense, is that in which we express *continued* or *repeated* action; "My father *has lived* about eighty years." "The king *has reigned* more than forty years." "He *has been frequently heard* to lament." *Life of Cowper*. We use it also when a specified past time is represented, if that time is expressed as *a part of the present period*. Thus, altho we cannot say "We have been together yesterday," we usually say "We have been together this morning, or this evening." We even use this tense in mentioning events which happened at a greater distance of time, if we connect that time with the present; as "his brother has visited him once within two years." "He has not seen his sister, since the year 1800."

Perfect tense, definite.

This form represents an action as just finished ; as “I *have been reading* a history of the revolution in France.”

*Prior-past tense, indefinite** [pluperfect.]

This form of the prior past tense expresses an action which was past at or before some other past time specified ; as “he *had received* the news before the messenger arrived.”

Prior-past, definite.

This form denotes an action to be just past, at or before another past time specified ; as “I *had been reading* your letter when the messenger arrived.”

Future tense, indefinite.

This form of the future tense gives notice of an event to happen hereafter ; as, “Your son *will obtain* a commission in the navy.” “We *shall have* a fine season.”

Future tense, definite.

This form expresses an action which is to take place and be unfinished at a specified future time ; as “He *will be preparing* for a visit, at the time you arrive.”

* This name, *prior-past*, is infinitely preferable to the usual one, *preter-pluperfect*, or *pluperfect*.

Prior-future, indefinite.

This form of the future tense denotes an action which will be past at a future time specified; as "They *will have performed* their task, by the appointed hour."

Prior-future, definite.

This form represents an action which will be just past at a future specified time; as "We *shall have been making* preparations a week before our friends arrive."*

In the use of the present tense, the following things are to be noticed.

1st. The present tense is customarily used to express future time, when by any mode of expression, the mind is transported forward to the time, so as to conceive it present; as "I cannot determin, till the mail *arrives*." "As soon as it *is* light, we shall depart." "When he *has* an opportunity, he will write." The words *till, when, as soon as*, carry the mind to the time of an event to happen, and we speak of it as present.

2. By an easy transition, the imagination passes from an author to his writings; these being in existence and present, tho long after his decease, we substitute the writer's name for his works, and speak of him as living, or in

* The common names and distribution of the tenses, are so utterly incorrect and incompetent to give a just idea of their uses, that I have ventured to offer a new division, retaining the old names, as far as truth will warrant. The terms *prior-past*, and *prior-future*, are so perfectly descriptive of the tenses arranged under them, that I cannot but think they will be well received. The distinction of indefinite and definite is not wholly new; but I have never seen the definite forms displayed, though they are as necessary as the indefinite forms. Indeed, I see not how a foreigner can learn our language, as the tenses are commonly distributed and defined.

the present tense ; thus, Milton *resembles* Homer in sublimity and invention, as Pope *resembles* Virgil, in smoothness of versification. Plato *is* fanciful ; Aristotle *is* profound.

3. It gives great life and effect to description, in prose or verse, to represent past events as present ; to introduce them to the view of the reader or hearer, as having a present existence. Hence the frequent use of the present tense for the future, by the historian, the poet and the orator :

“ She spoke ; Minerva *burns* to meet the war ;
And now heaven’s empress *calls* the blazing car ;
At her command *rush* forth the steeds divine,
Rich with immortal gold, the trappings shine.”

Iliad. 5.

The definite tenses, it will be observed, are formed by the verbal or participle of the present tense, and the substantive verb, *be*. This verbal always expresses present time, even when annexed to a past or future tense ; for *I was writing*, denotes that, at the past time mentioned, the action was present ; *I shall be writing*, denotes future time, but an action then to be present.

The past tense of every regular verb ends in *ed—d* being added to a verb ending in *e* ; and *ed* to a verb with other terminations ; as hate, hated ; look, looked.

The future tense is formed of the present tense of *shall* and *will* ; for, I shall go, he will go, are merely an appropriate use of *I shall to go, I will to go*. See an explanation of these words under the head of auxiliars.

There are other modes of expressing future time ; as “ I am going to write ” — “ I am about to write. ” These have been called the *inceptive* future, as they note the commencement of an action, or an intention to commence an action without delay.

We have another mode of expression, which does not strictly and positively foretel an action, yet it implies a necessity of performing an act, and clearly indicates that it will take place. For example, “ I *have to pay* a sum of money to-morrow. ” That is, I am under a *present* necessity or obligation to do a *future* act.

The substantive verb followed by a radical verb, forms another idiomatic expression of future time; as "John *is to command* a regiment." "Eneas went in search of the seat of an empire which *was, one day, to command* the world." The latter expression is a future past—that is, *past* as to the narrator; but *future* as to the event, at the time specified.

Modes.

Mode, in grammar, is the manner of representing action and being, or the wishes and determinations of the mind. This is performed by inflections of the verb, or by combinations of verbs with auxiliars, and verbals or participles, and by their various positions.

As there are scarcely two authors who are agreed in the number and denominations of the modes in English, I shall offer a distribution of the verbs, and a display of their inflections and combinations, somewhat different from any which I have seen.

1. The first and most simple form of the verb, is, the verb without inflections, and unconnected with persons. This form usually has the prefix *to*; as *to love*. *To* denotes *act, motion, purpose* or *effect*. The use of it is to convert a name into a verb; for *love* being the name of a certain passion, *to love*, is, *act* or *motion to love*. Such is the primary use of *to* before verbs.

This form of the verb, not being restricted to person or number, is usually called the *Infinitive Mode*.—*Indefinite Mode* would be preferable; and I should still prefer to either, the terms *Radical Verb*. *

2. Another use of the verb is to *affirm, assert, or declare* some action or existence, either positively, as *he runs*, or

*The general use of *to* for forming the infinitive mode, is of modern date. The Saxons had a distinct termination for the Infinitive verbs; as *gifan*, to give. But *to* in Greek had a use nearly similar to its modern use in English.

negatively, as *you are not in health*. This form is called the *Indicative Mode*—tho *declarative* would be more appropriate.

3. Another office of the verb is to command, direct, ask, or exhort; as *arise, make haste, let us be content*. This is called the *Imperative Mode*.

4. Another form of the verb is used to declare the power, liberty, possibility, or necessity of action or being, by means of certain words called auxiliars, as *may, can, must, &c.* This form is called the *Potential Mode*; as *I may or can write; he must wait*.*

5. Another use of verbs is to represent actions or events which are uncertain, conditional or contingent; as *if he shall go; if they would attend*. This is called the *Subjunctive Mode*; but would better be denominated the *Conditional*. The Indicative and Potential become *conditional*, by means of words used to express condition; as *if, tho, unless, whether*.

The *MODES* then are five.—The Infinitive or Radical Verb, the Indicative or Declarative, the Infinitive, the Potential, and the Conditional. But the Infinitive might be discarded without inconvenience.

It may also be observed that the combinations, and arrangements of our verbs and auxiliars, to express negative and interrogative propositions, are really *modes* of the verb, and a place might be assigned to the verb for each purpose, were it not for the inconvenience of having *modes of modes*. For the sake of distinction, I denominate these verbs *interrogative* and *negative*, and have exhibited the conjugation of each.

* This mode is inserted in compliance with the opinion of many Grammarians; but in opposition to my own. It is in fact the Indicative mode, affirming the *power, &c.* of acting, instead of the act itself.

Verbals or Participles.

Verbals, commonly called participles, are derivatives from *verbs*, formed by particular terminations, and having the sense of verbs, attributes or names.

There are two species of verbals—one denoting present time, and formed by adding *ing* to the verb: as *turn*, *turning*; or when the verb ends with *e*, by dropping that letter and adding *ing*; as *place*, *placing*. But *e* is retained in *dyeing*, from *dye*, to color, to distinguish it from *dying*, the verbal of *die*; in which word, *y* is used to prevent the duplication of *i*. In *singeing*, from *singe*, *e* is retained to soften *g*, and to distinguish the word from *singing*; so also in *twingeing*.

This verbal of the present tense, is used, as before observed, to form the definite tenses. But it often loses the sense of the verb, and becomes an attribute; as a *loving* friend, *lasting* friendship. In this use, it admits of comparison by more and less, most and least; as *more lasting*, *less saving*, *most promising*. The verbal, in this use, may be called a *verbal attribute*.

This verbal also becomes a modifier by receiving the termination *ly*; as *lovingly*, *laughingly*: and this species of modifiers admits of comparison, as *more lovingly*, *most charmingly*.

This verbal also becomes a name and admits of the definitives; as "The *burning* of London in 1666." In this capacity, it takes the plural form, as "the *overflowings* of the Nile"—"He seeth all his *goings*." And sometimes the plural is used when a modifier is attached to the verbal; as "the *goings out*, the *comings in*." *Ezek.* 43. 11. But this use of the verbal is not esteemed elegant, nor is it common.

In a few instances, the verbal in *ing* becomes a name by receiving the termination *ness*; as *willingness*, from *willing*.

The other species of verbal or participle is formed from the verb, by adding *d* or *ed*, and in regular verbs, it corresponds exactly with the past time; as *loved*, *proceeded*. This may be called the verbal of the *perfect* tense.

This verbal, when its verb is *transitive*, may be joined with the verb *be*, in all its inflections, to form a passive verb, and the verbal, in such combination, is called *passive*.

But

This verbal, when formed from an *intransitive* verb, cannot, except in a few instances, be joined to the substantive verb, or used in a passive sense: but it unites with the other auxiliars.

This verbal often loses its verbal character, and becomes an attribute; as a *concealed* plot, a *pointed* house. In this character, it admits of comparison; as "a more admired artist," "a most respected magistrate;" and a few of these verbal attributes receive the termination *ly*, and become modifiers; as *pointedly*, *more conceitedly*, *most dejectedly*.

Those verbs, whose past tense and participle end in *ed*, are deemed regular. All which deviate from this rule, are deemed irregular, and their verbals of the perfect tense end mostly in *t*, *n* and *g*. A list of them will be found in the sequel.

Auxiliars.

In English, a few monosyllabic verbs are chiefly employed to form the modes and tenses of other verbs, and from this use, are denominated *auxiliars*, or *helping verbs*. These are followed by other verbs, without the prefix *to*; as "he may go;" tho they were originally principal verbs, and some of them still retain that character, as well as that of auxiliars.

The verbs which are always auxiliary to others, are *may*, *can*, *shall*, *must*; those which are sometimes auxiliars, and sometimes principal verbs, are, *will*, *have*, *do*, and *be*. To these may be added *need* and *dare*.

May conveys the idea of *liberty* or permission; as "he may go, if he will." Or it denotes *possibility*; as "he may have written or not."*

* The primitive idea expressed by *may* was *power*; Sax. *magan* to be able.

Can, which is from the same radical as *ken* and *con*, to see and *know*, has now the sense of *to be able*.

Shall, in its primitive sense, denotes *to be obliged*, coinciding nearly with *ought*; which sense it retains in the German. But this signification, tho' evidently the root of the present uses of this word, is much obscured. The following remarks will illustrate the several uses of *will* and *shall*.

Will has a common origin with the Latin *volo*. Hence the German *wollen*, the old English *woll*, and the present contraction *won't*, that is, *woll-not*.*

This was originally a principal verb, and is still used as such in our language. It denotes the act of the mind in determining, or a determination; for he *wills to go*, and he *will go*, are radically of the same import.

When a man expresses his own determination of mind, *I will*, we are accustomed to consider the event, or act willed, as certain; for we naturally connect the power to act, with the intention; hence we make the declaration of *will* a ground of confidence, and by an easy association of ideas, we connect the declaration, with an *obligation* to carry the determination into effect. Hence *will*, expressed by a person himself, came to denote a *promise*.

But when a person declares the will of another, he is not supposed to possess the power to decide for him, and to carry his will into effect. He merely offers an opinion, grounded on information or probable circumstances, which give him more or less confidence of an event depending on another's will. Hence *will* in the second and third person simply *foretells*, or expresses an opinion of what will take place.

Shall, in some of its inflections, retains its primitive sense—*to be obliged*, or *bound in duty*; but in many of its uses, its sense is much varied. In the first person, it merely foretells; as "I shall go to New-York to-morrow." In this phrase, the word seems to have no reference to *obligation*; nor is it considered by a second person as imposing any obligation on the person uttering it. But when *shall*

* It is supposed that the Roman τ was pronounced as our *w*, *wols*.

is used in the *second* and *third* persons, it resumes its primitive sense, or one nearly allied to it, implying obligation; as when a superior commands with authority, *you shall go*; or implying a right in the second and third person to expect, and hence denoting a promise in the speaker; as "*you shall receive your wages.*" This is radically saying "*you ought to receive your wages;*" but this *right* in the second person to receive, implies an *obligation* in the person speaking to pay. Hence *shall* in the first person *foretells*; in the second, *promises, commands, or expresses determination*. When *shall* in the second and third persons, is uttered with emphasis, it expresses *determination* in the speaker, and implies an authority to enforce the act. "*You shall go.*"

Must expresses necessity, and has no variation for person, number or tense.

Do is a principal and a transitive verb, signifying *to act or make*; but is used in the present and past tenses as an auxiliar, to give emphasis to a declaration, to denote contrast, or to supply the place of the principal verb.

"It would have been impossible for Cicero to inflame the minds of the people to so high a pitch against *oppression*, considered in the abstract, as he actually *did* inflame them against Verres the *oppressor.*" *Camp. Rhet.* 1. 10. Here *did* expresses emphasis.

"It was hardly possible that he should not distinguish you as he has *done.*" *Cowp. Let.* 40. Here *done* stands in the place of *distinguished you*. For it must be observed that when *do* is the substitute for another verb, it supplies the place not only of the *verb*, but of the *object* of the verb.

—————"He loves not plays
As thou *dost*, Anthony."

That is, as *thou lovest plays*.

Do is also used in negative and interrogative sentences; the present and past tenses of the Indicative Mode being chiefly formed by this auxiliar; as "I *do* not reside in Boston." *Does* John hold a commission?

Have is also a principal and transitive verb, denoting *to possess*; but much used as an auxiliar; as "He *has* lately

been to Hamburg." It is often used to supply the place of a principal verb or verbal, preventing a repetition of it, and the object after it; as "I have not seen Paris, but my brother has"—that is, *has seen Paris*.

Equally common and extensive is the use of *be*, denoting existence, and hence called the *substantive* verb. Either in the character of a principal verb, or an auxiliary, it is found in almost every sentence of the language.

The inflection of a verb, in all the modes, tenses, numbers and persons, is termed *Conjugation*. The English verbs have few inflexions, or changes of termination; most of the tenses and modes being formed by means of the auxiliars.

NOTE. In the following conjugations, a small *n* in an Italic character, is inserted in the place where *not* should stand in negative sentences. The same place is generally occupied by *never*, but not in every case. It is believed this letter will be very useful, especially to foreigners. The learner may conjugate the verb with or without *not*, at pleasure.

Conjugation of the Auxiliars.

MAY.

Present Tense.

	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1st. Person,	I may <i>n</i>	We may <i>n</i>
2d. Person,	{ Thou mayst <i>n</i>	{ Ye may <i>n</i>
	{ You may <i>n</i> *	
3d. Person.	{ <i>mas.</i> He may <i>n</i>	They may <i>n</i>
	{ <i>fem.</i> She may <i>n</i>	
	{ <i>neut.</i> It may <i>n</i>	

* It may be remarked once for all, that *thou* and *ye* are the second person used in the sacred style; and sometimes in other grave discourses. In all other cases, *you* is the second person of the singular number, as well as of the plural. It is not one of the most trivial absurdities which the student must now encounter at every step, in the study of English grammar, that he meets with *you* in the plural number only, though he finds it the representative of an individual.

Past Tense.

I might <i>n</i>	We might <i>n</i>
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i>	{ Ye might <i>n</i>
{ You might <i>n</i>	{ You might <i>n</i>
He might <i>n</i>	They might <i>n</i>

CAN.

Present Tense.

I can <i>n</i>	We can <i>n</i>
{ Thou canst <i>n</i>	{ Ye can <i>n</i>
{ You can <i>n</i>	{ You can <i>n</i>
He can <i>n</i>	They can <i>n</i>

Past Tense.

I could <i>n</i>	We could <i>n</i>
{ Thou couldst <i>n</i>	{ Ye could <i>n</i>
{ You could <i>n</i>	{ You could <i>n</i>
He could <i>n</i>	They could <i>n</i>

SHALL.

Present Tense.

I shall <i>n</i>	We shall <i>n</i>
{ Thou shalt <i>n</i>	{ Ye shall <i>n</i>
{ You shall <i>n</i>	{ You shall <i>n</i>
He shall <i>n</i>	They shall <i>n</i>

Past Tense.

I should <i>n</i>	We should <i>n</i>
{ Thou shouldst <i>n</i>	{ Ye should <i>n</i>
{ You should <i>n</i>	{ You should <i>n</i>
He should <i>n</i>	They should <i>n</i>

WILL.

Present Tense.

I will <i>n</i>	We will <i>n</i>
{ Thou wilt <i>n</i>	{ Ye will <i>n</i>
{ You will <i>n</i>	{ You will <i>n</i>
He will <i>n</i>	They will <i>n</i>

Past Tense.

I would <i>n</i>	We would <i>n</i>
{ Thou wouldst <i>n</i>	{ Ye would <i>n</i>
{ You would <i>n</i>	{ You would <i>n</i>
He would <i>n</i>	They would <i>n</i>

NOTE. *Will*, when a principal verb, is regularly conjugated; I will, thou wilt, he wills. Past tense, *I willed*.

MUST.

Must has no change of termination, and is joined with verbs only in the following tenses.

Present Tense.

I must <i>n</i> love	We must <i>n</i> love
{ Thou must <i>n</i> love	{ Ye must <i>n</i> love
{ You must <i>n</i> love	{ You must <i>n</i> love
He must <i>n</i> love	They must <i>n</i> love.

Perfect Tense.

I must <i>n</i> have loved	We must <i>n</i> have loved
{ Thou must <i>n</i> have loved	{ Ye must <i>n</i> have loved
{ You must <i>n</i> have loved	{ You must <i>n</i> have loved
He must <i>n</i> have loved	They must <i>n</i> have loved.

DO.

Indicative or Declarative Mode.

Present Tense.

I do <i>n</i> love	We do <i>n</i> love
{ Thou dost <i>n</i> love	{ Ye do <i>n</i> love
{ You do <i>n</i> love.	{ You do <i>n</i> love
He does or doth <i>n</i> love.	They do <i>n</i> love.

Past Tense.

I did <i>n</i> love	We did <i>n</i> love
{ Thou didst <i>n</i> love	{ Ye did <i>n</i> love
{ You did <i>n</i> love	{ You did <i>n</i> love
He did <i>n</i> love	They did <i>n</i> love.

Radical Verb.

To do.

Verbals or Participles.

Doing, done ; having done.

NOTE. In the third person singular of the present tense, *doth* is used in sacred and solemn language ; *does*, in common and familiar language. This verb, when principal and transitive, has all the tenses and modes, I have done, I had done, I will do, &c.

HAVE.

Radical Verb, or Infinitive Mode, Present Tense.

To have.

Perfect Tense.

To have had.

Verbal, or Participle of the Present Tense.

Having.

Of the Perfect Tense.

Had.

Compound.

Having had.

H

Declarative or Indicative Mode.

Present Tense.

I have <i>n</i>	We have <i>n</i>
{ Thou hast <i>n</i>	{ Ye have <i>n</i>
{ You have <i>n</i>	{ You have <i>n</i>
He has or hath <i>n</i> *	They have <i>n</i>

Past Tense.

I had <i>n</i>	We had <i>n</i>
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i>	{ Ye had <i>n</i>
{ You had <i>n</i>	{ You had <i>n</i>
He had <i>n</i>	They had <i>n</i>

NOTE. In the foregoing tenses, this verb is used either as a principal verb or an auxiliar.

Perfect Tense.

I have <i>n</i> had	We have <i>n</i> had
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> had	{ Ye have <i>n</i> had
{ You have <i>n</i> had	{ You have <i>n</i> had
He has or hath <i>n</i> had	They have <i>n</i> had.

Prior-past Tense.

I had <i>n</i> had	We had <i>n</i> had
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> had	{ Ye had <i>n</i> had
{ You had <i>n</i> had	{ You had <i>n</i> had
He had <i>n</i> had	They had <i>n</i> had.

NOTE. In these tenses, the *perfect* and *prior-past*, this verb is always principal and transitive.

Future Tense.

In this tense, the verb is principal or auxiliary, with the same form of conjugation.

* *Hath* is used in the solemn style; *has* in the familiar.

The following form foretells :

I shall <i>n</i> have	We shall <i>n</i> have
{ Thou wilt <i>n</i> have	{ Ye will <i>n</i> have
{ You will <i>n</i> have	{ You will <i>n</i> have
He will <i>n</i> have.	They will <i>n</i> have.

The following form promises, commands or determines.

I will <i>n</i> have	We will <i>n</i> have
{ Thou shalt <i>n</i> have	{ Ye shall <i>n</i> have
{ You shall <i>n</i> have	{ You shall <i>n</i> have
He shall <i>n</i> have	They shall <i>n</i> have.

Prior-Future.

This tense foretells, and is used only when the verb is principal.

I shall <i>n</i> have had	We shall <i>n</i> have had
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> have had	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> have had
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have had	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have had
He shall or will <i>n</i> have had	They shall or will <i>n</i> have had.

NOTE. *Will* is not used in the first person of this tense ; it being incompatible with the nature of a promise. We cannot say, "*I will have had* possession a year, on the first of October next ;" but *I shall have had*, is a common expression.

Imperative Mode.

Sing.

Have *n* or have thou *n*
 Have you *n* or do *n* you have
 Let me *n* have
 Let him *n* have

Plural.

Have ye *n*, have you *n*
 Do *n* you have
 Let us *n* have
 Let them *n* have.

NOTE. A command, request or exhortation, must, in the nature of things, be addressed to the *second* person; nor can these phrases, *let me have, let us have*, be considered, in strictness, as the first person of this mode; nor *let him have*, as the third; but they answer to the first and third persons of this mode in other languages, and the mere naming of them is wholly immaterial.

The true force and effect of the verb, in this mode, depend on its application to characters, and the manner of utterance. *Come, go, let him go*, if uttered with a respectful address, or in a civil manner, may express entreaty, request or exhortation. On the other hand, such words uttered with a tone of authority, and addressed to inferiors, express command.

Potential Mode.

Present Tense.

In the following tense, this verb is either auxiliary or principal.

I may or can <i>n</i> have	We may or can <i>n</i> have
{ Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i>	{ Ye may or can <i>n</i> have
{ have	{ You may or can <i>n</i> have
{ You may or can <i>n</i> have	{ They may or can <i>n</i> have
He may or can <i>n</i> have	

Must is used in the foregoing tense, and in the perfect also.

Past Tense.

In this tense, the verb is principal or auxiliary.

I might <i>n</i> have	We might <i>n</i> have
I should <i>n</i> have	We should <i>n</i> have
I could <i>n</i> have	We could <i>n</i> have
I would <i>n</i> have	We would <i>n</i> have
Thou mightest <i>n</i> have	Ye might <i>n</i> have
Thou shouldst <i>n</i> have	Ye should <i>n</i> have
Thou couldst <i>n</i> have	Ye could <i>n</i> have
Thou wouldst <i>n</i> have	Ye would <i>n</i> have

You might *n* have
 You should *n* have
 You could *n* have
 You would *n* have

You might *n* have
 You should *n* have
 You could *n* have
 You would *n* have

He might *n* have
 He should *n* have
 He could *n* have
 He would *n* have

They might *n* have
 They should *n* have
 They could *n* have
 They would *n* have.

Perfect Tense.

In this tense, *have* is a principal verb only.

I may <i>n</i> have had	We may <i>n</i> have had
{ Thou mayest <i>n</i> have had	{ Ye may <i>n</i> have had
{ You may <i>n</i> have had	{ You may <i>n</i> have had
He may <i>n</i> have had	They may <i>n</i> have had

Prior-past Tense—the principal verb only.

I might <i>n</i> have had	We	} might <i>n</i> have had.
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> have had	Ye	
{ You might <i>n</i> have had	You	
He might <i>n</i> have had	They	

In the same manner with *should*, *could* and *would*.

There is no future tense, distinct from that of the Indicative Mode.

Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

The Conditional or Subjunctive Mode is the same as the Declarative or Indicative; with some preceding word expressing condition, supposition, or contingency. These words are *if*, *tho* or *altho*, *unless*, *except*, *whether*, *lest*, *albeit*.

If is a corruption of *gif*, the imperative of *gifan*, the Saxon orthography of *give*. *Tho*, the Saxon *theah*, is pro-

bably the same word as the Celtic *thoir*, and Latin *da*, the imperative of the verb *do, dare*, to give. *Altho* is a compound of *all* and *tho*, give or allow all. The old word *thof*, still used in some parts of England, is the imperative of the Saxon *thofian*, to allow. *Unless*, is the imperative of the Saxon *onlysan*, to loose, or dissolve. *Except* is the imperative of that verb. *Whether* is a compound of two Saxon words, *hwæt* and *thar*, *what that*, or *which that*: referring primarily to two following things or sentences; and denoting an alternative, one or the other. "*Hwæther heora sceolde on othrum sige habban—the he on Romanum; the Romane on him.*" *Whether* of them should have the victory over the other—*that*, he over the Romans, or *that*, the Romans over him. *Alf. Oros. 132.* This sentence is a precise illustration of the use of *whether*, which is a compound substitute, *which that*—that is, which of the two declarations which follow; *that*, or *that*. *Lest* is from *lesan*, to lease or dissolve. *Albeit*, is a compound of *all, be* and *it*, let it be so.

These words, *if, tho*, answer in signification and use, to the following; *admit, grant, allow, suppose*, as signs of a condition or hypothesis; "if you shall go," is simply "give, you shall go;" that is, give that condition or fact; allow or suppose it to be so.

It has been, and is still customary for authors to omit the personal terminations of the second and third persons of the verb in the present tense, to form the subjunctive mode; if thou go, if he write. This practice seems to have originated in the Saxon mode of expressing a future contingency; *gif he habbe*, if he have; which was in reality, the future tense, used before *shall* and *will* became the appropriate signs of the future. This has been the source of continual error, in writing conditional sentences; and the error, being very general in the age of Elizabeth and James, was introduced into the translation of the Scriptures, and made the basis of a rule by Dr. Lowth. Thus it happens in the scriptures, as in other writings, the future tense, denoting a *future contingency*, is continually confounded with the present tense, denoting *present uncertainty*.

The correct construction of the subjunctive Mode is precisely the same as that of the indicative; as it is used in popular practice, which has preserved the true idiom of the language; *if thou hast, if he has or hath*; to denote present uncertainty. But a future contingency, may be expressed by the omission of the personal terminations; *if he go*, that is, *if he shall go*.

This principle of our language corresponds with that of the Galic or Erse, the primitive language of Europe; in which a condition is expressed by the indicative mode, with *ma, if*, prefixed. *Shaw's Analysis*, p. 61.

Be.

Be is a verb denoting existence, and therefore called the substantive verb. It is very irregular, being derived from different radicals, and having undergone many dialectical changes. It has two sources, as Jones in his Greek Grammar, has justly observed; the Hebrew *eue*, the appropriate name of the author of all being, *Jehovah* or *Jove*; and *aur*, light, which figuratively represented life. The Greeks formed the first person upon the model of verbs in *mi*, *ei-mi*; and the Latin *sum* and English *am* are from the same source. The Greek *eis*, *ei*; the Latin *es*, *est*, and the English *is* and *was* are from the same source. The Latin *eram*, *ero*, the English *are*, *art* and *were*, and the German *werder*, are from *aur*, light, for *to be*, *to exist*, was considered as the enjoyment of light. *Be* from the German *beon*, originated in the change of the Hebrew *v* into its cognate letter *b*; *evc*, *ebe*, a change very common in the progress of language; and hence also the Greek *biao* and Latin *vivo*, to live. Thus we observe the verb denoting existence, originated in the name of God who is existence itself, and the author of all created beings.

Radical Verb, or Infinitive, Present Tense.

To be.

Perfect Tense.

To have been.

A PHILOSOPHICAL AND
Verbal of the Present Tense.

Being.

Of the Perfect.

Been.

Compound.

Having been.

Declarative or Indicative Mode.

Present Tense.

I am <i>n</i>	We are <i>n</i>	
Thou art <i>n</i>	Ye are <i>n</i>	
You are <i>n</i>	You are <i>n</i>	
{	He is <i>n</i>	They are <i>n</i>
	She is <i>n</i>	
	It is <i>n</i>	

The foregoing form of the present tense is now generally used by good writers. But the following form is the most ancient, is found in the translation of the bible, and other good English authorities, and is still very general in popular practice.

I be <i>n</i>	We be <i>n</i>
You be <i>n</i>	Ye or you be <i>n</i>
He is <i>n</i>	They be <i>n</i>

Thou beest, in the second person, is not in use.

Past Tense.

I was <i>n</i>	We were <i>n</i>
Thou wast <i>n</i>	Ye were <i>n</i>
You was or were <i>n</i> *	You were <i>n</i>
He was <i>n</i>	They were <i>n</i>

* The compilers of grammars condemn the use of *was* with *you*—but in vain. The practice is universal, except among men who learn the language by books. The best authors have given it their sanction, and the usage is too well established to be altered.

Perfect Tense.

I have <i>n</i> been	We have <i>n</i> been
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> been	{ Ye have <i>n</i> been
{ You have <i>n</i> been	{ You have <i>n</i> been
He hath or has <i>n</i> been	They have <i>n</i> been

Prior-past Tense.

I had <i>n</i> been	We had <i>n</i> been
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> been	{ Ye had <i>n</i> been
{ You had <i>n</i> been	{ You had <i>n</i> been
He had <i>n</i> been	They had <i>n</i> been

Future Tense.

I shall or will <i>n</i> be	We shall or will <i>n</i> be
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> be	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> be
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be
He shall or will <i>n</i> be	They shall or will <i>n</i> be

Prior-future Tense.

I shall <i>n</i> have been	We shall <i>n</i> have been
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> have	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> have been
been	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have been	been
He shall or will <i>n</i> have been	They shall or will <i>n</i> have
	been.

Imperative Mode.

Command { Be *n*; be thou *n*; do *n* thou be, or do *n* be;
 { be ye *n*; do *n* you be, or do you *n* be; or do
 { *n* be.

Exhortation { Let me *n* be, let him *n* be, let us *n* be, let
 Entreaty { them *n* be.

Potential Mode.

I may or can <i>n</i> be	We may or can <i>n</i> be
{ Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i> be	{ Ye may or can <i>n</i> be
{ You may or can <i>n</i> be	{ You may or can <i>n</i> be
He may or can <i>n</i> be	They may or can <i>n</i> be

Must is used in this tense, and in the perfect also.

Past Tense.

I might <i>n</i> be	We might <i>n</i> be
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> be	{ Ye might <i>n</i> be
{ You might <i>n</i> be	{ You might <i>n</i> be
He might <i>n</i> be	They might <i>n</i> be.

In the same manner with *could*, *should* and *would*.

Perfect Tense.

I may or can <i>n</i> have been	We may or can <i>n</i> have been
{ Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i> have been	{ Ye may or can <i>n</i> have been
{ You may or can <i>n</i> have been.	{ You may or can <i>n</i> have been.
He may or can <i>n</i> have been	They may or can <i>n</i> have been.

Prior-past Tense.

I might <i>n</i> have been	We might <i>n</i> have been
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> have been	{ Ye might <i>n</i> have been
{ You might <i>n</i> have been	{ You might <i>n</i> have been
He might <i>n</i> have been	They might <i>n</i> have been

In the same manner with *could*, *would* and *should*. There is no future tense in this mode.

Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

This Mode is formed by prefixing any sign of condition, hypothesis or contingency, to the indicative mode in its various tenses.

Present Tense.

<i>If</i> I am	We are
{ Thou art	Ye are
{ You are	You are
He is	They are.

Past Tense.

<i>If</i> I was	We were
{ Thou wast	Ye were
{ You was or were	You were
He was	They were

The foregoing tenses express uncertainty, whether a fact exists or existed; or they admit the fact. The following form is used for the like purposes:

<i>If</i> I be	We be
{ Thou be	Ye be
{ You be	You be
He be	They be.

But this is more properly the form of the conditional future; that is, the verb without the sign of the future—*if he be*, for *if he shall be*.

The following is the form of expressing supposition or hypothesis, and may be called the

Hypothetical Tense.

<i>If</i> I were	We were
Thou wert	Ye were
You was or were	You were
He were	They were

“If I were,” supposes I am *not* ; “if I were not,” supposes I am.*

The other tenses are the same as in the indicative mode.

* No fault is more common than the misapplication of this tense. In the Saxon, *were* was often used in the third person of the indicative mode, and without a preceding sign of condition ; as in these examples—“After thisum hafde se cyng mycel getheat, and swithe deope space with his witan ymbe this land, hu hit *were* gesett. *Sax. Chron. An.* 1085. After this the king held a great council, and made important representations respecting this land, how it *were* settled.” In the German, the inflection of the word, in the imperfect tense of the indicative is—Ich war, du warest, er war, he *were*. The orthography of the word, in the imperfect tense of the subjunctive, is *were* and our early English writers seem to have confounded the two tenses. The regular Saxon verb in the past tense of the indicative was, thus inflected—Ic was, du ware, he was. Hence our greatest writers, Milton, Dryden, Pope and others, retained that form of the word—Before the heavens thou *wert* ; remember what thou *wert*—expressions which Lowth condemns as not analogous to the formation of verbs in different modes. I would condemn this use of the verb also, but for a different reason ; it is now obsolete.

But the use of this form of the verb is retained in the subjunctive mode, which, our grammars teach us, must follow the signs of condition—*if, tho, unless, whether*—a rule which, without qualification, has a mischievous effect. On carefully examining the original state of the language, I find the common and true use of *were* in the singular number, is, to express *hypothesis or supposition*. Thus, *Sax. Chron. ad annum* 1017. On the third of the ides of December, at night, the moon appeared—“swylce he eall blodig *were*”—*such, or, as if, he all bloody were*—and the heaven was red, “swylce hit byrne *were*”—as if it *were* on fire. This use of *were*, in the singular number, is legitimate and is still retained by good writers—but its use to express a mere uncertainty respecting a past event, after a sign of condition, is obsolete or not legitimate. The following examples will illustrate the distinction—“Whether the killing *were* malicious or not, is no farther a subject of inquiry,” &c. *Judge Parker, trial of Selfridge, p.* 161. Here *were* is improperly used—So also where the fact is admitted ; “Tho he *were* a son, yet learned he obedience.” *Heb.* 5. 8. where Lowth justly condemns the use of *were*—“Unless a felony *were* attempted or intended.” *Selfridge, Trial. p.* 125. It ought to be *was*.

The following is the true use of *were* in the singular number—“*Were* it necessary for you to take those books with you ?” *Judge Parker. ibm.* 159 “If it *were* possible, they would deceive the elect.” *Mat.* 24. 24. This is the only legitimate use of this tense.

The Conjugation of a Regular Verb.

LOVE.

Radical Verb, or Infinitive Mode, Present Tense.

To love.

Perfect Tense.

To have loved.

Verbal of the Present Tense.

Loving.

Of the Perfect.

Loved.

Compound.

*Having loved.**Declarative or Indicative Mode.*

Present Tense, indefinite.

I love <i>n</i>	We love <i>n</i>
{ Thou lovest <i>n</i>	{ Ye love <i>n</i>
{ You love <i>n</i>	{ You love <i>n</i>
He loveth or loves <i>n</i>	They love <i>n</i>

With the auxiliar *do*.

I do <i>n</i> love	We do <i>n</i> love
{ Thou dost <i>n</i> love.	{ Ye do <i>n</i> love
{ You do <i>n</i> love.	{ You do <i>n</i> love
He doth or does <i>n</i> love	They do <i>n</i> love.

Definite.

I am <i>n</i> loving	We are <i>n</i> loving
{ Thou art <i>n</i> loving	{ Ye are <i>n</i> loving
{ You are <i>n</i> loving	{ You are <i>n</i> loving
He is <i>n</i> loving	They are <i>n</i> loving.

Past Tense, indefinite.

I loved <i>n</i>	We loved <i>n</i>
{ Thou lovedst <i>n</i>	{ Ye loved <i>n</i>
{ You loved <i>n</i>	{ You loved <i>n</i>
He loved <i>n</i>	They loved <i>n</i>

With the auxiliar *did*.

I did <i>n</i> love	We did <i>n</i> love
{ Thou didst <i>n</i> love	{ Ye did <i>n</i> love
{ You did <i>n</i> love	{ You did <i>n</i> love
He did <i>n</i> love	They did <i>n</i> love

Definite.

I was <i>n</i> loving	We were <i>n</i> loving
{ Thou wast <i>n</i> loving	{ Ye were <i>n</i> loving
{ You was <i>n</i> loving	{ You were <i>n</i> loving
He was <i>n</i> loving	They were <i>n</i> loving.

Perfect Tense, indefinite.

I have <i>n</i> loved	We have <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye have <i>n</i> loved
{ You have <i>n</i> loved	{ You have <i>n</i> loved
He has or hath <i>n</i> loved	They have <i>n</i> loved.

Definite.

I have <i>n</i> been loving	We have <i>n</i> been loving
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> been loving	{ Ye have <i>n</i> been loving
{ You have <i>n</i> been loving	{ You have <i>n</i> been loving
He has or hath <i>n</i> been lov- ing	They have <i>n</i> been loving

Prior-past, indefinite.

I had <i>n</i> loved	We had <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye had <i>n</i> loved
{ You had <i>n</i> loved	{ You had <i>n</i> loved
He had <i>n</i> loved	They had <i>n</i> loved

Definite.

I had <i>n</i> been loving	We had <i>n</i> been loving
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> been loving	{ Ye had <i>n</i> been loving
{ You had <i>n</i> been loving	{ You had <i>n</i> been loving
He had <i>n</i> been loving	They had <i>n</i> been loving

Future Tense, indefinite.

The form of predicting.

I shall <i>n</i> love	We shall <i>n</i> love
{ Thou wilt <i>n</i> love	{ Ye will <i>n</i> love
{ You will <i>n</i> love	{ You will <i>n</i> love
He will <i>n</i> love	They will <i>n</i> love.

The form of promising, commanding and determining.

I will <i>n</i> love	We will <i>n</i> love
{ Thou shalt <i>n</i> love	{ Ye shall <i>n</i> love
{ You shall <i>n</i> love	{ You shall <i>n</i> love
He shall <i>n</i> love	They shall <i>n</i> love.

Definite.

I shall or will <i>n</i> be loving	We shall or will <i>n</i> be loving
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> be lov- ing	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> be loving
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be loving	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be loving
He shall or will <i>n</i> be loving	They shall or will <i>n</i> be lov- ing.

Prior-future, indefinite.

I shall <i>n</i> have loved	We shall <i>n</i> have loved
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> have loved	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> have loved
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have loved	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have loved
He shall or will <i>n</i> have loved	They shall or will <i>n</i> have loved

Definite.

I shall <i>n</i> have been loving	We shall <i>n</i> have been loving
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> have been loving	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> have been loving
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have been loving	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have been loving
He shall or will <i>n</i> have been loving	They shall or will <i>n</i> have been loving.

Imperative Mode.

Let me <i>n</i> love	Let us <i>n</i> love
Love <i>n</i>	Love <i>n</i>
Do <i>n</i> love	Do <i>n</i> love
Do thou <i>n</i> love	Do ye or you <i>n</i> love
Do you <i>n</i> love	Let them <i>n</i> love.
Let him <i>n</i> love	

In the place of *let*, the poets employ the verb without the auxiliary—"Perish the lore that deadens young desire."
Beat. Minst. That is, let the lore perish.

"Be ignorance thy choice, where knowledge leads to woe."
ibm.

Potential Mode.

— Present Tense, indefinite.

I may or can <i>n</i> love	We may or can <i>n</i> love
----------------------------	-----------------------------

{	Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i> love	{	Ye may or can <i>n</i> love
	You may or can <i>n</i> love		You may or can <i>n</i> love
	He may or can <i>n</i> love		They may or can <i>n</i> love

Must is used in this tense and in the perfect.

Definite.

I may or can <i>n</i> be loving	We may or can <i>n</i> be loving		
{	Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i> be loving	{	Ye may or can <i>n</i> be loving
	You may or can <i>n</i> be loving		You may or can <i>n</i> be loving
He may or can <i>n</i> be loving	They may or can <i>n</i> be loving.		

Past Tense, indefinite.

I might <i>n</i> love	We might <i>n</i> love		
{	Thou mightest <i>n</i> love	{	Ye might <i>n</i> love
	You might <i>n</i> love		You might <i>n</i> love
He might <i>n</i> love	They might <i>n</i> love.		

With *could*, *would* and *should* in the same manner.

Definite.

I might <i>n</i> be loving	We might <i>n</i> be loving		
{	Thou mightest <i>n</i> be loving	{	Ye might <i>n</i> be loving
	You might <i>n</i> be loving		You might <i>n</i> be loving
He might <i>n</i> be loving	They might <i>n</i> be loving.		

With *could*, *would* and *should* in the same manner.

Perfect Tense, indefinite.

I may or can <i>n</i>	} have	We	} may or can <i>n</i>	
Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i>		loved		Ye
You may or can <i>n</i>				You
He may or can <i>n</i>		They	have loved.	

Definite.

I may or can <i>n</i> have been loving	We may or can <i>n</i> have been loving
{ Thou mayest or canst <i>n</i> have been loving	{ Ye may or can <i>n</i> have been loving
{ You may or can <i>n</i> have been loving	{ You may or can <i>n</i> have been loving
He may or can <i>n</i> have been loving	They may or can <i>n</i> have been loving.

Prior-past Tense, indefinite.

I might <i>n</i> have loved	We might <i>n</i> have loved
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> have loved	{ Ye might <i>n</i> have loved
{ You might <i>n</i> have loved	{ You might <i>n</i> have loved
He might <i>n</i> have loved	They might <i>n</i> have loved.

Definite.

I might <i>n</i> have been loving	We might <i>n</i> have been loving
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> have been loving	{ Ye might <i>n</i> have been loving
{ You might <i>n</i> have been loving	{ You might <i>n</i> have been loving
He might <i>n</i> have been loving	They might <i>n</i> have been loving.

With *could*, *would* and *should* in the same manner, in the two last forms.

The Potential mode becomes conditional by means of the modifiers, *if*, *tho*, *unless*, &c. prefixed to its tenses, without any variation from the foregoing inflections. This may, for distinction, be called the *Conditional Potential*.

Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

Present Tense.

If, tho, unless,
whether, suppose,
admit, &c.

I love <i>n</i>	We love <i>n</i>
{ Thou lovest <i>n</i>	{ Ye love <i>n</i>
{ You love <i>n</i>	{ You love <i>n</i>
He loveth or loves <i>n</i>	They love <i>n</i>

Some authors omit the personal terminations in the second and third persons—*if thou love, if he love*. With this single variation, which I deem contrary to the principles of our language, the conditional Mode differs not in the least from the indicative, and to form it, the learner has only to prefix a sign of condition, as *if, tho, unless, &c.* to the indicative, in its several tenses: With this exception, however, that in the future tense, the auxiliary may be and often is suppressed. Thus instead of

<i>If</i> I shall or will love	We shall or will love
Thou shalt or wilt love	Ye shall or will love
You shall or will love	You shall or will love
He shall or will love	They shall or will love

Authors write,

<i>If, &c.</i> I love	We love
Thou love	Ye love
You love	You love
He love	They love

It is further to be remarked, that *should* is very often used to form the conditional future—*if I should, thou shouldst, &c.* This tense is inflected like the past tense of the potential, but is probably more used for the conditional future than *shall* and *will*.

The other auxiliars also in the past time are used in this conditional mode in a very indefinite sense.

I shall therefore offer a new tense in this mode, composed of any principal verb, with *might, could, should* and *would*, expressing, like the Greek aorists, time indefinite *present, past* or *future*, especially the *future*.

Conditional Mode, *indefinite* Tense.

If, tho, unless, whether, lest, except, suppose, &c.

Singular.

I might, could, should, or would *n* love
 Thou mightest, couldst, shouldst, wouldst *n* love
 You might, could, should, would *n* love
 He might, could, should, would *n* love

Plural.

We might, could, should, would *n* love
 Ye or you might, could, should, would *n* love
 They might, could, should, would *n* love

It should be noticed that the sign of the condition is not always expressed. *Supposition* or *hypothesis* may be well expressed without the modifiers *if, tho, &c.* As in the following; "It being no more necessary that there *should be* existing a solid body infinitely extended, because we have an idea of the infinity of space, than it is necessary that the world *should be* eternal, because we have an idea of infinite duration." *Locke on Und. b. 2. ch. 17.*

In the conditional mode, there is a peculiarity in the tenses which should be noticed. When I say, *if it rains*, it is understood that I am *uncertain* of the fact, at the time of speaking. But when I say, "*if it rained*, we should be obliged to seek shelter," it is not understood that I am uncertain of the fact; on the contrary, it is understood that I am certain, it *does not rain* at the time of speaking. Or if I say, "*if it did not rain*, I would take a walk," I convey the idea that it *does* rain at the moment of speaking. This form of our tenses in the conditional mode has never been

the subject of much notice, nor ever received its due explanation and arrangement. For this hypothetical verb is actually a present tense, or at least indefinite—it certainly does not belong to past time. It is further to be remarked, that a negative sentence always implies an affirmative—“if it did not rain,” implies that it *does* rain. On the contrary, an affirmative sentence implies a negative—“if it *did* rain, implies that it does *not*.

In the past time, a similar distinction exists; for “if it rained yesterday,” denotes uncertainty in the speaker’s mind—but “if it had *not* rained yesterday,” implies a certainty, that it *did* rain.

Passive form of the Verb.

Indicative Mode.

Present Tense.

I am <i>n</i> loved	We are <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou art <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye are <i>n</i> loved
{ You are <i>n</i> loved	{ You are <i>n</i> loved
He is <i>n</i> loved	They are <i>n</i> loved.

Past Tense.

I was <i>n</i> loved	We were <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou wast <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye were <i>n</i> loved
{ You was or were <i>n</i> loved	{ You were <i>n</i> loved
He was <i>n</i> loved	They were <i>n</i> loved

Perfect Tense.

I have <i>n</i> been loved	We have <i>n</i> been loved
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> been loved	{ Ye have <i>n</i> been loved
{ You have <i>n</i> been loved	{ You have <i>n</i> been loved
He has or hath <i>n</i> been loved	They have <i>n</i> been loved

Prior-past Tense.

I had <i>n</i> been loved	We had <i>n</i> been loved
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> been loved	{ Ye had <i>n</i> been loved
{ You had <i>n</i> been loved	{ You had <i>n</i> been loved
He had <i>n</i> been loved	They had <i>n</i> been loved

Future Tense.

I shall or will <i>n</i> be loved	We shall or will <i>n</i> be loved
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> be loved	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> be loved
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be loved	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> be loved
He shall or will <i>n</i> be loved	They shall or will <i>n</i> be loved

Prior-future Tense.

I shall <i>n</i> have been loved	We shall <i>n</i> have been loved
{ Thou shalt or wilt <i>n</i> have been loved	{ Ye shall or will <i>n</i> have been loved
{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have been loved	{ You shall or will <i>n</i> have been loved
He shall or will <i>n</i> have been loved	They shall or will <i>n</i> have been loved.

Imperative Mode.

Let me <i>n</i> be loved	Let us <i>n</i> be loved
Be <i>n</i> loved	Be <i>n</i> loved
Be thou or you <i>n</i> loved	Be ye or you <i>n</i> loved
Do you <i>n</i> be loved	Do you <i>n</i> be loved
Let him <i>n</i> be loved	Let them <i>n</i> be loved

NOTE....The *not* is usually placed after *do*, and contracted into *don't*.

Potential Mode.

Present Tense.

I may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved	We may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved
{ Thou mayest, canst or must <i>n</i> be loved	{ Ye may, can, or must <i>n</i> be loved
{ You may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved	{ You may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved
He may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved	They may, can or must <i>n</i> be loved.

Past Tense.

I might <i>n</i> be loved	We might <i>n</i> be loved
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i> be loved	{ Ye might <i>n</i> be loved
{ You might <i>n</i> be loved	{ You might <i>n</i> be loved
He might <i>n</i> be loved	They might <i>n</i> be loved.

With *could*, *should* and *would* in the same manner.

Perfect Tense.

I may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved	We may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved
{ Thou mayest, canst or must <i>n</i> have been loved	{ Ye may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved
{ You may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved	{ You may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved
He may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved	They may, can or must <i>n</i> have been loved

Prior-past Tense.

I might <i>n</i>	} have been loved	We	} might <i>n</i> have been loved.
{ Thou mightest <i>n</i>		{ Ye	
{ You might <i>n</i>		{ You	
He might <i>n</i>		They	

In the same manner, with *could*, *would* and *should*.

Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

Present Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I am <i>n</i> loved	We are <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou art <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye are <i>n</i> loved
{ You are <i>n</i> loved	{ You are <i>n</i> loved
He is <i>n</i> loved	They are <i>n</i> loved.

Or thus :

<i>If, &c.</i> I be <i>n</i> loved	We be <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou be <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye be <i>n</i> loved
{ You be <i>n</i> loved	{ You be <i>n</i> loved
He be <i>n</i> loved	They be <i>n</i> loved.

Past Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I was <i>n</i> loved	We were <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou wast <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye were <i>n</i> loved
{ You was or were <i>n</i> lov- ed	{ You were <i>n</i> loved
He was <i>n</i> loved	They were <i>n</i> loved.

Or thus :

<i>If, &c.</i> I were <i>n</i> loved	We were <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou wert <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye were <i>n</i> loved
{ You were <i>n</i> loved	{ You were <i>n</i> loved
He were <i>n</i> loved	They were <i>n</i> loved

The last form is obsolete in common practice, and not much used by the learned.

Perfect Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I have <i>n</i> been loved	We have <i>n</i> been loved
{ Thou hast <i>n</i> been loved	{ Ye have <i>n</i> been loved
{ You have <i>n</i> been loved	{ You have <i>n</i> been loved
He has or hath <i>n</i> been loved	They have <i>n</i> been loved

Prior-past Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I had <i>n</i> been loved	We had <i>n</i> been loved
{ Thou hadst <i>n</i> been loved	{ Ye had <i>n</i> been loved
{ You had <i>n</i> been loved	{ You had <i>n</i> been loved
He had <i>n</i> been loved	They had <i>n</i> been loved

Future Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved	We shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved
{ Thou shalt, wilt or shouldst <i>n</i> be loved.	{ Ye shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved
{ You shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved	{ You shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved
He shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved	They shall, will or should <i>n</i> be loved.

Prior-future Tense.

<i>If, &c.</i> I shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved	We shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved
{ Thou shalt or shouldst <i>n</i> have been loved	{ Ye shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved
{ You shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved	{ You shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved
He shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved	They shall or should <i>n</i> have been loved.

The future is often elliptical, the auxiliary being omitted. Thus instead of *if I shall be loved, &c.* are used the following forms.

<i>If, &c.</i> I be <i>n</i> loved	We be <i>n</i> loved
{ Thou be <i>n</i> loved	{ Ye be <i>n</i> loved
{ You be <i>n</i> loved	{ You be <i>n</i> loved
He be <i>n</i> loved	They be <i>n</i> loved.

An exhibition of the verb in the interrogative form, with the sign of the negative.

Indicative Mode.

Present Tense, indefinite.

Love I <i>n</i> ?	Love we <i>n</i> ?
{ Lovest thou <i>n</i> ?	{ Love ye <i>n</i> ?
{ Love you <i>n</i> ?	{ Love you <i>n</i> ?
Loveth or loves he <i>n</i> ?	Love they <i>n</i> ?

The foregoing form is but little used. The following is the usual mode of asking questions.

Do I <i>n</i> love ?	Do we <i>n</i> love ?
{ Dost thou <i>n</i> love ?	{ Do ye <i>n</i> love ?
{ Do you <i>n</i> love ?	{ Do you <i>n</i> love ?
Does or doth he <i>n</i> love ?	Do they <i>n</i> love ?

Definite.

Am I <i>n</i> loving ?	Are we <i>n</i> loving ?
{ Art thou <i>n</i> loving ?	{ Are ye <i>n</i> loving ?
{ Are you <i>n</i> loving ?	{ Are you <i>n</i> loving ?
Is he <i>n</i> loving ?	Are they <i>n</i> loving ?

Past Tense, indefinite.

Did I <i>n</i> love ?	Did we <i>n</i> love ?
{ Didst thou <i>n</i> love ?	{ Did ye <i>n</i> love ?
{ Did you <i>n</i> love ?	{ Did you <i>n</i> love ?
Did he <i>n</i> love ?	Did they <i>n</i> love ?

The other form of this tense, loved he ? is seldom used.

Definite.

Was I <i>n</i> loving ?	Were we <i>n</i> loving ?
-------------------------	---------------------------

{ Wast thou <i>n</i> loving ?	{ Were ye <i>n</i> loving ?
{ Was or were you <i>n</i> loving ?	{ Were you <i>n</i> loving ?
Was he <i>n</i> loving ?	Were they <i>n</i> loving ?

Perfect Tense, indefinite.

Have I <i>n</i> loved ?	Have we <i>n</i> loved ?
Hast thou <i>n</i> loved ?	Have ye <i>n</i> loved ?
Have you <i>n</i> loved ?	Have you <i>n</i> loved ?
Has or hath he <i>n</i> loved ?	Have they <i>n</i> loved ?

Definite.

Have I <i>n</i> been loving ?	Have we <i>n</i> been loving ?
Hast thou <i>n</i> been loving ?	Have ye <i>n</i> been loving ?
Have you <i>n</i> been loving ?	Have you <i>n</i> been loving ?
Has or hath he <i>n</i> been lov- ing ?	Have they <i>n</i> been loving ?

Prior-past, indefinite.

Had I <i>n</i> loved ?	Had we <i>n</i> loved ?
Hadst thou <i>n</i> loved ?	Had ye <i>n</i> loved ?
Had you <i>n</i> loved ?	Had you <i>n</i> loved ?
Had he <i>n</i> loved ?	Had they <i>n</i> loved ?

Definite.

Had I <i>n</i> been loving ?	Had we <i>n</i> been loving ?
Hadst thou <i>n</i> been loving ?	Had ye <i>n</i> been loving ?
Had you <i>n</i> been loving ?	Had you <i>n</i> been loving ?
Had he <i>n</i> been loving ?	Had they <i>n</i> been loving ?

Future Tense, indefinite.

Shall I <i>n</i> love ?	Shall we <i>n</i> love ?
Shalt or wilt thou <i>n</i> love ?	Shall or will ye <i>n</i> love ?
Shall or will you <i>n</i> love ?	Shall or will you <i>n</i> love ?
Shall or will he <i>n</i> love ?	Shall or will they <i>n</i> love ?

Definite.

Shall I <i>n</i> be loving?	Shall we <i>n</i> be loving?
{ Shall or wilt thou <i>n</i> be lov- ing?	{ Shall or will ye <i>n</i> be lov- ing?
{ Shall or will you <i>n</i> be lov- ing?	{ Shall or will you <i>n</i> be lov- ing?
Shall or will he <i>n</i> be lov- ing?	Shall or will they <i>n</i> be lov- ing?

Prior-future, indefinite.

Shall I <i>n</i> have loved?	Shall we <i>n</i> have loved?
{ Shall or wilt thou <i>n</i> have loved?	{ Shall or will ye <i>n</i> have lov- ed?
{ Shall or will you <i>n</i> have loved?	{ Shall or will you <i>n</i> have lov- ed?
Shall or will he <i>n</i> have lov- ed?	Shall or will they <i>n</i> have loved?

The definite form of this tense, is little used.

Will, in this tense, is not elegantly used in the first person.

The interrogative form is not used in the imperative mode—a command and a question being incompatible.

It is not necessary to exhibit this form of the verb in the potential mode. Let the learner only be instructed that in interrogative sentences, the nominative follows the verb when alone, or the first auxiliary, when one or more are used; and the sign of negation *not*, [and generally *never*,] immediately follows the nominative.

Irregular Verbs.

All verbs whose past tense and perfect participle or verbal do not end in *ed* are deemed irregular. The number of these is about one hundred and seventy-seven. They are of three kinds.

1st. Those whose past tense, and verbal of the perfect are the same as the present; as beat, burst, cast, cost, cut,

hit, hurt, let, put, read, rent, rid, set, shed, shred, shut, slit, split, spread, thrust, sweat, wet. *Wet* has sometimes *wetted*; *heat* sometimes *het*, but the practice is not respectable. *Light* and *quit* have *lit* and *quit* in the past time and verbal, but they are also regular.

2. Verbs whose past time and verbal are alike, but different from the present; as *meet, met*; *sell, sold*.

3. Verbs whose present and past tenses and verbal are all different; as *know, knew, known*.

A few verbs ending with *ch, ck, x, ft, ll, ess*, tho regular, suffer a contraction of *ed* into *t*, as *snacht* for *snatched*, *checkt*, for *checked*, *snapt*, for *snapped*, *mixt*, for *mixed*, *dwelt*, for *dwelled*, *past*, for *passed*. Others have a digraph shortened; as *dream, dreamt*, *feel, felt*, *mean, meant*, *sleep, slept*, *deal, dealt*. In a few, *v* of the radical verb is changed into *f*, as *bereave, bereft*, *leave, left*.

As some of the past tenses and verbals are obsolete or obsolescent, it is deemed proper to set these in separate columns for the information of the student.

IRREGULAR VERBS.

Radical Verb.	Past Tense.	Verbal.	Past Tense obsolete.	Verbal obsolete.
Abide	abode	abode		
Am	was	been		
Arise, rise	arose, rose	arisen, risen		
Awake	awoke, awakened	awaked		
Bear	bore	borne	bare	
Beat	beat	beat, beaten		
Begin	begun, began	begun		
Bend	bended, bent	bended, bent		
Bereave	bereaved, bereft	bereaved, bereft		
Beseech	besought	besought		
Bid	bid	bid	bade	bidden
Bind	bound	bound		bounden
Bite	bit	bit, bitten		

<i>Rad. Verb.</i>	<i>Past Tense.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Past T. obsol.</i>	<i>Ver. ob.</i>
Bleed	bled	bled		
Blow	blew	blown		
Break	broke	broke, broken	brake	
Breed	bred	bred		
Bring	brought	brought		
Build	buildded, built	built		
Burst	burst	burst		
Buy	bought	bought		
Cast	cast	cast		
Catch	catched, caught	catched, caught		
Chide	chid	chid		chidden
Chuse, choose	chose	chose, chosen		
Cleave, to stick	cleaved	cleaved	clave	
Cleave, to split	cleft	cleft	clove	cloven
Cling	clung	clung		
Clothe	clothed	clothed		clad
Come	came, come	come		
Cost	cost	cost		
Crow	crowed	crowed	crew	
Creep	crept	crept		
Cut	cut	cut		
Dare	durst, dared*	dared		
Deal	dealt, dealed	dealt, dealed		
Dig	dug, digged	dug, digged		
Do	did	done		
Draw	drew	drawn		
Drive	drove	driven, drove	drave	
Drink	drank	drank		drunken
Dwell	dwelt, dwelled	dwelt, dwelled		[drunk]
Eat	eat, ate	eat, eaten		
Engrave	engraved	engraven, engraved		
Fall	fell	fallen		
Feel	felt	felt		
Fight	fought	fought		
Find	found	found		
Flee	fled	fled		
Fling	flung	flung		
Fly	flew	flown		
Forget	forgot	forgot, forgotten	forgot	
Forsake	forsook	forsaken, forsook		

*When transitive, this verb is always regular; as "he dared him."

<i>Rad. Verb.</i>	<i>Past Tense.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Past T. obsol.</i>	<i>Ver. ob.</i>
Freeze	froze	frozen, froze		
Get	got	got, gotten		gat
Gild	gilded, gilt	gilded, gilt		
Gird	girded, girt	girded, girt		
Give	gave	given		
Go	went	gone		
Grave	graved	graved, graven		
Grind	ground	ground		
Grow	grew	grown		
Have	had	had		
Hang	hanged, hung	hanged, hung		
Hear	heard	heard		
Hew	hewed	hewed, hewn		
Hide	hid	hid, hidden		
Hit	hit	hit		
Hold	held	held		holden
Hurt	hurt	hurt		
Keep	kept	kept		
Knit	knit	knit		
Know	knew	known		
Lade	laded	laden		
Lay	laid	laid		
Lead	led	led		
Leave	left	left		
Lend	lent	lent		
Let	let	let		
Lie (down)	lay	lain		
Lose	lost	lost		
Make	made	made		
Meet	met	met		
Mow	mowed	mowed, mown		
Pay	paid	paid		
Put	put	put		
Read	read	read		
Rend	rent	rent		
Rid	rid	rid		
Ride	rode, rid	rid		ridden
Ring	rung	rung	rang	
Rise	rose	risen		
Rive	rived	rived, riven		
Run	ran, run	run		
Saw	sawed	sawed, sawn		

<i>Rad. Verb.</i>	<i>Past Tense.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Past T. obsol.</i>	<i>Ver. ob.</i>
Say	said	said		
See	saw	seen		
Seek	sought	sought		
Sell	sold	sold		
Send	sent	sent		
Set	set	set		
Shake	shook	shaken, shook		
Shape	shaped	shaped		shapen
Shave	shaved	shaved		shaven
Shear	sheared	sheared		shorn
Shed	shed	shed		
Shine	shone, shined	shone, shined		
Shew	shewed	shewn		
Show	showed	shown, showed		
Shoe	shod	shod		
Shoot	shot	shot		
Shrink	shrunk	shrunk		
Shred	shred	shred		
Shut	shut	shut		
Sing	sung	sung	sang	
Sink	sunk	sunk	sank	
Sit	sat	sat		sitten
Slay	slew	slain		
Sleep	slept	slept		
Slide	slid	slid		slidden
Sling	slung	slung		
Slink	slunk	slunk		
Slit	slit, slitted	slit, slitted		
Smite	smote	smitten, smit		
Sow	sowed	sowed, sown		
Speak	spoke	spoke, spoken	spake	
Speed	sped	sped		
Spend	spent	spent		
Spill	spilled, spilt	spilled, spilt		
Spin	spun	spun		
Spit	spit	spit	spat	spitten
Spread	spread	spread		
Spring	sprung	sprung	sprang	
Stand	stood	stood		
Steal	stole	stole, stolen		
Sting	stung	stung		

<i>Rad. Verb.</i>	<i>Past Tense.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Past T. obsol.</i>	<i>Ver. ob.</i>
Stink	stunk	stunk	stank	
Stride	strid, strode	strid		stridden
Strike	struck	struck		stricken
String	strung	strung		
Strive	strove	striven		
Strow	strowed	strowed, strown		
Strew	strewed	strewed		
Swear	swore	sworn	sware	
Sweat	sweat	sweat		
Swell	swelled	swelled		swollen
Swim	swum, swam	swum		
Swing	swung	swung		
Take	took	taken, took		
Teach	taught	taught		
Tear	tore	torn, tore		
Tell	told	told		
Think	thought	thought		
Thrive	thrived	thrived	throve	thriven
Throw	threw	thrown		
Thrust	thrust	thrust		
Tread	trod	trod, trodden		
Wax	waxed	waxed		waxen
Wear	wore	worn, wore		
Weave	wove	woven, wove		
Weep	wept	wept		
Win	won	won		
Wind	wound	wound		
Work	work'dwrought	worked, wrought		
Wring	wrung, wringed	wrung, wringed		
Write	wrote, writ	writ, written.		

NOTE 1.....The old forms of the past tense, *sang, spake, sprang, forgat, &c.* are here placed among the obsolete words. They are entirely obsolete, in ordinary practice, whether popular or polite; and it seems advisable not to attempt to revive them. In addition to this reason for omitting them, there is one which is not generally understood. The sound of *a* in these and all other like cases, was originally the broad *a* or *aw*; which sound, in the Gothic and Saxon, as in modern Scotch, corresponded nearly with *o* in *spoke, swore*. *Spoke* is therefore nearer to the original than *spake*, as we now pronounce the vowel *a* with its first or long sound as in *sake*.

NOTE 2.....In the use of the past tense and participle of some of these verbs, there is a diversity of practice; some authors retaining those which others have rejected as obsolete. Many words which were in use in the days of Shakespeare and Lord Bacon are now wholly laid aside; others are used only in books, while others are obsolescent, being occasionally used; and a few of the old verbals, having lost the verbal character, are used only as attributes. Of the last mentioned, species are *fraught, drunken, molten, beholden, shorn, clad, bounden, cloven*, which are no longer considered as belonging to the verbs, from which they are derived. *Holpen* is entirely obsolete. *Holden, swollen, gotten, and forgotten*, are nearly obsolete in common parlance. *Wrought* is evidently obsolescent; *stricken* is used only in one phrase, *stricken in age or years*, which we learn from the bible; but in every other case, is inelegant and pedantic.

Bishop Lowth has attempted to revive the use of many of the obsolescent past tenses and verbals, for which he has, and I think deservedly, incurred the severe animadversions of eminent critics. "Is it not surprising, says Campbell on Rhetoric, b. 2. ch. 2. that one of Lowth's penetration should think a single person entitled to revive a form of inflection in a particular word, which had been rejected by all good writers of every denomination, for more than a hundred and fifty years." This writer declares what Lowth has advanced on the use of the past tense and participle, to be inconsistent with the very first principles of grammar. He observes justly, that authority is every thing in language, and that this authority consists in reputable, national, present usage.

Independent of authority however, there are substantial reasons in the language itself for laying aside the verbals ending with *en*, and for removing the differences between the past time and verbal. In opposition to the opinion of Lowth, who regrets that our language has so few inflections, and maintains that we should preserve all we have, I think it capable of demonstration that the differences between the past time and verbal or participle of the past tense of our irregular verbs, is one of the greatest inconveniences in the language. If we used personal terminations to form our modes and tenses like the Greeks, it would be desirable that they should be carefully retained. But as we have no more than about half a dozen different terminations, and are therefore obliged to form our modes and tenses by means of auxiliars, the combination of these forms a part of the business of learning the language, which is extremely difficult and perplexing to foreigners. Even the natives of Scotland and Ireland do not always surmount the difficulty. This difficulty is very much augmented by the difference between the past tense and the verbal. To remove this difference, in words in which popular usage has given a lead, is to obviate, in a degree, this inconvenience. This is recommended by another circumstance—it will so far reduce our irregular verbs to an analogy with the regular, whose past tense and verbal of the perfect are alike.

In a number of words, the dropping of *n* in the participle, will make a convenient distinction between the verbal and the attribute; for in the latter, we always retain *en*—we always say a written treatise, a spoken language, a hidden mystery—though the best authors write, a “mystery hid from ages;” “the language spoke in Bengal.”

Besides, whenever we observe a tendency in a nation to contract words, we may be assured that the contraction is found to be convenient, and is therefore to be countenanced. Indeed if I mistake not, we are indebted to such contractions for many real improvements; as write from gewrite; slain from ofslegen; fastened from gefastnode; men from monnan; holy from haligan, &c. And as a general remark, we may be assured that no language ever suffers the loss of a useful word or syllable. If a word or syllable is ever laid aside in national practice, it must be because it is not wanted, or because it is harsh and inconvenient in use, and a word or syllable more consonant to the general taste of a nation or state of society, is substituted.

Such is the fact with our participles in *en*: the *e* being suppressed in pronunciation, we have the words *spokn, writtn, holdn*, in actual practice. Nothing can be more weak, inefficient and disagreeable than this nasal sound of the half vowel *n*—it is disagreeable in prose, feeble in verse, and in music, intolerable. Were it possible to banish every sound of this kind from the language, the change would be desirable. At any rate, when people in general have laid aside any of these sounds, writers, who value the beauties of language, should be the last to revive them.

We need not however trouble ourselves to discuss the utility or propriety of retaining these participles; for it is a fact as curious as important, that no word, syllable or phrase entirely obsolete in common usage, was ever yet recalled into popular use. On the other hand, whatever is thus obsolete among the body of a people, is ultimately neglected by the learned. However the learned, therefore may pride themselves in their superior attainments, and in their right to control the usages of a nation, the history of languages will evince, that they must at last be borne away upon the current of popular practice.

Men of letters may revolt at this suggestion; but if they will attend to the history of our own language, they will find the fact to be as here stated. It is commonly supposed that the tendency of this practice of unlettered men is to corrupt the language. But the fact is directly the reverse. I am prepared to prove, were it consistent with the nature of this work, that nineteen twentieths of all the corruptions of our language, for five hundred years past, have been introduced by authors—men who have made alterations in particular idioms which they did not understand. The same remark is applicable to the orthography and pronunciation. The tendency of unlettered men is to uniformity—to analogy; and so strong is this disposition, that the common people have actually

converted some of our irregular verbs into regular ones. It is to unlettered people, that we owe the disuse of *holpen*, *bounden*, *sitten*, and the use of the regular participles *swelled*, *helped*, *worked*, in the place of the ancient ones. This popular tendency is not to be condemned and disregarded, as some of the learned affect to do, for it is governed by the natural, primary principles of all languages, to which we owe all their regularity and all their melody; viz. a love of uniformity in words of a like character, and a preference of an easy natural pronunciation, and a desire to express the most ideas with the smallest number of words and syllables. It is a fortunate thing for language that these natural principles generally prevail over arbitrary and artificial rules.

Defective Verbs.

Verbs which want the past time or verbal, are deemed defective. Of these we have very few. The auxiliars *may*, *can*, *will*, *shall*, *must*, having no participle, belong to this class. *Ought* is used in the present and past tenses only, with the regular inflection of the second person only — *I ought*, *thou oughtest*, *he ought*, *We*, *you*, *they ought*. *Quoth* is wholly obsolete, except in poetry and burlesque. It has no inflection, and is used chiefly in the third person, with the nominative following it, *quoth he*.

Wit, to know, is obsolete, except in the radical form, to introduce an explanation or enumeration of particulars; as “There are seven persons, *to wit*, four men and three women.” It is found in one passage of scripture; “Moreover, brethren, we do you *to wit* of the grace of God.” 2 Cor. 8. 1. “We make you to know.” Here *do* is used in an obsolete sense. *Wot* is frequently used in scripture, in the present tense; “I *wot* not who hath done this thing.” Gen. 21. “My master *wotteth* not what is with me in the house.” 39. 8. I find it thus used in the Saxon. *Wot* is not only the past tense, but a dialectical variation of the present.

Wist, the past tense of *wis*, to think or imagin, is now wholly obsolete, tho frequently used in the vulgar version of the bible. It is very desirable that these and a few other obsolete words and phrases in that version should be ex-

punged, for some of them are actually unintelligible to most readers. Some words are also used in a sense which is no longer attached to them, and they are not understood.

Modifiers.

Modifiers, words which are usually comprehended under the term *adverb*, are a secondary part of speech. Their uses are to enlarge, restrain, limit, define, and in short, to *modify* the sense of other words.

Modifiers may be classed according to their several uses.

1. Those which qualify the actions expressed by verbs and verbals; as "a good man lives *piously*;" "a room is *elegantly* furnished." Here *piously* denotes the *manner of living*—*elegantly*, denotes the *manner of being furnished*. The words of this kind, which are very numerous, are really compound attributes, formed by annexing the attribute *like* to any other attribute—*pious-like*, *elegant-like*. The phrases mentioned, when expressed according to the primitive idiom, stand thus; "he lives *pious-like*;" "a room *elegant-like* furnished." So that the most numerous class of modifiers of verbs are really attributes; but being used as the qualifiers of verbs and other attributes, and not to express the qualities of names, they may well take a different appellation.

In this class may be ranked a number of other words whose origin is less known or more remote; as *when*, *soon*, *then*, *where*, *whence*, *hence*, and many others, whose use is to modify verbs.

2. Another class of modifiers are words usually called prepositions, used with verbs to vary their signification; for which purpose they generally follow them in construction; as *to fall on*, *give out*, *bear with*, *cast up*; or they are prefixed and become a part of the word; as *overcome*, *underlay*. In these uses, these words *modify*, or change the sense of the verb; and when prefixed, are united with the verb in orthography.

3. The other class of modifiers consists of old Saxon verbs or other words; as *if, tho,* whether, unless, else, lest*, whose use is to give a conditional or hypothetical form to sentences; and if a distinction of names should be thought useful, they may be called *modifiers of sentences*. They have been most improperly classed with conjunctions.

A few modifiers admit the terminations of comparison; as *soon, sooner, soonest; often, oftener, oftenest*. Most of those which end in *ly* may be compared by *more* and *most, less* and *least*; as *more justly, most excellently; less honestly, least criminally*.

NOTE.....The numerous distinctions of modifiers into those of time, place and quantity, causal, illative, adversative, &c. seems to be more perplexing than useful. We might as well make the definition of every word in our dictionaries the foundation of a class, as to recognize the divisions of this species of words, with which the ingenuity of authors has filled our grammars.

Prepositions.

Prepositions, so called from their being *put before* other words, serve to connect words and show the relation between them; or to show the condition of things. Thus a man *of* benevolence, denotes a man who possesses benevolence. Christ was crucified *between* two thieves. Receive the book *from* John and give it *to* Thomas.

The prepositions most common, are, *to, for, by, of, in, into, on, upon, among, between, betwixt, up, over, under, beneath, against, from, out, with, through, at, towards, before, behind, after, without, across*.

We have a number of particles, which serve to vary or modify the words to which they are prefixed, and which are sometimes called *inseparable prepositions*, because they are never used, but as parts of other words—such are *a, be, son, mis, pre, re, sub*, in *abide, become, conjoin, mistake, prefix, return, subjoin, &c.* These may be called *prefixes*.

* *Tho* is usually written *though*; but improperly; and probably by confounding *tho* with *thof*, a distinct word, nearly obsolete.

Connectives.

Connectives are words which unite words and sentences in construction, joining two or more simple sentences into one compound one, and continuing the sentence at the pleasure of the writer or speaker. They also begin sentences after a full period, manifesting some relation between sentences in the general tenor of discourse.

The connectives of most general use, are *and, or, either, nor, neither, but, than*. To which may be added *because*.

And is supposed to denote an *addition*; as "The book is worth four shillings *add* sixpence." That is, it is worth four shillings, *add* sixpence, or with sixpence *added*.* "John resides at New-York, and Thomas, at Boston." That is, John resides at New-York, *add*, [add this which follows] Thomas resides at Boston. From the great use of this connective in joining words of which the same thing is affirmed or predicated, it may be justly called the *copulative* by way of eminence.

The distinguishing use of the connective is to save the repetition of words; for this sentence "John, Thomas and Peter reside at York," contains three simple sentences; "John resides at York,"—"Thomas resides at York,"—"Peter resides at York;" which are all combined into one, with a single verb and predicate, by means of the copulative.

Either and *or* have been already explained under the head of substitutes; for in strictness they are the representatives of sentences or words; but as *or* has totally lost that

* Mr. H. Tooke supposes *and* to be a contraction of *an-ad, an,* give and *ad* congeries, a mass, pile or heap. This etymology is not sufficiently probable; nor can I find one that is. *An*, in the Celtic, is equivalent to the English *the* or *that*; and perhaps *an* may be united to the radical of the verb *add*—in which case, the sense is, *add that—add what follows*. I find no small part of English words and many of our idioms are of Celtic original. But the origin of *and* is obscure; and that which is here offered is mere conjecture.

character, both these words will be here considered as connectives. Their use is to express an alternative, and I shall call them *alternatives*. Thus "Either John *or* Henry will be at the exchange," is an alternative sentence; the verb or predicate belonging to one or the other, but not to both; and whatever may be the number of names or propositions thus joined by *or*, the verb and predicate belong to one only.

One very common use of *or*, is to join to a word or sentence, something added by way of explanation or definition. Thus "No disease of the mind can more fatally disable it from benevolence, than ill-humor *or* peevishness." *Rambler*. No. 74. Here *peevishness* is not intended as a distinct thing from *ill-humor*, but as another term for the same idea. In this case, *or* expresses only an *alternative of words*, and not of signification.

Neither and *nor* are mere contractions of *ne-either*, the Saxon for *not either*, and of *ne or*, or *ne other*.* As *either* and *or* are affirmative of one or other of the particulars named, so *neither* and *nor* are negative of all the particulars. Thus "For I am persuaded that *neither* death, *nor* life, *nor* angels, *nor* principalities, *nor* powers, *nor* things present, *nor* things to come, *nor* height, *nor* depth, *nor* any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God." *Rom.* 8. 38. Here *neither* is in fact a substitute for each of the following particulars—all which it denies to be able to effect a certain purpose—not *either* of these which follow shall separate us from the love of God. It is laid down as a rule in our grammars, that *nor* must always answer to *neither*; but this is a great mistake, for the negation of *neither*, not either, extends to every one of the following alternatives. But *nor* is more generally used, and in many cases, as in the passage just recited, is far the most emphatical.

Neither and *nor* may be called *negative alternatives*.

But is used for two Saxon words, originally by mistake, but now by established custom; *bet* or *bote*, the radical of

* In some cases pronounced *nuther* or *nouter*, as it was formerly written.

our modern words *better*, *boot*, and denoting *sufficiency*, *compensation*, *more*, *further*, or *something additional*, by way of amendment; and *beutan* or *butan*, equivalent to *without* or *except*.

In the former sense, we have the word in this sentence; "John resides at York, *but* Thomas resides at Bristol." The primitive sense here is, John resides at York; *more*, *add* or *supply*, Thomas resides at Bristol. It does not signify *opposition*, as is usually supposed, but some addition to the sense of what goes before.

In the latter sense, or that of *beout*, it is used in this passage "He hath not grieved me *but* in part." 2 Cor. 2. 5. that is, "He hath not grieved me, *except* in part." The first assertion is a complete negation; the word *but*, (*beutan*) introduces an exception.—"Nothing, *but* true religion, can give us peace in death." Here also is a complete negation, with a saving introduced by *but*. Nothing, *except* true religion.

These were the only primitive uses of *but*, until by means of a mistake, a third sense was added, which is, that of *only*. Not knowing the origin and true meaning of *but*, authors omitted the negation in certain phrases where it was essential to a true construction; as in the following passages "Our light affliction which is *but* for a moment." 2 Cor. 4. "If they kill us, we shall *but* die." 2 Kings. 7.

The *but*, in these passages, is *buton*, be out, except; and according to the true original sense, *not* should precede, to give the sentence a negative turn; "Our light affliction is not, *but* (except) for a moment." "We shall not, *but* die." As they now stand, they would in strictness signify, Our light affliction is *except* for a moment—We can *except* die, which would not be sense. To correct the sense, and repair the breach made in the true English idiom, by this mistake, we must give *but* a new sense, equivalent to *only*. Thus we are obliged to patch and mend, to prevent the mischiefs of innovation.

The history of this word *but* should be, as Johnson expresses the idea, "a guide to reformers, and a terror to innovators." The first blunder or innovation blended two words of distinct meanings into one, in orthography and

pronunciation. Then the sense and etymology being obscured, authors proceeded to a further change, and suppressed the negation, which was essential to the *buton*. We have now therefore one word with three different* and unal-
lied meanings ; and to these may be reduced the whole of Johnson's eighteen definitions of *but*.

Let us however trace the mischief of this change a little further. As the word *but* is now used, a sentence may have the same meaning, *with* or *without* the negation. For example ; "he hath *not* grieved me, but in part"—and "he hath grieved me, but in part," have, according to our present use of *but*, precisely the same meaning. Or compare different passages of scripture, as they now stand in our bibles.

He hath *not* grieved me, *but* in part.

Our light affliction *is but* for a moment.

This however is not all ; for the innovation being directed neither by knowledge nor judgment, is not extended to all cases, and in a large proportion of phrases to which *but* belongs, it is used in its original sense with a preceding negation, especially with *nothing* and *none*. "There is none good, *but* one, that is God." *Matt.* 19. 17. This is correct—there is none good, except one, that is God. "He saw a fig-tree in the way, and found nothing thereon *but* leaves only." *Matt.* 21. 19. This is also correct—"he found nothing, except leaves," the *only* is redundant. "It amounts to no more *but* this." *Locke. Und. b.* 1. 2. This is a correct English phrase ; "it amounts to no more, *except* this," but it is nearly obsolete.

Hence the propriety of these phrases ; "They could not, *but* be known before." *Locke.* 1. 2. "The reader may be, nay cannot chuse *but* be very fallible in the understanding of it." *Locke.* 3. 9. Here *but* is used in its true sense—They could not, except this, be known before. That is, the contrary was not possible. The other phrase is frequently found in Shakespeare and other old writers, but is now obsolete. They *cannot chuse but*—that is, they have no choice, power or alternative, *except* to be very fallible.

But is called in our grammars, a *disjunctive conjunction*, connecting sentences, but expressing opposition in the sense. To illustrate the use of this word which *joins* and *disjoins* at the same time, Lowth gives this example; "You and I rode to London, *but* Peter staid at home."—Here the Bishop supposed the *but* to express an opposition in the sense. But let *but* be omitted, and what difference will the omission make in the sense? "You and I rode to London, Peter staid at home." Is the opposition in the sense less clearly marked than when the conjunction is used? By no means. And the truth is, that the opposition in the sense, when there is any, is never expressed by the connective at all, but always by the following sentence or phrase: "They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but see not." *Psalm* 115. 5. Let *but* be omitted—"They have mouths, they speak not; eyes have they, they see not." The omission of the connective makes not the smallest alteration in the sense, so far as opposition or difference of idea in the members of the sentence is concerned. Indeed the Bishop is most unfortunate in the example selected to illustrate his rule; for the copulative *and* may be used for *but*, without the least alteration of the sense—"You and I rode to London, *and* Peter staid at home." In this sentence the opposition is as completely expressed as if *but* was used; which proves that the opposition in the sense has no dependence on the connective.

Nor is it true that an opposition in the sense always follows *but*; "Man shall not live by bread alone, *but* by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." *Mat.* 4. 4. Here the last clause expresses no opposition, but merely an additional fact. The true sense of *but* when used for *bate*, is *supply, more, further, something additional*, to complete the sense—it may be in opposition to what has preceded, or in continuation only. In general however, the word *but* is appropriately used before a clause of a sentence, intended to introduce a new and somewhat different idea, by way of modifying the sense of the preceding clause. This use is very naturally deduced from the original sense of the word, something further which is to make complete or qualify what has preceded.

Than is a connective of comparison; as "John is taller than Peter."

Because, is a mere compound of the verb *be* and *cause*—the *cause be* or *is*—or *let the cause be*. "It is the case of some to contrive some false periods of business, *because* they may seem men of despatch." *Bacon of Despatch*. See also *Apoth.* 7. 6. This is a correct English idiom, Dr. Lowth's criticism to the contrary notwithstanding, but it is now obsolete.

Exclamations.

Exclamations are sounds uttered to express passions and emotions; usually those which are violent or sudden. They are called *interjections*, words *thrown in* between the parts of a sentence. But this is not always the fact, and the name is insignificant. The more appropriate name is, *exclamations*; as they are mere irregular sounds, uttered as passion dictates and not subject to rules.

A few of these sounds however become the customary modes of expressing particular passions and feelings in every nation. Thus in English, joy and surprise and grief are expressed by *oh*, uttered with a different tone and countenance. *Alas* expresses grief or great sorrow—*fish*, *fishaw*, express contempt. Sometimes verbs, names and attributes are uttered by way of exclamation, in a detached manner; as hail! Welcome! Bless me! Gracious heavens!

In two or three instances, exclamations are followed by names and substitutes in the nominative and objective—as *O thou* in the nominative—*ah me* in the objective. Sometimes *that* follows *O*, expressing a wish—"O that the Lord would guide my ways." But in all such cases, we may consider *wish* or some other verb to be understood.

Derivation.

However numerous may be the words in a language, the number of radical words is small. Most words are formed from others by addition of certain words or terminating syllables, which were originally distinct words, but which have lost their distinct character, and are now used only in combination with other words. Thus *er* in *lover*, is a contraction of *wer*, a Saxon word denoting *man*, [the Latin *vir* ;] *ness* is from the same root as *nasus*, nose, promontory, and denotes state or condition ; *ly* is an abbreviation of *like* or *liche* ; *fy* is from *fio*, to make, &c.

Most of the English derivatives fall under the following heads :

1. Names formed from names, or more generally from verbs, by the addition of *r*, *er* or *or*, denoting an agent ; as *lover*, *hater*, *assignor*, *flatterer*, from *love*, *hate*, *assign*, *flatter*. In a few instances, words thus formed are less regular ; as *glazier*, from *glass*, *courtier*, from *court*, *parishioner*, from *parish*.

2. Names converted into verbs by the prefix *to*, as from *love*, to *love* ; from *fear*, to *fear*, and to *hope*, to *cloud*, to *water*, from the nouns.

3. Attributes converted into verbs in the same manner ; as to *lame*, to *cool*, to *warm*, from *lame*, *cool*, *warm*.

4. Verbs formed from names and attributes by the termination *ize* ; as *method*, *methodize* ; *system*, *systemize* ; *moral*, *moralize*. When the primitive ends with a vowel, the consonant *t* is prefixed to the termination ; as *stigma*, *stigmatize*.

5. Verbs formed from names and attributes by the addition of *en* or *n* ; as *lengthen*, *widen*, from *length*, *wide*.

6. Verbs formed by *fy* ; as *brutify*, *stratify*, from *brute*, *stratum*.

7. Names formed from attributes by *ness* ; as *goodness*, from *good* ; *graciousness*, from *gracious*.

8. Names formed by *dom* and *ric*, denoting jurisdiction ; as kingdom, bishopric, from king and bishop. *Dom* and *ric*, are nouns denoting jurisdiction or territory.

9. Names formed by *hood* and *ship*, denoting state or condition ; as manhood, lordship, from man, lord.

10. Names ending in *ment* and *age*, from the French, denoting state or act ; as commandment, parentage, from command, parent.

11. Names in *er*, *or* and *ee*, used by way of opposition, the former denoting the agent, the latter the receiver or person to whom an act is performed ; as assignor, assignee ; indorser, indorsee.

12. Attributes formed from names by the addition of *y* ; as healthy, from health ; pithy, from pith ; or *ly* added to the name ; as stately, from state. *Ly* is a contraction of *like*.

13. Attributes formed from names by the addition of *ful* ; as hopeful, from hope.

14. Attributes formed from names or verbs by *ible* or *able* ; as payable, from pay ; creditable, from credit ; compressible, from compress. *Able* denotes power or capacity.

15. Attributes formed from names or attributes by *ish* ; as whitish, from white ; blackish, from black ; waggish, from wag.

16. Attributes formed from names by *less* ; as fatherless, from father, noting destitution.

17. Attributes formed from names by *ous* ; as famous, from fame, gracious, from grace.

18. Attributes formed by adding *some* to names ; as delightful, from delight.

19. Modifiers formed from attributes by *ly*, as sweetly, from sweet.

20. Names to express females formed by adding *ess* to the masculine gender ; as heiress, from heir. *Ess* is from the Hebrew *essa*, a female.

21. Names ending in *ly*, some directly from the Latin, others formed from attributes ; as responsibility, from responsible ; contractility, from contractile ; probity, from probitas.

22. Attributes formed by adding *al* to names ; as national, from nation.

23. Attributes ending in *ic* mostly from the Latin, or French, but some of them by the addition of *ic* to a name ; as balsamic, from balsam ; sulphuric, from sulphur.

24. Names formed by *ate* to denote the union of substances in salts ; as carbonate, in the chemical nomenclature denotes carbonic acid combined with another body.

25. Names ending in *ite*, from other names and denoting salts formed by the union of acids with other bodies, as sulphite, from sulphur.

26. Names ending in *ret* formed from other names, and denoting a substance combined with an alkaline, earthy or metallic base ; as sulphuret, carburet, from sulphur and carbon.

27. Names formed from other names by adding *cy* ; as ensigncy, captaincy, from ensign, captain.

Words are also formed by prefixing certain syllables and words, some of them significant, by themselves ; others never used but in composition : as *re*, *fire*, *con*, *mis*, *sub*, *super* ; and great numbers are formed by the union of two words ; as bed-room, ink-stand, pen-knife.

Syntax.

Syntax teaches the rules to be observed in the construction of sentences.

A sentence is a number of words arranged in due order, and forming a complete affirmation or proposition. In philosophical language, a sentence consists of a subject and a predicate, connected by an affirmation. Thus "God is

omnipotent," is a complete proposition or sentence, composed of *God*, the subject, *omnipotent*, the predicate or thing affirmed, connected by the verb *is*, which forms the affirmation.

The predicate is often included in the verb; as "the sun shines."

A simple sentence then contains one subject and one personal verb; that is the *name* and the *verb*; and without these, no proposition can be formed.

A compound sentence consists of two or more simple sentences, joined by connectives. The divisions of a compound sentence may be called members or clauses.

Sentences are *declaratory*, as I am writing; the wind blows—*imperative*, as go, retire, be quiet—*interrogative*, as where am I? who art thou?—or *conditional*, as If he should arrive.

The rules for the due construction of sentences fall under three heads. *First*, concord or agreement—*Second*, government—*Third*, arrangement and punctuation.

In agreement, the *name* or noun is the controlling word, as it carries with it the verb, the substitute and the attribute. In government, the verb is the controlling word; but names and prepositions have their share of influence also.

Agreement or Concord.

RULE 1.

A verb must agree with its nominative in number and person.

Examples.

In solemn style. "Thou hast loved righteousness."

Heb. 1. 9.

"Thou madest man a little lower than the angels, and crownedst him with glory and honor." *Heb. 2. 7.*

"Thou shalt not steal." *Commandment.*

"*Art thou called, being a servant?*" 1 Cor. 7. 21.

"*But ye are washed; but ye are sanctified.*"

1 Cor. 6. 11.

"*Know ye not that we shall judge angels.*"

1 Cor. 1. 2.

"*Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world.*"

1 Cor. 1. 2.

In familiar language, "*This is the word of promise.*"
Rom. 9. 9.

I write; John reads; *Newton was* the first of astronomers; *we are* astonished at his discoveries; *are you* pleased with the new chemistry? *Emilia has* an elegant form.

NOTE.....The nominative to a verb is found by young learners, by asking *who* or *what* does what is affirmed. "Eumenes, a young man of great abilities, inherited a large estate from his father. His father, harrassed with competitions, and perplexed with a multiplicity of business, recommended the quiet of a private station." Let the question be asked, who inherited a large estate? The answer is *Eumenes*, which is the nominative to the verb *inherited*. Who recommended the quiet of a private station? *His father*, which is therefore the nominative to the verb *recommended*.

NOTE 2.....Let the following rules be observed respecting the position of the nominative.

I. The nominative usually precedes the verb in declaratory phrases; as "God created the world;" "the law is a rule of right." But the nominative may be separated from its verb, by a member of a period; as "*Liberty*, say the fanatic favorers of popular power, *can* only be found in a democracy." *Anarch. ch. 62.*

II. The nominative often follows an intransitive verb, for such a verb can have no object after it, and that position of the nominative creates no ambiguity: thus, "Above it stood the *Seraphims.*" *Isa. 6.* "Gradual sinks the breeze." *Thompson.*

III. When the verb is preceded by *here, there, hence, thence, then, thus, yet, so, nor, neither, such, the same, herein, therein, wherein*, and perhaps by some other words, the nominative may follow the verb, especially *be*; as “here are five men;” “there was a man sent from God;” “hence arise wars;” “thence proceed our vicious habits;” “then came the scribes and pharisees:” “thus saith the Lord;” “yet required not I bread of the governor.” *Neh. 5. 18.* “So panteth my soul after thee, O Lord.” *Psalms 42.* “Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents.” *John 9.* “Such were the facts;” “the same was the fact.” “Herein consists the excellence of the English government.” *Blacks. Com. b. 1.*

IV. When an emphatical attribute introduces a sentence, the nominative may follow the verb; as “Great is the Lord, glorious are his works, and happy is the man who has an interest in his favor.”

V. In certain phrases, which are conditional or hypothetical, the sign of the condition may be omitted, and the nominative placed after the auxiliary; as “Did he but know my anxiety; for, if he did but know—“Had I known the fact,” for, if I had known—“Would they consent,” for, if they would, &c.

VI. When the words *whose, his, their, her, mine, your*, &c. precede the verb with a governing word, the nominative may follow the verb; as “Out of whose modifications have been made most complex modes.” *Locke 2. 22. 10.*

VII. In interrogative sentences, the nominative follows the verb when alone, or the first auxiliary; as *believest thou? Will he consent? Has he been promoted?* The nominative also follows the verb in the imperative mode; as *go thou, “be ye warmed and filled.”* But after a single verb, the nominative is commonly omitted; as *arise, flee.*

NOTE 3.....In poetry, the nominative is often omitted in interrogative sentences, in cases where in prose the omission would be improper; as "Lives there who loves his pain." *Milton*. That is, lives there a man or person.

NOTE 4.....In the answer to a question, the whole sentence is usually omitted, except the name, which is the principal subject of the interrogation; as "who made the chief discoveries concerning vapor? Black." "Whose theory of respiration is generally received? Crawford's."

NOTE 5.....In poetry, the verb in certain phrases is omitted, chiefly such verbs as express an address or answer; as "To whom the monarch"—that is, said or replied.

NOTE 6.....When a verb is placed between two nominatives in different numbers, it may agree with either; but generally is made to agree with the first, and this may be considered as preferable; as "His *meat* was locusts and wild honey." It [piracy] is the remains of the manners of ancient Greece." *Anarch. ch. 36*.

NOTE 7.....Verbs follow the connective *than*, without a nominative expressed; as "Not that any thing occurs in consequence of our late loss, more afflictive than *was* to be expected." *Life of Cowp. Let. 62*.

"He felt himself addicted to philosophical speculations, with more ardor than consisted with the duties of a Roman and a senator." *Murphy's Tacitus. 4. 57*.

"All words that lead the mind to any other ideas, than *are* supposed really to exist in that thing." *Locke. 2. 25*.

These forms of expression seem to be elliptical; "more afflictive than *that which* was to be expected." *That which* or *those which* will generally supply the ellipsis.

NOTE 8.....We sometimes see a nominative introducing a sentence, the sense suddenly interrupted, and the nominative left without its intended verb; as "The name of a procession; what a great mixture of independent ideas of persons, habits, tapers, orders, motions, sounds does it contain," &c. *Locke 3. 5. 13*. This form of expression is often very striking in animated discourse. The first words, being the subject of the discourse and important, are made to usher in the sentence, to invite attention; and the mind of the speaker, in the fervor of animation, quitting the trammels of a formal arrangement, rushes forward to a description of the thing mentioned, and presents the more striking ideas in the form of exclamation.

NOTE 9.... We have one phrase in which the personal substitute *me* precedes a verb in the third person—*methinks, methought*. Anciently *him* was used in like manner—*him thuhte*, him thought. *Alf. Orosius*. And names also; as “*tham halgan Gast was gethuht*.” It thought (or seemed good) to the Holy Ghost. *Lamb. Sax. Laws*. 21. *Him, me* and *tham* are here in the Saxon dative case.

RULE II.

A name, a nominative case or a sentence joined with a verbal or participle of the present tense, may stand in construction without a verb, forming the *Case* or *Clause independent*; as “*Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place*.” *John* 5. 13. Here *multitude*, the name, joined with *being*, stands without a verb.

“By memory we conceive heat or light, yellow or sweet, the object being removed.” *Locke* 2. 10.

“I have, notwithstanding this discouragement, attempted a dictionary of the English language.” *Johnson's Preface*.

“Whatever substance begins to exist, it must, during its existence, necessarily be the same.” *Locke* 2. 27. 28.*

“The penalty shall be fine and imprisonment, any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding.”

The latter phraseology is peculiar to the technical law style. In no other case, does *notwithstanding* follow the sentence. But this position makes no difference in the true construction, which is, “any law or custom to the contrary not opposing”—the real clause independent.

It is very common, when this verbal agrees with a number of words, or a whole clause, to omit the whole except

* *During* is the verbal of an old verb now obsolete; but its derivatives *endure* and *enduring* are in use. *During* is usually called a *preposition*; but no consideration can justify the practice—it retains its true verbal sense. Equally erroneous is the classification of *notwithstanding*, with conjunctions. The two words, *not* and *withstanding* are joined indeed without reason; but the resolution of sentences in which this compound is found, demand a restoration of it to its true place and character.

the verbal ; and in this use of *notwithstanding*, we have a striking proof of the value of abbreviations in language. For example ; “Moses said, let no man leave of it till the morning. *Notwithstanding*, they hearkened not unto Moses.” *Ex.* 16. 20. Here *notwithstanding* stands without the clause to which it belongs ; to complete the sense in words, it would be necessary to repeat the whole preceding clause or the substance of it—“Moses said, let no man leave of it until the morning. *Notwithstanding this command of Moses*, or *notwithstanding Moses said that which has been recited*, they hearkened not unto Moses.”

“Folly meets with success in this world ; but it is true, *notwithstanding*, that it labors under disadvantages.” *Porteus. Lecture 13.* This passage at length would read thus—“Folly meets with success in the world ; but it is true, *notwithstanding folly meets with success in the world*, that it labors under disadvantages.” By supplying what is really omitted, yet perfectly well understood, we learn the true construction ; so that *notwithstanding* is a verbal always agreeing with a word or clause, expressed or understood, and forming the independent clause ; and by a customary ellipsis, it stands alone in the place of that clause.

Such is its general use in the translation of the scriptures. In the following passage, the sentence is expressed—“Notwithstanding I have spoken unto you.” *Jer.* 35. That is, “This fact, *I have spoken unto you*, not opposing or preventing.” Or in other words, “In opposition to this fact.”

It is also very common to use a substitute *this*, *that*, *which* or *what*, for the whole sentence ; as “Bodies which have no taste, and no power of affecting the skin, may, *notwithstanding this*, [notwithstanding they have no taste, and no power to affect the skin] act upon organs which are more delicate.” *Fourcroy. Translation.*

I have included in hooks, the words for which *this* is a substitute.

“To account for the misery that men bring on themselves, *notwithstanding that*, they do all in earnest pursue happiness, we must consider how things come to be represented to our desires under deceitful appearances.”

Locke 2. 21. 61.

Here *that*, a substitute, is used, and the sentence also for which it is a substitute. This is correct English, but it is usual to omit the substitute, when the sentence is expressed—“*Notwithstanding they do all in earnest pursue happiness.*”

It is not uncommon to omit the verbal of the present tense, when a verbal of the perfect tense is employed—“The son of God, while clothed in flesh, was subject to all the frailties and inconveniences of human nature, *sin excepted.*” *Locke*. 3. 9. That is, *sin being excepted*; the clause independent.

This omission is more frequent when the verbal *provided* is used, than in any other case. “In the one case, *provided the facts on which it is founded be sufficiently numerous*, the conclusion is said to be morally certain.” *Campbell on Rhet.* 1. 114. Here *being* is omitted, and the whole clause in italics is independent—“*The facts on which it is founded are sufficiently numerous*, that *being provided*, the conclusion is morally certain. *Provided*, in such cases, is equivalent to *given*, *admitted* or *supposed*.

“In mathematical reasoning, *provided you are ascertained of the regular procedure of the mind*, to affirm that the conclusion is false, implies a contradiction.” *ibm.* 134.

In this phrase, *that* may follow *provided*—*provided that*, you are ascertained, &c. as in the case of *notwithstanding*, before mentioned—*that* being a definitive substitute, pointing to the following sentence—*that which follows being provided.**

To this construction must be referred the old verbal *since* [sithence, sith, sin, for *seen*] from the Saxon verb to *see*. “The Lord hath blessed thee *since my coming.*” *Gen.* 30. 30. That is, *my coming being seen*. This was a Saxon expression to fix the time of an event, or its beginning and continuation, which were represented by the idea of *seeing* it. “As he spake by the mouth of his holy

**Provided that*, says Johnson, is an adverbial expression, and we sometimes see *provided* numbered among the conjunctions, as its correspondent word is in French. What strange work has been made with Grammar!

prophets, which have been, *since the world began.*" Luke 1. 70. That is, "the world began being seen"—that fact being in existence.*

It is not uncommon for authors to carry the practice of abridging discourse so far as to obscure the common regular construction. An instance frequently occurs in the omission both of the nominative and the verbal, in the case independent. For example: "*Conscious of his own weight and importance, his conduct in parliament would be directed by nothing but the constitutional duty of a peer.*" Junius. Let. 19. Here is no noun expressed to which *conscious* can be referred. We are therefore to supply the necessary words, to complete the construction—"He being conscious"—forming the clause independent.

RULE III.

A sentence, a number of words or a clause of a sentence may be the nominative to a verb, in which case the verb is always in the third person of the singular number; as "*All that is in a man's power in this case, is, only to observe what the ideas are which take their turns in the understanding.*" Locke 2. 14. Here the whole clause in italics is the nominative to *is*.

"*To attack vices in the abstract, without touching persons, may be safe fighting indeed, but it is fighting with shadows.*" Pope. Let. 48.

"I deny that *men's coming to the use of reason, is the time of their discovery.*" Locke 1. 2.

"*That any thing can exist, without existing in space, is to my mind incomprehensible.*" Darwin. Zoon. sect. 14. Here the definitive substitute may be transferred to a place next before the verb—"Any thing can exist, without existing in space," that [whole proposition] *is* incomprehensible.

* This word has also been thrown into the *common sink of adverbs and prepositions*.

No species of sentences fall under this rule more frequently than those which begin with the radical verb. “*To shew how the understanding proceeds herein, is the design of the following discourse.*” *Locke* 1. 4.

This sentence may be inverted without the change of a single word. “The design of the following discourse is to show,” &c.

“To fear no eye and to suspect no tongue, *is* the great prerogative of innocence.” *Rambler*. This sentence may be inverted; but according to our idiom, the substitute *it* would precede the verb—“*it is the great prerogative of innocence to fear,*” &c. The sentence thus inverted would be good English without the substitute—“The great prerogative of innocence is”—but this alters the sense, and limits the prerogatives of innocence to the one mentioned. By changing *the* to *a*, this inconvenience would be remedied; but in either case the force of the sentiment would be impaired.

“*Our idea of eternity can be nothing but an infinite succession of moments of duration.*” *Locke* 2. 17. 16. “*The notion they have of duration, forces them to conceive,*” &c. *ibm*. In these passages, we observe the nominative or subject of the affirmation consists of several words; for it is not simply *an idea* which is affirmed to be nothing but an infinite succession of moments of duration; but our *idea of eternity*. In like manner, attributes and other words often make an essential part of the nominative. “A wise son maketh a glad father; but a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother.” Abstract the name from its attribute, and the propositions cannot always be true—“A son maketh a glad father”—a son is the heaviness of his mother.”

“He that gathereth in summer is a wise son.” Here the predicate belongs to the person described—“He that gathereth in summer.” Take away the description, *that gathereth in summer*, and the affirmation ceases to be true or becomes inapplicable.

These sentences or clauses thus constituting the subject of an affirmation, may be termed *nominative sentences*.

RULE IV.

The radical verb may be the nominative to a personal verb ; as “ *to see* is desirable ; *to die* is the inevitable lot of men.” Sometimes an attribute is joined with the radical verb ; as *to be blind* is calamitous.” In this case the attribute has no name expressed to which it refers. The proposition is abstract, and applicable to any human being, but not applied to any.

RULE V.

In some cases, the imperative verb is used without a definite nominative ; as “ I will not take any thing that is thine—*save* only that which the young men have eaten.” *Gen. 14. 24.*

“ Israel burned none, *save* Hazor only.” *Josh. 11. 13.*

“ I would that all—were such as I am, *except* these bonds.” *Acts 26. 29.*

“ Our ideas are movements of the nerves of sense, as of the optic nerve in recollecting visible ideas, *suppose* of a triangular piece of ivory.” *Darwin. Zoon. Lect. 39.*

This use of certain verbs in the imperative is very frequent, and there is a peculiar felicity in being thus able to use a verb in its true sense and with its proper object, without specifying a nominative ; for the verb is thus left applicable to the first, second or third person. I may *save* or *except*, or you may *except*, or we may *suppose*. If we examine these sentences, we shall be convinced of the propriety of the idiom ; for the ideas require no application to any person whatever.

RULE VI.

When the same thing is affirmed or predicated of two or more subjects, in the singular number, the nominatives are joined by the copulative *and*, with a verb agreeing with them in the plural number; as "John and Thomas and Peter reside at Oxford." In this sentence, *residence at Oxford* is a predicate common to three persons—and instead of three affirmations—John resides at Oxford, Thomas resides at Oxford, Peter resides at Oxford; the three names are joined by *and*, and one verb in the plural applied to the whole number.

"Reason and truth constitute intellectual gold, which defies destruction." *Johnson*. "Why are *whiteness* and *coldness* in snow?" *Locke*. "Your *lot* and *mine*, in this respect, *have been* very different." *Cowp. Let. 38.**

In like manner, names and attributes representing all the subjects or particulars connected by *and*, must be in the plural number; as "Plato and Aristotle *were* learned men; *these philosophers* founded the academic and peripatetic schools." "The most able *generals* of the last century *were* Frederick of Prussia, the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene." "We look on the *whiteness* and *softness*, produced in the wax, not as *qualities* in the sun, but *effects* produced by its powers." *Locke 2. 8.*

When three or more particulars are enumerated, the connective may be omitted, except before the last; as "The particular bulk, number, figure and motion of the parts of fire or snow are really in them." *Locke 2. 8.* The copulative may however be inserted, where the repetition of it adds to the ideas dignity, force or solemnity.

When terms of number are employed to specify the particulars, the copulative is suppressed; as "These three then, first the law of God, secondly the law of political societies, thirdly the law of fashion or private censure, are those to which men compare their actions." *Locke 2. 28. 13.*

* The last example is an evidence that *mine* is a possessive case!!

NOTE 1.....The rule for the use of a plural verb with two or more names in the singular number, connected by *and*, is laid down by critics with too much positiveness and universality. On original principles, all the names, except the first, are in the objective case; for it is probable that *and* contains in it the verb *add*. "John and Thomas and Peter reside at York," on primitive principles must be thus resolved—"John, add Thomas, add Peter reside at York." But without resorting to first principles, which are now lost or obscured, the use of the singular verb may be justified by considering the verb to be *understood* after each name; and that which is expressed, agreeing only with the last; as "Nor were the young fellows so wholly lost to a sense of right, as *pride* and *conceit* has since made them affect to be." *Rambler*. No. 97. That is, as *pride* *has* and as *conceit* *has*. "Their safety and welfare *is* most concerned." *Spectator*. No. 121. In our best authors the singular verb is frequent in such sentences.*

What will the hypercritic say to this sentence, "Either sex and every age was engaged in the pursuits of industry." *Gibbon*. *Rom. Emp.* ch. 10. Is not the distributive effect of *either* and *every*, such as to demand a singular verb? So in the following: "The judicial and every other power *is* accountable to the legislative." *Paley*. *Phil.* 6. 8.

NOTE 2.....When names and substitutes belonging to different persons, are thus joined, the plural substitute must be of the first person in preference to the second and third, and of the second in preference to the third—*I*, *you* and *he* are represented by *we*; *you* and *he*, by *you*. Pope in one of his letters makes *you* or *I* to be represented by *we* or *you*. "Either *you* or *I* are not in love with the other." The sentence is an awkward one and not to be imitated.

RULE VII.

When an affirmation or predicate refers to one subject only among a number, which are separately named in the singular number, the subjects are joined by the alternative *or* or *nor*, with a verb, substitute and name in the sin-

* This was also a very common practice with the best Greek and Roman writers—"Mens enim, et ratio, et consilium in senibus est." *Cicero*. *de Senec.* ca. 19.

"Sed etiam ipsius terræ vis et natura delectat." *ibm.* 15.

See *Homer*. *Il.* 1. 61.

See also examples in the Greek Testament. *Matth.* 12. 31.—13. 42, 50.—16. 17.—23. 1.

gular number ; as “ Either John or Peter *was* at the Exchange yesterday ; but neither John nor Peter *is* there to-day.”

Errors. “ A circle or square *are* the same in idea.”

Locke 2. 8.

“ But whiteness or redness *are* not in the porphyry.”

ibm.

“ Neither of them [Tillotson and Temple] *are* remarkable for precision.” *Blair.*

Substitutes for sentences, whether they represent a single clause, or the parts of a compound sentence, are always in the singular number ; as “ *It is true indeed that many have neglected opportunities of raising themselves to honors and to wealth, and rejected the kindest offers of fortune.*” *Rambler. No. 58.* Here *it* and *that* refer to the clauses which follow—“ *It is true that, many have rejected the kindest offers, &c.*”

“ *It being unavoidable in discourses, differing from the ordinary received notions, either to make new words, or to use old words in a new signification.*” *Locke* 2. 12. 14. Here *it* refers to the two alternative clauses which succeed.

RULE VIII.

Collective or aggregate names, comprehending two or more individuals under a term in the singular number, have a verb or substitute to agree with them in the singular or plural ; as The council *is* or *are* unanimous ; the company *was* or *were* collected ; *this* people, or *these* people.

No precise rule can be given to direct, in every case, which number is to be used. Much regard is to be had to usage, and to the unity or plurality of idea. In general, modern practice inclines to the use of the plural verb and substitute ; as may be seen in the daily use of clergy, nobility, court, council, commonalty, audience, enemy and the like.

“ The clergy began to withdraw themselves from the temporal courts.” *Blacks. Com. Introduction.*

“Let us take a view of the principal incidents, attending the nobility, exclusive of *their* capacity as hereditary counsellors of the crown.” *Bl. Com.* 1. 12.

“The commonalty *are* divided into several degrees.”
ibm.

“The enemy *were* driven from their works.” *Portuguese Asia. Mickle.* 163.

“The chorus *prepare* resistance at his first approach—the chorus *sings* of the battle—the chorus *entertains* the stage.” *Johnson’s Life of Milton.*

“The nobility *are* the pillars to support the throne.”
Bl. Com. 1. 2.

Party and *army*, in customary language, are joined with a verb in the singular number. *Constitution* cannot be plural. *Church* may be singular or plural. *Mankind* is almost always plural.

The most common and palpable mistakes in the application of this rule, occur in the use of *sort* and *kind*, with a plural attribute—*these sort, those kind*. This fault infects the works of our best writers; but these words are strictly singular, and ought so to be used.

When a collective name is preceded by a definitive, which clearly limits the sense of the word to an aggregate with an idea of unity, it requires a verb and substitute to agree with it in the singular number; as *a company of troops was* detached; *a troop of cavalry was* raised; *this people is* become a great nation; *that assembly was* numerous; “a government established by *that* people.” *Bl. Com.* 1. 2.

Yet our language seems to be averse to the use of *it*, as the substitute for names even thus limited by *a, this* or *that*. “How long will *this people* provoke me, and how long will it be ere *they* will believe me for all the signs that I have shewed among *them*.” *Num.* 14. 11. “Liberty should reach every individual of *a people*; as *they* all share one

common nature." *Spectator*. No. 287. In these passages, *it* in the place of *they*, would not be relished by an English ear; nor is it ever used in similar cases.*

RULE IX.

When the nominative consists of several words, and the last of the names is in the plural number, the verb is commonly in the plural also; "A *part of the exports* consist of raw silk." "The *number of oysters* increase." *Golds. Anim. Nat.* vol. 4, ch. 3. "Of which seeming equality we have no other measure, but such as the *train of our ideas* have lodged in our memories." *Locke* 2. 14. 21. "The greater *part of philosophers* have acknowledged the excellence of this government." *Anarch.* vol. 5. 272.

NOTE 1.....The practice of using a plural verb after these and similar nominatives, is a proof of the propriety of considering the whole of the words or the name and its adjuncts as the actual nominative. Separate the words *part* and *exports* in the first example, and the affirmation of the verb cannot with truth be applied to either; and as the whole must be considered as the nominative, the verb is very naturally connected in number with the last name.

NOTE 2.....When an aggregate amount is expressed by the plural names of the particulars composing that amount, the verb may be in the singular number; as "There *was* more than a hundred and fifty thousand pounds sterling." *Mavor. Voyages*. 1.

However repugnant to the principles of grammar this may seem at first view, the practice is correct; for the affirmation is not made of the individual parts or divisions named, the *pounds*, but of the entire sum or amount. See this subject more fully explained under Rule 14.

*The Romans used a greater latitude in joining plurals with collective names, than we can—"Magna *pars* in villis *repleti* cibo *vineque*." *Liv.* 2. 26. Here is an attribute plural of the masculine gender, agreeing with a name in the singular, of the feminine gender.

RULE X.

Substitutes [pronouns] must agree with the names they represent, in number, gender and person ; as

“ Mine *answer* to them that do examin me is *this*.”
1 Cor. 9. 3.

“ *These* are not the *children* of God.” Rom. 9. 8.

“ Speak unto the *children* of Israel and say unto *them*, when *ye* come into the land whither I bring *you*.”
Num. 15. 18.

“ This is the heir, come let us kill *him*, and let us seize on *his* inheritance.” Matth. 21. 38.

“ *Esther* put on *her* royal apparel—*she* obtained favor in his sight—then the king said unto *her*.” Esth. 5.

“ A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and it was parted”—Gen. 2. 10.

“ The *woman whom* thou gavest to be with me.”
Gen. 3. 12.

“ *Ignatius, who* was bishop of Antioch, conversed with the apostles.” Paley. Evid. sect. 3.

“ A letter, *which* is just received, gives us the news.”

“ O *thou who* rulest in the heavens.”

Who and *whom* are exclusively the substitutes for persons ; *whose* is of all genders, and as correctly applied to things as to persons.

“ The question *whose* solution I require.” Dryden.

“ That forbidden *fruit whose* mortal taste”—Milton.

“ A *system whose* imagined suns ;” Golds.

“ These are the charming agonies of love
Whose miseries delight.” Thomp.

It, tho neuter, is used as the substitute for *infant* or *child* ; the distinction of sex in the first period of life being disregarded.

Formerly *which* was used as a substitute for *persons*; as appears from old authors, and especially in the vulgar version of the scriptures—"mighty men *which* were of old." But this use of the word is entirely discarded. *Which* however represents persons, when a question is asked or discrimination intended; as *which* of the men was it; I know not *which* person it was.

Who, is sometimes used as the substitute for things, but most unwarrantably: "The countries *who*"—*Davenant on Rev.* 2. 13. "The towns, *who*"—*Hume Contin.* 11. ch. 10. "The faction or party *who*"—Equally faulty is the use of *who* and *whom* for brutes: "the birds *who*"—

The use of *it* for a sentence, seems to have given rise to a very vague application of the word in phrases like this: How shall I contrive *it* to attend court? How fares *it* with you? But such phrases, whatever may have given rise to them, are used chiefly in familiar colloquial language, and are deemed inelegant in any other style.

A more justifiable use of *it* is seen in this sentence: "But it is not this real essence that distinguishes them into species; *it* is men, who range them into sorts," &c. *Locke.* 3. 6. 36.

Here *it* is in the singular, tho referring to *men* in the plural. The cause or origin of this, in our language as in others, may perhaps be found in the disposition of the mind to combine the particular agents employed in performing an act, into a single agent. The *unity* of the *act* or *effect* seems to predominate in idea, and control the grammatical construction of the substitute.

RULE XI.

In compound sentences, a single substitute, *who*, *which*, or *that* employed to introduce a new clause, is the nominative to the verb or verbs belonging to that clause, and to others connected with it; as "The thirst after curiosities, *which* often draws contempt." *Rambler.* No. 83. "He *who* suffers not his faculties to lie torpid, has a chance of doing good." *ibm.* "They *that* are after the flesh, do

mind the things of the flesh." *Rom.* 8. 5. "Among those *who* are the most richly *endowed* by nature, and [are] *accomplished* by their own industry, how few are there whose virtues are not obscured by the ignorance, prejudice or envy of their beholders." *Spect.* No. 255.

In a few instances, the substitute for a sentence or a clause, is introduced as the nominative to a verb, *before* the sentence or clause which it represents; as "There was therefore, *which* is all that we assert, a course of life pursued by them, different from that which they before led." *Paley. Evid.* ch. 1. Here *which* is the representative of the whole of the last part of the sentence, and its natural position is *after* that clause.

The substitute *what* combines in itself the offices of two substitutes, *which*, if expressed, would be the nominatives to two verbs, each in distinct subsequent clauses; as "Add to this, *what*, from its antiquity *is* but little known, *has* the recommendation of novelty." *Hermes. pref.* 10. Here *what* stands for *that, which*—and the two following verbs have no other nominative.

This use of *what* is not very common. But *what* is very frequently used as the representative of two cases—one, the objective after a verb or preposition, and the other, the nominative to a subsequent verb. Examples:

"I heard *what* was said." "He related *what* was seen."

"We do not so constantly love *what* has done us good."
Locke 2. 20. 14.

"Agreeable to *what* was afterwards directed."
Bl. Com. b. 2. ch. 3.

"Agreeable to *what* hath been mentioned."
Pridsaux. p. 2. 6. 3.

"There is something so overruling in *whatever* inspires us with awe." *Burke on Sublime.* 304. In these sentences *what* includes an object after a verb or preposition, and a nominative to the following verb. "I have heard *that, which* was said."

RULE XII.

When a new clause is introduced into a sentence, with two substitutes, or with one substitute and a name, one of them is the nominative to the verb, and the other is governed by the verb or a preposition in the objective case, or by a noun in the possessive; as "Locke, *whom* there is no reason to suspect of favoring idleness, has advanced"—*Ramb.* 89. Here *reason* is the nominative to *is*, and *whom* is governed by *suspect*.

"Take thy only son Isaac, *whom* thou lovest." *Gen.* 22. Here are two substitutes, one the nominative to the verb, and the other governed by it in the objective.

"God is the sovereign of the universe, whose majesty ought to fill us with awe, *to whom* we owe all possible reverence, and *whom* we are bound to obey."

It is not unusual to see in periods, a third clause introduced within a second, as a second is within the first, each with a distinct substitute for a nominative; as, "Those modifications of any simple idea, *which*, as has been said, I call simple modes, are distinct ideas." *Locke* 2. 13.

Involution to this extent may be used with caution, without embarrassing a period; but beyond this, if ever used, it can hardly fail to occasion obscurity. Indeed the third member included in a second, must be very short, or it will perplex the reader.

Substitutes are sometimes made to precede their principals: thus, "When a man declares in autumn, when he is eating *them*, or in spring when there are *none*, that he loves grapes." *Locke* 2. 20. But this arrangement is usually awkward and seldom allowable.

RULE XIII.

When there are two antecedents in different persons, to which a nominative substitute refers, the substitute and verb following may agree with either, tho usage may sometimes offer a preference; as "I am the Lord that make all things; that stretch forth the heavens alone; that spread abroad the earth," &c. *Isa.* 44. Here *I* and *Lord* are of different persons, and *that* may agree with either—If it agrees with *I* the verbs must be in the first person; "I am the Lord *that make.*" If *that* agrees with *Lord* in the third person, the verb must be in the third person; "I am the Lord *that maketh.*" But in all cases, the following verbs should all be of the same person.

RULE XIV.

The definitive attributes, *this* and *that*, the only attributes which are varied to express number, must agree in number with the names to which they refer; as *this* city, *that* church; these cities, those churches.

This and *that* are often used as substitutes for a name in the singular number, which is omitted; but the same name in the plural immediately follows after a connective; as in this example, "The mortality produced by *this* and other *diseases*"—*Life of Washington.* 3. 6. That is, by this disease and other diseases. The sentence may be varied thus—by this disease and others—but the first form is the most common, and it occasions no obscurity.

Other attributes and verbals used as attributes, are joined to the names which they qualify without inflection; as a wise man, wise men; an amiable child, or amiable children; a received truth, or received truths; a shining character, or shining characters.

Attributes are often used as substitutes for the names of men and things which they describe by their qualities; as *few* were present; the *wise* are respected; the *bravest* are not always victorious.

In this character, attributes take the plural form, and are qualified by other attributes; as the *goods* of fortune, two *finites* or *infinites*, *universals*, *generals*—the *chief good*, a *happy few*; “the *extraordinary great*”—Burke on the *Sublime*. 304. “The *blue profound*.” Akenside.

When names are joined by a copulative, an attribute preceding the first, is applied to the others without being repeated; as “From *great* luxury and licentiousness”—here *great* belongs to licentiousness as well as to luxury. “Converted to strict sobriety and frugality of manners.” *Enfield*.

When a period of time is described by its component parts or portions, specified by plural names, an attribute in the singular number, or denoting unity, may be joined to the plural names of the parts; as “I have not been to London *this five years* ;” “an election regularly takes place *every seven years* ;” that is, in every *single period* or *term* of seven years.

This idiom is explainable on very natural principles. The whole portion of time has no name, and we are therefore obliged to express our idea of it by something equivalent, which, in this instance, are the parts, *five* and *seven years*. The mind is fixed upon the entire period, and while the lips utter the name of the parts, the mind naturally considers the whole as a *unity*, and overlooking the several portions, attaches the attribute to that *unity* or whole period. Hence originated the customary abbreviation of *twelve months*, into a *twelvemonth*; *seven nights* into *se’night*; *fourteen nights* into a *fortnight*; and hence dozen, hundred, &c. admit the definitive *a*.

To the same cause probably may be ascribed the common phrases, *twenty pound*, *thirty foot*, and others similar; in which a whole quantity or space, for which we have no appropriate name, is described by smaller portions equivalent. The idea of *unity*, in all such cases, being predominant, and the only one which the speaker wishes to communicate, is very apt to control the language, and occasion the omission of the sign of the plural, even when it is necessary to the very purpose intended.

Hence we learn the cause why enumeration and addition of numbers are usually expressed in the singular number; two and two *is* four; seven and nine *is* sixteen; that is, the *sum* of seven and nine *is* sixteen. This is correct upon principle; for the affirmation respects the total amount or result, which in idea is always a *unity*. These idioms, instead of being violations of grammatical rules, as our critics would make us believe, are wonderful proofs either of ingenuity in the framers of language, or more probably, of an irresistible propensity in men, independent of reasoning, to accommodate words to ideas, and to express their ideas with the utmost brevity as well as force.

RULE XV.

Attributes are usually placed before the names to which they belong; as a *wise* prince; an *obedient* subject, a *pious* clergyman, a *brave* soldier.

Exception 1. When some word or words are dependent on an attribute, it follows the name; as "knowledge *requisit* for a statesman; furniture *convenient* for a family.

Exception 2. When an attribute becomes a title, or is emphatically applied to a name, it follows it; as Charles, the Great; Henry, the First; Lewis, the Gross; Wisdom incomprehensible.

Exception 3. Several attributes belonging to the same name, may precede or follow the name to which they belong; as a learned, wise and martial prince, or a prince learned, wise and martial.

Exception 4. The verb *be* often separates the name from its attribute; as war *is* expensive; gaming *is* ruinous.

Exception 5. An emphatical attribute is often used to introduce a sentence, in which case it precedes the name which it qualifies, and sometimes at a considerable dis-

tance; as "*Great* is the Lord;" *auspicious* will be that event; *fortunate* is that young man who escapes the snares of vice.

Exception 6. The attribute *all* may be separated from its name by *the*, which never precedes it in construction; as "all the nations of Europe." *Such* and *many* are separated from names by *a*; as "such a character is rare;" "many a time."

All attributes are separated from names by *a* when preceded by *so* and *as*—*so* rich a dress—*as* splendid a retinue; and they are separated by *a* or *the*, when preceded by *how* and *however*; as "how distinguished an act of bravery"—"how brilliant the prize." "However just the complaint."

The word *soever* may be interposed between the attribute and the name; "how clear *soever* this idea of infinity"—"how remote *soever* it may seem." *Locke*.

Double is separated from its noun by *the*; as "double the distance"—*the*, in such cases, never preceding *double*. But *a* precedes *double*, as well as other attributes.

All and *singular* or *every* precede *the* before the name in these phrases. "All and singular the articles, clauses and conditions." "All and every of the articles"—phrases of the law style.

RULE XVI.

Attributes belong to verbs in the radical form or infinitive mode; as "to see is pleasant"—"to ride is more agreeable than to walk;" "to calumniate is detestable."

Sometimes the attribute belongs to a radical verb in union with another attribute or a name; as "to be blind is unfortunate;" "to be a coward is disgraceful." Here the attribute *unfortunate* is the attributive of the first clause, *to be blind*, &c.

RULE XVII.

Attributes belong to sentences, or whole propositions :
Examples :

“ Agreeable to this, we read of names being blotted out of God’s book.” *Burder’s Oriental Customs.* 375.

What is agreeable to this ? The answer is found in the whole of the last clause of the sentence.

“ Antiochus—to verify the character prophetically given of him by Daniel, acted the part of a vile and most detestable person, agreeable to what hath been aforementioned of him.”
Prideaux. part 2. b. 3.

“ Her majesty signified her pleasure to the admiral that as soon as he had left a squadron for Dunkirk, agreeable to what he had proposed, he should proceed with the fleet.”
Burchet. Nav. Hist. 439.

“ Independent of his person, his nobility, his dignity, his relations and friends, may be urged,” &c. *Guthrie’s Quintilian.*

“ No body can doubt but that these ideas of mixed modes are made by a voluntary collection of ideas put together in the mind, independent from any original patterns in nature.”
Locke. 3. 5.

“ Whereupon God was provoked to anger, and put them in mind how, contrary to his directions, they had spared the Canaanites.” *Whiston’s Josephus.* b. 5. ch. 2.

“ Greece, which had submitted to the arms, in her turn, subdued the understandings, of the Romans, and contrary to that which in these cases commonly happens, the conquerors adopted the opinions and manners of the conquered.”
Enfield. Hist. Phil. b. 3. 1-

“ This letter of Pope Innocent enjoined the payment of tithes to the parsons of the respective parishes, where any man inhabited, agreeable to what was afterwards directed by the same Pope in other countries.” *Blacks. Comment.* b. 2. ch. 3.

"*Agreeable to this, we find some of the Anglo-Saxon ladies were admitted into their most august assemblies.*" *Henry. Hist. Brit. b. 2. ch. 7. and b. 4. ch. 1. sect. 4.*

"As all language is composed of significant words variously combined, a *knowledge of them is necessary, previous to our acquiring an adequate idea of language.*"

Encyclopi. art. Grammar.

"*His empire could not be established, previous to the institution of pretty numerous societies.*" *Smellie. Ph. Nat. Hist. 339.*

"*Suitable to this, we find that men, speaking of mixed modes, seldom imagine,*" &c. *Locke. 3. 5. 11.*

"*No such original convention of the people was ever actually held, antecedent to the existence of civil government in that country.*" *Pal. Phil. b. 6. ch. 3.*

NOTE.....Writers and critics, misapprehending the true construction of these and similar sentences, have supposed the attribute to belong to the verb, denoting the *manner of action*. But a little attention to the sense of such passages will be sufficient to detect the mistake. For instance, in the example from Enfield, the attribute *contrary* cannot qualify the verb *adopted*; for the conquerors did not adopt the opinions of the conquered in a *manner contrary* to what usually happens—the *manner of the act* is not the thing affirmed, nor does it come into consideration. The sense is this, the fact, that *the conquerors adopted the opinions and manners of the conquered, was contrary to what commonly happens in like cases*. The attribute belongs to the whole sentence or proposition. The same explanation is applicable to every similar sentence.

In consequence of not attending to this construction, our hypercritics, who are very apt to distrust popular practice, and substitute their own rules for customary idioms founded on common sense, have condemned this use of the attribute, and authors, suffering themselves to be led astray by these rules, often use an adverb or modifier, in the place of an attribute.

"The greater part of philosophers have acknowledged the excellence of this government, which they have considered, some *relatively* to society, and others as it has relation to the general system of nature." *Anarch. ch. 62.*

"The perceptions are exalted into a source of exquisite pleasure, *independently* of every particular relation of interest."

Studies of Nature. 12.

In the first of these examples, *relatively* is used very awkwardly for *as relative*, or *as relating*, or *as it relates*, or *in relation*; for the word has a direct reference to *government*.

In the second example, *independently* is used as if it had been intended to modify the verb *exalt*—the perceptions are *independently exalted*. But the *manner of exalting* is not the thing described. It is not that the perceptions are exalted in an independent manner, not in a manner independent of a relation to interest; but the fact, that the *perceptions are exalted into a source of exquisite pleasure*, is independent of every relation of interest. Equally faulty is the following sentence:

“*Agreeably to this law*, children are bound to support their parents.” *Paley. Phil.*

Johnson in his life of Thompson has this sentence—“Why the dedications are to winter and the other seasons, *contrarily to custom*, left out, in the collected works, the reader may imagine.” It is strange that a man of this author’s discernment should not perceive that it was not the *manner of leaving out*, which he was stating, but the *fact*—The dedications to winter and other seasons are left out, which fact or thing is *contrary to custom*.* I do not recollect this use of *contrary* in any other passage; tho it is certainly as vindicable as the use of any other modifier under like circumstances; for in every case it entirely perverts the sense. In this instance, the use of the modifier instead of the attribute, may have been an oversight.

In this kind of phrase, I have even seen an instance of the participle *according* converted into *accordingly*. See this word explained in the sequel. I have not seen *priorly* used for *prior*, in like sentences—“*Priorly to his arrival in England*”—Nor *anteriorly*, *posteriorly*, *exteriorly*, *inferiorly*, nor *adjacently*, or *contiguously* to the river; and the like barbarisms; but *subsequently*, *antecedently*, *consistently*, *conformably*, are frequent, in our best authors. “To do what we will, *consistently* with the interest of the community, is civil liberty.” *Paley. Phil.* 6. 5. This is not English; for it is not the *manner of doing*, but the *thing done*, which must be *consistent* with the public interest. A misapprehension of the true import and construction of such passages, has done immense mischief to the language.

*The idiom in question has resulted from that disposition to abridge the number of words used in communicating ideas, which I have repeatedly mentioned; the effects of which are among the prime excellencies of every language.

RULE XVIII.

Attributes are used to modify the action of verbs, and to express the qualities of things in connection with the action by which they are produced. Examples :

“Open thine hand *wide*.” *Deut.* 15. 17.

We observe, in this passage, that *wide*, the attribute of hand, has a connection with the verb *open* ; for it is not “open thy *wide hand* ;” but the attribute is supposed to be the *effect* of the act of opening. Nor can the modifier, *widely* be used ; for it is not simply the *manner* of the act which is intended ; but the *effect*.

“Let us write *slow* and *exact*.” *Guthrie. Quintillian* 2. 375.

We might perhaps substitute *slowly* for *slow*, as describing only, the manner of writing ; but *exactly* cannot be substituted for *exact* ; for this word is intended to denote the *effect* of writing, in the correctness of what is written. The attribute expresses the idea with a happy precision and brevity.

As this is one of the most common, as well as most beautiful idioms of our language, which has hitherto escaped due observation, the following authorities are subjoined to illustrate and justify the rule.

“We could hear distinctly the bells—which sounded sweetly *soft* and *pensive*.” *Chandler’s Travels. ch.* 2.

“A southerly wind succeeded blowing *fresh*.”
ibm. vol. 2. 3.

“His provisions were grown very *short*.”
Burchet’s Nav. Hist. 357.

“When the Caloric exists *ready* combined with the water of solution.” *Lavoisier. Trans. ch.* 5.

“The purest clay is that which burns *white*.”
Encyc. art. Chemistry.

“*Bray*, to pound or grind *small*.” *Johnson’s Dict.*

“When death lays *waste* thy house.” *Beattie’s Mins.*

"All which looks *very little like* the steady hand of nature." *Pal. Phil. ch. 5.*

"Magnesia feels *smooth*; calcareous earths feel dry; eithomarga feels very *greasy* or at least *smooth*; yet some feel *dry* and *dusty*." *Kirwan. vol. 1. 12. 189.*

"By this substance, crystals and glasses are colored *blue*." *Chaptal. Trans. 299.*

"There is an apple described in Bradley's work, which is said to have one side of it a sweet fruit, which boils *soft*; and the other side, a *sour* fruit which boils *hard*."

Darwin. Phytol. 105.

"Drink *deeft* or taste not the Pierian spring."

Pope.

"Heaven opened *wide* her ever during gates."

Milton. P. L. 7.

"The victory of the ministry cost them *dear*."

Hume. Contin. 11. 9.

"And *just* as *short* of reason he must fall." *Pope.*

"*Thick* and more *thick* the steely circle grows."

Hoole's Tasso b. 8.

"Ancus—marched *strait* to Fidenæ."

Hook. Rom. Hist. 1. 6.

"The cakes eat *short* and *crisp*."

Vicar of Wakefield.

"A steep ascent of steps which were cut *close* and *deeft* into the rocks." *Hampton's Polybius. 2. 265.*

"It makes the plow go *deeft* or *shallow*."

Encyc. art. agriculture.

"The king's ships were getting *ready*." *Lusiad. 1. 91.*

"After growing *old* in attendance." *Spect. No. 282.*

"The sun shineth *watery*." *Bacon. Apoph.*

"*Soft* sighed the flute." *Thompson. Spring.*

"I made him *just* and *right*." *Milton. 3. 98.*

"He drew not *nigh* unheard." *ibm. 645.*

“Whether the soul be supposed to exist *antecedent* to, or *coeval* with, or some time after the first rudiments of organization.” *Locke. b. 2. 1.*

“When the vowel of the preceding syllable is pronounced *short.*” *Murray’s Grammar.*

“Here grass is cut *close* and gravel rolled *smooth.* Is not that trim?” *Boswell. Johnson. 3.*

“*Slow* tolls the village clock—*deep* mourns the turtle.”
Beattie’s Minstrel.

“If you would try to live *independent.*” *Pope. Let.*

“He obliged the Nile to run *bloody* for your sakes.”*
Whiston’s Josephus. 3. 5.

“Correct the heart and all will go *right.*”
Porteus. Lect. 3.

The poets sometimes use attributes in this manner, when modifiers would express the idea. Sometimes they are induced to it by the measure; and not unfrequently by the obvious superiority of the attribute in expressing the idea with force and precision.

When two qualifying words are wanted, the latter may be an attribute, tho applied to a verb; as “He beat time *tolerably exact.*” *Golds. An. Nat. ch. 12.*

“The air will be found diminished in weight *exactly equal* to what the iron has gained.” *Lavoisier. ch. 3.*

“Horses are sold *extremely dear.*” *Golds.*

“And *greatly independent* lived.” *Thomps. Spring.*

“This was applying a just principle *very ill.*”
Vattel. Trans. 2. 7.

It will be remarked that we have no adverbial form of the attribute in the comparative and superlative degrees, except that of *more* and *most*, *less* and *least*, prefixed. But we use the attributes with the regular terminations, in these degrees, to qualify verbs. Examples :

* “*Cruentam* etiam fluxisse aquam Albanam, quidam auctores erant.” *Liv. lib. 27. 11.* Some authors related that the Alban river ran *bloody.*

“To hands that *longer* shall the weapon wield.”

Hoole. Tas. 7.

—“Then the pleasing force
Of nature and her kind parental care,
Worthier I’d sing.” *Akenside. Pl. of Im. 1. 323.*

“So while we taste the fragrance of the rose,
Glow not her blush the *fairer*?” *ibm. 2. 77.*

“When we know our strength, we shall the *better* know
what to undertake with hopes of success.”

Locke. 1. 6.

“And he that can *most* inform or *best* understand him,
will certainly be welcomed.” *Rambler. No. 99.*

“How much *nearer* he approaches to his end.”

“I have dwelt the *longer* on the discussion of this point.”

Junius Let. 17.

“The next contains a spirited command and should be
pronounced much *higher*.” *Murray’s Grammar.**

“Leviathan, which God of all his works
Created *hugest* that swim th’ ocean’s stream.”

Milton. 1. 201.

“But mercy first and last shall *brightest* shine.”

ibm. 3. 134.

“Such opinions as seemed to approach *nearest* [to] the
truth.” *Enfield. Hist. Phil. 2. 59.*

“Her smiles, amid the blushes, *lovelier* show ;
Amid her smiles, her blushes *lovelier* glow.”

Hoole. Tasso. b. 15.

* In remarking upon such phrases as “The vices which enter *deeper* or *deepest* into the soul,” Murray says, *deeper* and *deepest* should be *more deeply*, *most deeply*. But when he forgets the rule, he writes correct English. It is recommended to him, to change the attribute in the two passages I have cited—“The vowel of the preceding syllable is pronounced *shortly*”—“The next should be pronounced much *more highly*!” This alteration will put his rule to the test.

Authors, misguided by Latin rules, and conceiving that every word which is used to qualify a verb, must be an *adverb*, have pronounced many of the passages here recited and similar ones to be incorrect—and in such as are too well established to bear censure, they call the attribute an *adverb*. Were it not for this influence in early education, which impresses a notion that all languages must be formed with the like idioms, we should never have received an idea that the same word may not modify a name, an attribute and a verb.

So far are the words here used from being adverbs, that they cannot be changed into adverbs, without impairing the beauty, weakening the force or destroying the meaning of the passages. Let the sentences be put to the test—Magnesia feels smoothly—the cakes eat shortly and crisply—the apples boil softly or hardly—glows not her blush the more fairly. Every English ear rejects this alteration at once—the sentences become nonsense. Nor can the attribute be separated from the verb—“Amid her smiles, her blushes, being lovelier, glow”—this is not the sense—nor will it answer to say, “her lovelier blushes glow”—this is not the idea. The sense is, that the attribute expressed by *lovelier*, is not only a quality of *blushes*, but a quality derived, in a degree, from the action of the verb, *glow*.

Thus, clay burns *white*—objects may be seen *double*—may rise *high*—fall *low*—grow *strait*, or *thick*, or *thin*, or *fat*, or *lean*—one may speak *loud*—the sun shines *clear*—the *finer* a substance is pulverized—to grow *wiser*, to plunge *deeper*, spread *wider*—and similar expressions without number, constitute a well established idiom, as common as it is elegant.*

* The Roman writers availed themselves of the same idiom. “Ob multitudinem familiarum, quæ gliscebatur *immensum*.”

Tacitus. *An. lib. 4. 27.*

“Fabius—Arpos primum institit oppugnare—quæ maxime neglectam custodiam vidit, ea *potissimum* adgredi statuit.”

Liv. lib. 24. 46.

How much more impressive is the description which Tacitus here gives of an alarming insurrection of slaves, than if he had used

The attributes thus connected with verbs may easily be distinguished from those which merely qualify names, the latter being separable from the verb. Thus,

“Our great enemy
All uncorruptible, would, on his throne,
Sit *unpolluted*.” *Milton. P. l. 2.*

Here *unpolluted* has no effect at all upon the verb ; but may be separated from it, and carried into the first line without altering the sense.

“And the birds sing *concealed*.” *Thompson.*

“He roved *uncertain* through the dusky shade.”

Hoole.

RULE XIX.

Some attributes are used to modify the sense of others and of verbals ; as a *very clear* day, *red hot* iron, a *more or most* excellent character. “Without coming *any* nearer.” *Locke* ; *more* pressing necessity, *most* grating sound, “a *closer* grained wood.” *Lavoisier. Trans.*

“*Full* many a gem with purest ray serene.” *Gray.*

“Some deem’d him *wondrous* wise.”

Beattie’s Minstrel.

In these expressions the last attribute belongs more immediately to the noun expressing its quality—and the *first* attribute qualifies the *second*.

the adverb! “A multitude of slaves which was increasing and growing immense!” This is giving to prose the rhetorical sublimity of verse. It is giving the verb its full effect and at the same time, attaching the attribute to that effect.

In the word *potissimum*, in *Livy*, as in many others, we see the effect of not understanding this elegant use of attributes. Such words are marked in Dictionaries as adverbs! How would *Tully*, *Livy* and *Tacitus* smile to see their native tongue disfigured with accents to distinguish adverbs from adjectives, in a modern dictionary of the language! It is a just remark of *Mr. Tooke*, that all words which critics have not understood, they have thrown into the common sink of adverbs.

Not infrequently two attributes are used to modify a third, or the principal one; as "The manner in which external force acts upon the body is *very little* subject to the will." *Rambler. No. 78.*

RULE XX.

Attributes are used to qualify the sense of modifiers or adverbs; as a city was *very* bravely defended; the soldiers were *most* amply rewarded; a donation *more* beneficially bestowed; a house *less* elegantly furnished; a man the *least* peaceably disposed.

In these phrases, the modifier attends the verb or verbal to mark the *manner* or *character* of the act or affirmation; and the attribute attends the modifier to mark the degree or extent of that manner or character.

For a like purpose of defining the *degrees* of quality and modification, we make great use of *much* before attributes of the comparative and superlative degrees; as a prince *much* more humanely disposed; or *much* less martially inclined.

We have a few other words which are often used to modify attributes as well as verbs—as a *little*, a *great deal*, a *trifle*. "Many letters from persons of the best sense—do not a *little* encourage me." *Spectator. 124.* "It is a great deal better;" a *trifle* stronger; the last of which expressions is colloquial.

RULE XXI.

The attributes *each*, *every*, *either* and *neither*, have verbs and substitutes agreeing with them in the singular number; as

"*Each one* was a head of the house of *his* fathers."

Josh. 22. 14.

"*Every one* that *findeth* me, shall slay me."

Gen. 4. 14.

“And take every man *his* censer.” *Num.* 16. 17.

“Nadab and Abihu took *either* of them his censer.”
Lev. 10. 1.

“*Neither* of the ways of separation, real or mental, is compatible to pure space.” *Locke.* 2. 13.

Errors. “Let each esteem others better than *themselves*.” It ought to be *himself*.

“There are bodies, *each* of which are so small.” It ought to be *is*. *Locke.* 2. 8.

NOTE.....A plural verb, which affirms something of a number of particulars, is often followed by a distributive which assigns the affirmation to the particular objects or individuals. Thus, “If metals have, *each* a peculiar earth”—Here we may consider *each* as the nominative to *has* understood—“If metals have, if each metal has a peculiar earth.” There is no other way of resolving the phrase. This manner of expression is common, tho quite useless—as the last clause, “if each metal has”—is sufficient. It has not the merit of an abbreviation. This phrase, “Let us love one another,” is of a similar construction, but it is not easy to find a substitute of equal brevity.

RULE XXII.

Names of measure or dimension stand without a governing word, followed by an attribute ; as, “a wall seven feet high and two feet thick”—“a carpet six yards wide”—“a line sixty fathoms long”—“a kingdom five hundred miles square”—“water ten feet deep.”

“An army forty thousand strong,” is a similar phrase.

NOTE.....Double comparatives and superlatives, *most straitest*, *most highest*, being improper and useless, are not to be used. The few which were formerly used, are obsolete. *Worser*, a mistake in spelling *wyrsa*, is obsolete ; but *lesser*, a mistake for *lessa*, is still used, as well as its abbreviation, *less*.

The superlative form of certain attributes, which in the positive degree, contain the utmost degree of the quality, as *extremest*, *chiefest*, is improper and obsolete. But authors indulge in a most unwarrantable license of annexing comparison to attributes whose negative sense precludes increase or diminution ; as in these sentences, “These are more formidable and *more impassable* than the

mountains." *Golds. An. Nat. ch. 2.* "This difficulty was rendered still more insurmountable by the licentious spirit of our young men." *Murphy. Tacit. Orat. 35.* "The contradictions of impiety are still more incomprehensible." *Massillon. Serm. to the Great.*

Similar to these are numerous expressions found in good authors—more impossible, more indispensable, less universal, more uncontrollable; and others, in which the sign of comparison is not only improper, but rather enfeebles the epithet; for the word itself expressing the full extent of the idea, ought to bear some emphasis, which, if a qualifying word is prefixed, will naturally be transferred to that word.*

In a few instances, this usage seems to be too well established to be altered, and particularly in the use of *more* and *most*, *less* and *least* perfect. In general, it would indicate more precision of thought to apply a term of diminution to the affirmative attribute—*less passable*, *less surmountable*, *less controllable*; rather than a term of increase to a negative attribute.

NOTE 2....In English, two names are frequently united to form a new name; as earth-worm, drill-plow, ink-stand, book-case. In some cases, these compounds are by custom effectually blended into one term; in other cases, they are separated into their component parts by a hyphen—In other cases, words are united, and the first term forms a sort of occasional attribute to the second; as *family-use* or *family-consumption*.

NOTE 3....From a disposition to abridge the number of words in discourse, we find many expressions which are not reducible to any precise rule, formed at first by accident or ellipsis—Such are *at first*, *at last*, *at best*, *at worst*, *at most*, *at least*, *at farthest*, *at the utmost*. In these expressions there may have been an ellipsis of some name; but they are well established, brief and significant, and may be numbered among the *pinions of mercury*.

NOTE 4....We have certain attributes which follow a verb and a name to which they belong, but never precede the name. Such are *adry*, *afear'd*, *afraid*, *alone*, *alike*, *aware*, *akin*, *alive*, *asleep*, *awake*, *athirst*, *aloft*, *aghast*, *afoat*, *askew*, *ashamed*, *pursuant*, *plenty*, *worth*; to which may be added *amiss*, *aground*, *ashore*, *aside*, and a few others which may be used as attributes or modifiers. We say, one is *adry*, *ashamed*, *alive* or *awake*. But never an *adry*

* This effect may proceed also from another consideration. If the attribute alone is used, its sense precludes the idea of increase or diminution—it expresses all that can be expressed. But admit comparison, and it ceases to express the utmost extent of the quality.

person, an *ashamed* child, &c. We say, "A proclamation was issued *pursuant* to advice of council." But we can in no case place *pursuant* before a noun.

Plenty, as an attribute, has not yet been recognized by critics: but critics do not make language, nor can they reject what a nation has made. *Plenty* is constantly used as an attribute after a name in colloquial language, and is found in our best writers; to cavil at this usage therefore, is as idle as it is impertinent.

"The sea muscle is perhaps the most *plenty*." *Gold's An. Nature.*

"Where shrubs are *plenty* and water scarce." *Ibm.* 2. 21.

"In those provinces where wood was *plenty*." *Rycant Garcilasso.* 923.

"This species is more *plenty* in France." *Encycl. art. Loxia.*

"Provisions are *plenty* and living cheap." *Ibm. art. Adrianople.*

Worth not only follows the name which it qualifies, but is followed by a name denoting price or value; as a book *worth* a dollar, or a guinea—it is well *worth* the money—"It is *worth* observation."—*Beloe's Herodotus. Erato.* 98. If a substitute is used after *worth*, it must be in the objective case. *It is worth them* or *it*.

But *worthy*, the derivative of *worth*, follows the usual construction of attributes, and may precede the name it qualifies; as, a worthy man.

Regimen or Government.

RULE XXIII.

One name signifying the same thing with another, or descriptive of it, may be in apposition to it; that is, may stand in a like character or case, without an intervening verb; as, Paul, the apostle; John, the baptist; Newton, the philosopher; Chatham, the orator and statesman.

NOTE 1....In the following sentence, a name in the plural stands in apposition to two names in the singular, joined by an alternative. "The terms of our law will hardly find words that answer them in the *Spanish* or *Italian*, no scanty languages." *Locke* 3. 5. 8.

NOTE 2....Names are not unfrequently set in apposition to sentences, as "Whereby if a man had a positive idea of infinite, either duration or space, he could add two infinities together; nay, make one infinite infinitely bigger than another; *absurdities* too gross to be confuted." *Locke* 2. 17. 20. Here the *absurdities* are the whole preceding propositions.

“You are too *humane* and *considerate*; *things* few people can be charged with.” *Pope Let.* Here *things* are in apposition to *humane* and *considerate*. Such a construction may be justified, when the ideas are correct, but it is not very uncommon.

“The Dutch were formerly in possession of the coasting trade and freight of almost all other trading nations; they were also the bankers for all Europe; *advantages* by which they have gained immense sums.” *Zimmerman’s Survey*, 170. Here *advantages* is put in apposition to the two first members of the sentence.”

RULE XXIV.

When two names are used, one denoting the possessor, the other the thing possessed, the name of the possessor precedes the other in the possessive case; as, “In my *father’s house* are many mansions.” Men’s bravery; England’s fleet; a Christian’s hope; Washington’s prudence.

NOTE 1...When the thing possessed is obvious, it is usual to omit the name; as, “Let us go to St. Paul’s,” that is, church; “He is at the President’s;” that is, house.

“Nor thinks a lover’s are but fancied woes.” *Cowper.*

That is, a lover’s woes. “Whose book is this? William’s.”

NOTE 2...When the possessor is described by two or more names, the sign of the possessive is generally annexed to the last; as, “Edward, the second of England’s Queen.” *Bacon on Empire.*

“In Edward the third’s time.” *Blacks. Com. B. 1. Ch. 2.*

“John the Baptist’s head.” *Matt.*

But if the thing possessed is represented as belonging to a number severally specified, the sign of the possessive is repeated with each; as “He has the surgeon’s and the physician’s advice.” It was my father’s, mother’s, and uncle’s opinion.”*

* The contrary rule in Murray is egregiously wrong; as exemplified in this phrase, “This was my father, mother and uncle’s advice”—This is not English. When we say, “the king of England’s throne,” the three words, *king of England*, are one name in effect, and can have but one sign of the possessive. But when two or three distinct names are used, the article possessed is described as belonging to each. “It was my father’s advice, my mother’s advice and my uncle’s advice.” We can omit *advice* after the two first, but by no means, the sign of the possessive.

NOTE 3....When *of* is used before the possessive case of nouns, there is a double possessive, the thing possessed not being repeated; as "Vital air was a discovery *of Priestley's*." "Combustion, as now understood, was a discovery *of Lavoisier's*." The sense of which is, that vital air was one of the discoveries of Priestley. This idiom prevents the repetition of the same word.

NOTE 4....The possessive may be supplied by *of*, before the name of the possessor; as "the hope *of a christian*." But *of* does not always denote possession; it denotes also *consisting of or in, concerning, &c.* and in these cases, its place cannot be supplied by the possessive case. Thus *cloth of wool*, cannot be converted into *wool's cloth*; nor a *cup of water*, into *water's cup*; nor *an idea of an angel*, into an *angel's idea*; nor the *house of Lords*, into the *Lord's house*. An attention to this distinction would have prevented some mistakes and much impertinent criticism.

RULE XXV.

Verbals or participles are often used for names, and have the like effect in governing names in the possessive case; as "A courier arrived from Madrid, with an account of his Catholic *majesty's having agreed* to the neutrality." "In case of his Catholic *majesty's dying* without issue." "Averse to the *nation's involving* itself in another war." *Hume. Cont. vol. 7. b. 2. ch. 1.* "Who can have no notion of the same *person's possessing* different accomplishments." *Spect. No. 150.*

This is the true idiom of the language; yet the omission of the sign of the possessive is a common fault among modern writers, who learn the language by grammar, and neglect usages which are much better authority, and the basis of correct grammar. "Pieces of iron arranged in such a way as seemed most favorable for the *combustion being* communicated to every part." *Lavoisier. Trans.*

"There is no reason for *hydrogene being* an exception." *ibm.* These expressions are not English.

RULE XXVI.

Transitive verbs and their verbals require the objective case or the object of action to follow them; as "In the beginning, God *created* the heaven and the earth."

"If ye love *me*, keep my commandments." "O righteous father, the world hath not known *thee*."

Sometimes the object and often the objective case of substitutes precedes the governing verb; as "The spirit of truth, *whom* the world cannot receive." "*Whom* ye ignorantly worship, *him* declare I unto you."

Whom and *which*, when in the objective case, always precede the verb.

In verse, a greater licence of transposition is used, than in prose, and names are often placed before the governing verb.

"But through the heart
Should jealousy its *venom* once diffuse." *Thompson*.

"She with extended arms his *aid implores*." *ibm*.

A name with *whatever*, *whatsoever* or *whichever*, preceding, is placed before the governing verb; as "*whatsoever* positive ideas we have." *Locke*. 2. 17.

NOTE 1.... We have some verbs which govern two words in the objective case; as,

"Did I request thee, maker, from my clay
To mold *me man*?" *Milton*. 10. 744.

"God seems to have made *him what* he was."

Life of Cowper.

"Ask *him his opinion*;" "You have asked *me the news*."

Will it be said that the latter phrases are elliptical, for "ask of him his opinion?" I apprehend this to be a mistake. According to the true idea of the government of a transitive verb, *him* must be the *object* in the phrase under consideration, as much as in this, "Ask *him* for a guinea;" or in this, "ask him to go."

This idiom is very ancient, as we often see it in the Latin—"Interrogatus sententiam." *Liv.* 26. 33. "Se id Scipionem orare." *ibm.* 27. 17. "Auxilia regem orabant." *ibm. lib.* 28. 5. The idiom in both languages had a common origin.

NOTE 2.....Some verbs were formerly used as transitive, which are no longer considered as such; as "he repented *him*"—"flee *thee* away"—"he was swerved"—"the sum was amounted," &c. which are held improper.

Cease however, is used as a transitive verb by our best writers—"Cease this impious rage." *Milton.* "Her lips their music cease." *Tasso. by Hoole.*

RULE XXVII.

Intransitive verbs are followed by the name of the *act*, which the verb expresses in *action*; as "To *live* a *life* of virtue;" "To *die* the *death* of the righteous;" "to *dream* *dreams*;" to run a race;" "to *sleep* the *sleep* of death."

We observe, in these examples, *life* is the *name of living* supposed to be complete; as *race* is the name of the *act of running* when accomplished.

NOTE.....Nearly allied to this idiom is that of using, after verbs transitive or intransitive, certain nouns which are not the objects of the verb, nor of precisely the same sense; but which are either the names of the result of the verb's action, or closely connected with it. Examples: "A guinea weighs five penny weight, six grains;" "a crown weighs nineteen penny weight;" "a piece of cloth measures ten yards."

"And on their hinges grate harsh thunder." "And rivets run potable gold." "The crispid brooks ran nectar." "Groves whose rich trees wept odorous gums and balm." "Grin a ghastly smile."
Milton.

"Her lips blush deeper sweets." *Thompson.*

* The radical idea of *weigh* is *carry, bear* or *sustain*, from the Saxon *weg*, a balance. The idiom in question has its original in that idea—a guinea *weighs* five penny weight, six grains—that is, *carries* or *sustains* that weight in the scales. How much of the propriety, and even of the beauty of language is lost, by neglecting to study its primitive state and principles!

"To ascend or descend a flight of stairs, a ladder, or a mountain"—"To cost a guinea."

Under this rule or the following may be arranged these expressions—"Let them go their way"—"When matters have been brought *this length*." *Lavois. Translation*. "We turn our eyes *this way or that way*." "Reckoning *any way* from ourselves, a yard, a mile, &c. *Locke*. 2. 17.

Similar to this idiom are the phrases to go *west* or *east*—*pointing north* or *south*—*north-west* or *south-east* and the like, which I find to be Saxon phrases and very ancient.

In some instances verbs of this sort are followed by two objects; as "a ring cost the *purchaser* an eagle."

RULE XXVIII.

Names of certain portions of time and space, and especially words denoting continuance of time or progression, are used without a governing word; as "Jacob said, I will serve thee *seven years* for Rachel." And dust shalt thou eat *all the days of thy life*." "And he abode with him the *space of a month*." "The tree of life yielded her fruit *every month*." "In those days I Daniel was mourning *three full weeks*." "Whosoever shall urge thee to go a *mile*, go with him *twain*." To walk a *mile* or a *league*."

"Effects occurring *every moment* to ourselves."

"You have asked me news *a hundred times*." *Pope*.*

Words expressing particular or precise points of time, are usually preceded by a preposition; as "at that hour;" "on that day." But to both these rules there are exceptions.

* Lowth, followed by the whole tribe of writers on this subject, alleges some preposition to be understood before these expressions of time. But this is a palpable error, arising from preconceived notions of the necessity of such words. The fact is otherwise. All these peculiar phrases, are idiomatic; and the remains of the early state of our language.

The same idiom is found in the Greek and Latin languages, which were built on a Teutonic foundation—it is found in the Saxon, from which it is derived to modern English; and is therefore to be considered as original, or coeval with the language.

RULE XXIX.

The verb *be* has the same case after it as before it; or two substitutes connected with *be* in construction are in the same case. “*It is I, be not afraid.*” “*Thou art she,*” “*it is he.*” “*Who was he?*” “*Who do men say that I am?*” “*Whom do they represent me to be.*” “*Whom do men say that I am,*” is incorrect.

RULE XXX.

Transitive verbs and their verbals admit of a sentence, a clause or number of words as their object; as “*He is not alarmed so far, as to consider how much nearer he approaches to his end.*” *Rambler, No. 78.*

Consider what? The whole following clause, which is the object of the verb.

“*For to say, a man has a positive clear idea of any quantity, without knowing how great it is, is as unreasonable as to say, he has a positive clear idea of the number of sands on the sea shore.*” *Locke. 2. 17. 15.* Here the parts of the period in Italics are the things said, the objects of the verb *say*. The first clause, being the object after *say*, forms, with the preceding words, the nominative to *is*—and the same clause of the period is qualified by the attribute *unreasonable*—*For to say all which follows is as unreasonable, &c.*

“*If he escapes being banished by others, I fear he will banish himself.*” *Pope. Let. to Swift.*

Here *being banished* stands in the place of a noun, as the object after *escapes*.

“*Whether that which we call ecstasy be not dreaming with the eyes open, I leave to be examined.*” *Locke. 2. 19.*

We cannot avoid observing *their sensible qualities, nay the very substances to be in a continual flux.*” *Locke. 2. 19.*

This rule comprehends the construction of the verbs, save, except, add, admit, allow, suppose, and many others when used to govern sentences; and in strictness, the old verbs if, tho, unless. Examples:

“Add to this, *what, from its antiquity, is but little known, has, from that very circumstance, the recommendation of novelty.*” *Hermes. Preface.* In this sentence, the whole of the clauses in Italics, is what is to be added—and is the actual object governed by the verb *add*.

“Suppose then *the world we live in to have had a creator*”—“Suppose *the disposition which dictated this council to continue.*” *Paley. Evid. 1.*

“Not forgetting therefore *what credit is due to the evangelical history, supposing even any one of the four gospels to be genuine.*” *ibm. ch. 9.*

“It is good also not to try experiments in states, except *the necessity be urgent or the utility evident.*”

Bacon on Innovation.

“They are in effect no more than standing commissions, save *that, they have greater authority.*” *ibm. of Counsel.*

“For that mortal dint,
Save *he who reigns above, none can resist.*”

Milton. 2. 815.

“I wish I could give you any good reasons for your coming hither, except *that, I earnestly invite you.*”

Pope. Let.

“Lord Bathurst is too great a husbandman to like barren hills, except *they are his own to improve.*”

Pope. Let. Sept. 3. 1726.

“The ships of either party may freely traffick with the enemies of the other, excepting *with contraband merchandize.*” *Anderson. Commerce. 3. 71.*

“Suppose I was to say, *light is a body.*” *Hermes. 78.*

“Except *ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*”

Luke 13.

“Ye cannot bear fruit, except *ye abide in me.*” *Jahn. 15.*

“He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, shall be put to death.” *Ex.* 22. 20.

“And he could there do no mighty works, save that, he laid his hand on a few sick and healed them.”

Matth. 6. 5.

He that is washed, needeth not, save to wash his feet.”

John. 13.

“Add to this their custom of plantation of Colonies.”

Bacon.

In these and similar passages, the object of the verb is a whole proposition or statement, in a sentence or clause of a sentence. In this passage, “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish,” the fact excepted is affirmed in a single verb. Take away this fact “that you shall repent”—and the consequence must be, you will perish. This is one of the modes of abbreviation in language which I have so frequently mentioned, and which constitutes a principal excellence of the English.

We observe in some of the passages here cited, the substitute *that*, after the verb. This is probably the true original construction; the substitute *that*, pointing to the whole following clause. “He could do no mighty works there, save *that*, [except that single fact which follows] he laid his hand on a few sick and healed them.”

NOTE.—It may be here observed that in some of the passages cited, the verb has no definitive nominative—the verbs *save*, *except*, *suppose*, *add*, &c. are in the imperative mode; but the address is not made to any particular person or persons. And this probably has led authors to class *save* and *except* among conjunctions, prepositions or adverbs, or to consider them as used adverbially; for it has been already observed that the class of adverbs has been a sort of common sink to receive all words which authors have not been able to comprehend.

Is it not strange that *suppose*, *add*, *admit*, *allow*, and other verbs, which are constantly used in the same manner, should have hitherto escaped the same doom? In the passages above cited from Paley, *suppose* is used precisely in the same manner, as *except* and *save* in others. Indeed nothing but the most inexcusable negligence could have led critics to this classification of *save* and *except*—for in many passages of scripture, these very words, in the sense in which they are called conjunctions or adverbs, have an object

following them, like other transitive verbs ; as " Israel burned none of them, *save Hazor only.*" *Josh.* 11. 13. " Ye shall not come into the land, *save Caleb and Joshua.*" *Num.* 14. 30. " I would that all were as I am, *except these bonds.*" *Acts.*

This use of verbs without a definite nominative occasions no inconvenience ; for the address is not made to any particular person, but is equally applicable to any one who will apply it. See the subject further explained under rule 38. The following passage in Locke. 2. 27. 2. contains another verb used in the same manner ; " Could two bodies be in the same place at the same time, then those two parcels of matter must be one and the same, *take them great or little.*"

The error of considering *save* as an adverb or conjunction has however produced a multitude of mistakes in construction, as in these passages ; " *Save he* who reigns above." *Milton.* " Which no man knoweth, *saving he* that receiveth it." *Rev.* 2. 17. The nominative *he* cannot be reconciled to any principle of true construction. *He* ought to be *him*, the object after the verb. *Except* might have been used, and this word being called a preposition, would have required after it the objective case. But both words are verbs, and ought to have the same construction.

RULE XXXI.

The radical verb or infinitive follows, first, another verb or verbal ; as " He loves *to cherish* the social affections"—" be persuaded *to abandon* a vicious life"—" he is willing *to encounter* danger"—" he was proceeding *to relate* his adventures."

2dly. The radical verb follows a name ; as " The next thing natural for the mind *to do.*" *Locke.* " He has a task *to perform.*"

3dly. It follows an attribute or verbal attribute ; as " a question difficult *to be solved.*" " It is delightful *to contemplate* the goodness of Providence." " God is worthy *to be loved and trusted.*" " Be prepared *to receive* your friend."

4thly. It follows the definitive substitute *as* ; thus, " an object so high *as to be* invisible ;" " a question so obscure *as to perplex* the understanding."

5thly. It follows *than* after a comparison; as "Nothing makes a man suspect much, more *than to know* little." *Bacon on Suspicion.*

6thly. It follows the preposition *for*, noting cause or motive; as "What went ye out *for to see*?" *Mat. 11.*

This is the true original idiom; but it is usual now to omit *for*; as "he went to see a reed shaken with the wind." In every phrase of this sort, *for* is implied in the sense; but the use of the word is confined to colloquial language.

The radical verb is independent, standing as a substitute for a whole phrase; as "It is not once in ten attempts that you can find the case you seek, in any law book; *to say* nothing of those numerous points of conduct concerning which the law professes not to prescribe." *Paley. Philos. ch. 4.*

RULE XXXII.

The verbs *bid, make, see, hear, feel, let*, with the auxiliars, *may, can, must, shall* and *will*, and *dare* and *need*, when used as auxiliars, are followed by the radical verb without the prefix *to*; as "He bids me *come*"—"We cannot make them *understand*"—"Let me see you *write*"—"We heard him *relate* the story"—"We felt the earth *tremble*."—"Which they *let* pass." *Locke.* "He may go, can go, must go, shall go, will go." "I dare engage or dare say"—"He need not be anxious."

NOTE 1.....In the uses of *dare* and *need*, there are some peculiarities which deserve remark.

When *dare* signifies to *defy* or *challenge*, it is regular in the tenses and persons, is a transitive verb, and followed by a radical verb with the usual prefix; as "he dares me to enter the list." But when it is intransitive, denoting *to have courage*, it more generally drops the personal terminations, has an anomalous past tense, and is followed by a radical verb without *to*; in short it has the form of an auxiliar; and in the German, it is classed with the auxiliars. Examples: "I dare engage." *Pope's Works, Letter to Gay.* "I dare not confess." *Swift to Gay.* "I dare say." *Locke.* "But my Lord, you dare not do either." *Junius. Let. 28.* "Durst I venture to deliver my own sentiments." *Hum. Es. 7.*

The past tense, when regular is followed by a radical verb with the usual prefix:—"You have *dared to throw* more than a suspicion upon mine." *Junius. Let. 20.* The same remark may be extended to the future tense; "He will not *dare to attack* his adversary."

The popular practice of using *dare* in the third person without the personal termination, *he dare*, is correct; for this appears to have been the original manner of using this verb.—"Se the wylle, oththe se the durre—"he that will or he that dare." *Alf. Oros. b. 6. 4.*

In the German language the same practice is established—*dare* is numbered among the auxiliars, and thus inflected in the present tense of the indicative—Ich darf—Du darfst—Er darf.

In like manner, *need*, when a transitive verb, is regular in its inflections; as "a man needs more prudence"—"The army needed provisions."—But when intransitive, it drops the personal terminations in the present tense; is formed like an auxiliar, and followed by a verb, without the prefix *to*; as "Nobody *need be afraid* he shall not have scope enough." *Locke. 2. 22. 9.* "I need not *go* any farther." *ibm.* "Nor need we *wonder.*" *ibm.* "The lender need *be under no fear.*" *Anarch. ch. 69.* "There need be no difficulty." *Beddoes' Hygeia. 1. 27.* "She need *dig no more.*" *Spectator. No. 121.* "A man need not be uneasy on these grounds." *Boswell. 3. 41.* "He need not urge to this honorable court." *Judge Chase.*

In the use of this verb, there is another irregularity, which is peculiar, the verb being without a nominative, expressed or implied. "Whereof here *needs no account.*" *Milt. P. L. 4. 225.* "There is no evidence of the fact, and there *needs none.*" This is an established use of *need*.

NOTE 2.....The radical verb [infinitive mode] has, in its sense and use, a near affinity to a name, and often has the construction of one. It is much employed to introduce sentences which are the nominatives to verbs, as well as the objects following them; as "*To will* is present with me, but *to perform* that which is good I find not." Here the first radical verb is the nominative to *is*, and the second begins the sentence which is the object after *find*.

NOTE 3.....A common mistake in the use of the radical verb, is, to use the perfect tense after another verb in past time; when in fact one of the verbs in the past time would correctly express the sense: Thus, "It *would have been* no difficult matter to *have compiled* a volume of such amusing precedents." *Cowper to Hill. Let. 29.* Here the first verb states the time past when it was not difficult to compile a volume; at that time the compilation could not be past; the verb therefore should have been *to compile*, which is present and always indefinite.

In the following passage, we have a like use of verbs which is correct. "A free pardon was granted to the son, who *was known*

to have offered indignities to the body of Varus." *Murphy. Tacitus.* 6. 1. Here the offering of indignities was a fact precedent to the time stated in the verb was known; and therefore the verb, to have offered, is well employed.

RULE XXXIII.

The radical verb, signifying motive or purpose, often introduces a clause or sentence which is not the nominative or objective to any verb; as "To see how far this reaches, and what are the causes of wrong judgment, we must remember that things are judged good or bad in a double sense." *Locke.* 2. 21. 61. "To prevent property from being too unequally distributed, no person should be allowed to dispose of his possessions to the prejudice of his lawful heirs." *Anarch. ch.* 62.

NOTE.....This form of sentence seems to be derived from the use of *for* before the verb; *for to see*. The modern practice is to prefix some noun; as *In order to see*, or "With a view to prevent." These are the bungling work of innovators, who were not satisfied with the original idiom, in which *for*, expressing *cause*, was prefixed to the verb; as it is still by our common people.

RULE XXXIV.

In the use of the passive verb, there is often an inversion of the order of the subject and object; thus, "The bishops and abbots were allowed their seats in the house of Lords." *Blacks. Com. b.* 1. *ch.* 2.

Here the true construction would be, "Seats in the house of lords were allowed to the bishops and abbots."

"Thrasea was forbid the presence of the emperor." *Murphy's Tacitus.* 2. 540. NOTE.....This is a common phrase. It may be resolved thus: The presence of the emperor was forbid to Thrasea—or Thrasea was forbid to approach the presence of the Emperor.

"I was this day shown a new potatoe." *Darwin. Phytol. sect.* 18.

“He was shown that very story in one of his own books.”
Guth. Quint. 1. 42.

This idiom is outrageously anomalous; but perhaps incorrigible.

RULE XXXV.

The verbal or participle of the present tense without a definitive *a* or *the*, or with any possessive attribute, usually retains the sense of its verb, and has the objective case after it; as “The clerk is *engrossing* the bill.” “The love we bear our friends is generally caused by *our finding* the same *dispositions* in them, which we feel in ourselves.” *Pope's Letters*.

“In return to *your inviting me* to your forest.” *ibm.*

But when the verbal is preceded by *a* or *the*, it takes the character and government of a name, and in most cases, must be followed by *of*; as “The middle station of life seems to be the most advantageously situated for *the gaining of* wisdom. Poverty turns our thoughts too much upon *the supplying of* our wants, and riches, upon *enjoying* our superfluities.” *Spectator. No.* 464.

In many cases, this verbal becomes a noun, without *a* or *the*; as “It is more properly *talking* upon paper than *writing*.” *Pope. Let.*

NOTE.....The foregoing rule is often violated by our best writers, and to make it universal is to assume an authority much too dictatorial. “Some were employed in blowing of glass; others in weaving of linen.” *Gibbon. Rom. Emp. ch.* 10.

“When the hindering any action.” *Locke. 2.* 21.

In these two examples the rule is disregarded to the prejudice of the language. But let us attend to the following—“*The attributing to faculties* that which belonged not to them”—*Locke. 2.* 21. Here the verbal, preceded by *the* cannot be followed by *of*, nor does it perform the office of a noun, but it retains the nature and government of a verb. “*The not making a will* is a culpable omission.” *Paley. Phil. ch.* 23. These expressions are perfectly good English.

RULE XXXVI.

Verbals [participles] of the present tense, either single or in union with the verbal of the perfect tense, often perform, at once, the office of a verb and a name; as "*The taking from another what is his, without his knowledge or allowance, is called stealing.*" *Locke. 2. 28. 16.*

"By the *mind's changing the object* to which it compares any thing." *Locke. 2. 25.*

"To save them from other *people's damning them.*"
Wycherley to Pope.

"Such a plan is not capable of *being carried into execution.*" *Anarch. ch. 62.*

"They could not avoid *submitting* to this influence." .
Boling. on Hist. Let. 8.

"Suppose a Christian, Platonist or Pythagorean, should, upon God's *having ended* all his works, think his soul hath existed ever since." *Locke. 2. 27. 14.*

"Taking a madman's sword to prevent *his doing* mischief." *ibm. 1. 2. 20.*

"He was displeased with the *king's having disposed* of the office, or with *his having bestowed* it upon a worthless man." *Henry. Hist. Brit. b. 3.*

"Its excesses may be restrained, without *destroying* its existence." *Blacks. Com. b. 1. ch. 2.*

"Supposing it had a right to meet, without *being called together.*" *ibm.*

"He was near *losing* his life."
Dobson's Life of Petrarch. 1. 29.

"*The advising* or *attempting* to procure any insurrection."
Judge Chase.

NOTE 1.....The verbal in *ing*, though strictly active in its signification, is not unfrequently used by modern authors in a passive sense;

as "More living particles are produced—than are necessary for nutrition or for the restoration of *decomposing* organs:" that is, organs suffering decomposition. *Darwin. Zoon. sect. 39. 9.* "From which Caloric is *disengaging*"—that is, undergoing the process of separation. *Lavoisier. Translation.* "The number is *augmenting* daily." *ibm.* "They seemed to think Cesar was *slaying* before their eyes rather than that he was slain." *Guth. Quint. 2. 18.* "The nation had cried out loudly against the crime while it was *committing*." *Boling. on Hist. Let. 8.* "My lives are *re-printing*." *Johns. to Boswell. 1782.*

Many of this kind of verbals have become mere attributes; as "Writing paper; looking glass; spelling or pronouncing dictionary." *Wanting* and *owing* have long had the character of passive verbals—or attributes, with the sense of *wanted, owed.*

NOTE 2.....The use of two verbals in the place of a noun is one of the most frequent practices of our best writers; as "This did not prevent John's *being acknowledged* and *solemnly inaugurated* Duke of Normandy." *Henry. Hist. Brit. b. 3.* The verbal *being* with an attribute, supplies the place of a noun also. "As to the difference of *being more general*, that makes this maxim more remote from *being innate*." *Locke. 1. 2. 20.*

RULE XXXVI.

Verbals, like attributes, agree with a sentence, a part of a sentence or a substitute for a sentence; as "*Concerning* relation in general, *these things may be considered*." *Locke. 2. 25.*

Here *concerning* relates to the whole of the last clause of the sentence—"These things may be considered"—all which is *concerning* relation in general.

"*This criterion will be different, according* to the nature of the object which the mind contemplates."

Enfield. Hist. Ph. 2. 15.

That is, the difference of criterion will *accord* with the nature of the object.

"*According* to Hierocles, Ammonius was induced to execute the plan of a distinct eclectic school," &c.

ibm. p. 63.

Here the whole statement of facts in the last clause was *according to Hierocles*; that is, it accorded with his testimony.

“I have accepted thee, *concerning* this thing also.”

Gen. 19.

“I speak *concerning* Christ and the Church.”

Eph. 5. 32.

“Thus shalt thou do unto the Levites, *touching* their charge.” Num. 8. 26.

“And *touching* the house of the king of Judah, say, Hear ye the word of the Lord.” Jer. 21. 10.

“Now as *touching* things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge.” 1 Cor. 8. 1.

In general *as* is used in scripture before *touching*, and the construction is, Now *as*, or *that* which follows is *touching* things offered to idols. Since the translation of the bible, this word *touching*, in this sense, has been obsolescent, and *respecting* has taken its place.

“He finds the ideas he has in his mind to agree or disagree, *according as* the words standing for them are affirmed or denied one of another in the proposition.”

Locke 1. 2. 23.

In this passage, *according as* are used in a manner which is very common, but which none of our critics have seen fit to explain. *As* has the same sense here which it has in other places—it is a definitive substitute for the whole of the subsequent clause—*according that* which follows. The resolution of the sentence is thus—“The words standing for his ideas are affirmed or denied one of another—according that fact.”—Or more at large the resolution will stand thus—“The words standing for his ideas are *affirmed* one of another—*according that proposition*—he finds his ideas to agree—Or the words standing for his ideas are *denied* of each other, *according that fact*, he finds his ideas to disagree.” So that *according as*, when closely examined, are found to have a close affinity to the clause *independent*.

NOTE.—The use of verbals explained under this rule, coincides with that of attributes as explained under Rule 17.

RULE XXXVIII.

Verbals often stand without a name, sentence or substitute on a which they immediately depend, being referable to either of the persons indefinitely: as "It is not possible to act otherwise, *considering* the weakness of our nature." *Spectator.*

NOTE 1....Johnson in his Dictionary, calls this a *kind of conjunction*, and adds—"It had been more grammatically written *considered*, *vu* French, but *considering* is always used."

This criticism indicates an incorrect view of the subject. *Considered*, cannot be used without a change in the structure of the sentence—"The weakness of our nature being considered." But to make this form of expression correspondent to the other clause, that ought also to be varied, and a definite person introduced, thus—"It does not appear (to us) possible to act otherwise, the weakness of our nature being considered." But this amendment would be of no advantage, but rather an injury.

To comprehend the use of such expressions, we should consider that men find it useful to deal in abstract propositions, and lay down truths without reference to persons. This manner of discoursing is often less invidious than to apply propositions or opinions to persons. To accomplish this purpose, men have devised words and modes of speech which enable them thus to communicate their ideas. In the passage cited, the first clause contains a general abstract proposition, equally applicable to any person—"It is not possible to act otherwise" That is, it is not possible for me, for you, for him or for her—but it might be invidious to specify persons. It is not possible for John or Thomas to act otherwise, he considering the weakness of his nature. Hence the proposition is left without application—and it follows naturally that the persons who are to consider the cause, the *weakness of our nature*, should be left indefinite, or unascertained. Hence *considering* is left without a direct application to any person.

Whatever foundation there may be for this explanation, the idiom is common and well authorized—It bears a close affinity to the independent clause.

"Generally speaking, the heir at law is not bound by the intention of the Testator." *Paley. Phil.* 23.

"Supposing that electricity is actually a substance, and taking it for granted that it is different from caloric, does it not in all probability, contain caloric, as well as all other bodies?"

Thompson Chem. art. Caloric.

Here is no noun expressed or implied, to which *supposing* and *taking* can be referred; we would be most naturally understood—

"*Supposing* the first stratum of particles to remain in their place, after their union with caloric, we can conceive an affinity, &c." *ibm.* Here *supposing* may be referred to *we*, but is this the real construction?

"For *supposing* parliament had a right to meet spontaneously, without being called together, it would be impossible to conceive that all the members would agree," &c. *Blacks. Com.* B. 1. 2.

"The articles of this charge, *considering* by whom it was brought, were not of so high a nature as might have been expected."

Henry. Brit. B. 4. ch. 1.

"It is most reasonable to conclude that, *excepting* the assistance he may be supposed to have derived from his countrymen, his plan of civilization was the product of his own abilities."

Enfield H. Ph. 1. ch. xi.

"None of us put off our clothes, *saving* that every one put them off for washing." *Neh.* 4. 23.

"And he said unto them, hinder me not, *seeing* the Lord hath prospered my way." *Gen.* 24. 56.

"Lie not one to another, *seeing* that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." *Col.* 3. 9.

"*Comparing* two men, in reference to a common parent, it is easy to frame the ideas of brothers." *Locke* 2. 25.

"*Granting* this to be true, it would help us in the species of things no farther than the tribes of animals and vegetables."

Locke 3. 6. 23.

Bating for *abating*, in a like construction, is found in old authors, but now obsolete. *Admitting*, *allowing*, and some others are frequent in a like construction.

The substitute, which, in most of these phrases, might be most conveniently supplied, is *we*, as the writer may be considered as addressing himself to his readers, and including them with himself.

It will be readily observed how nearly this idiom is allied to the independent clause; for by a trifling change, these sentences may be resolved into that case. "Two men being compared in reference to a common parent, it is easy [for us, you or him] to frame the ideas of brothers."—"Hinder me not, since (*seeing*) the Lord hath prospered my way."*

* To what cause but to the low state of philological knowledge, must be ascribed the classing of *according*, *excepting*, *saving*, *touching* and words used in a like manner, with *prepositions* and *conjunctions*. The reference of these words to *whole sentences*, is one of the most common and best established idioms of the English lan-

NOTE 2.....It has been remarked that the verbals of many of the regular verbs are obsolescent, the past tense being often used in their place; and the reasons for encouraging this practice have been assigned. The influence of Bishop Lowth has had some effect in preserving the use of the old participles in books, but not in oral and popular usage; and why should we retain words in writing which are not generally recognized in oral practice!

The following authorities, coinciding with common usage, may be considered as exhibiting the true verbals and past tenses of the verbs mentioned,

- “Having *spoke* of this in another place.” *Locke*. 2. 17. 5.
 “If any of these creatures could have *spoke*.” *ibm* 3. 6. 27.
 “He would have *spoke*.” *Milton*. *P. L.* x. 517.
 “Words *interwove* with sighs.” *P. L.* 1. 621.
 “Their crowns *inwove* with amarant.” *P. L.* 2. 352.
 “The serpent, insinuating, *wove* with gordian twine.” *P. L.* 4. 348.
 “The fragrant briar was *wove*.” *Dryden’s Fables*.
 “A stuff *wove* all of gold.” *Encyc. art. Brocade*.
 “Though *wove* and quilted by their ladies’ hands.” *Lusiad*. 3.
 “Why hast thou, Satan, *broke* the bounds prescribed.” *P. L.* 4. 878.
 “His voice was *broke* with sighs.” *Spect. No.* 164.
 “Had *broke* the enemy’s lines.” *Murphy. Tacitus*. 2. 63.
 “When they have *broke* themselves a passage.” *Golds. An. Nat.* 2.
 “Ofarrel was *broke* with infamy.” *Hume Contin.* 7. ch. 5.
 “The parley was *broke* off.” *ibm*.
 “One of his postillions had *broke* his leg.” *Rambler. No.* 61.

guage, and without such reference, it is not possible to resolve, or correctly to understand, the sentences in which they are employed.

Indeed so ignorant have some authors been of the true construction, that they have converted *according*, into *accordingly*, as if it was a modifier of the verb, in the manner before remarked of *agreeably*—“*accordingly* to the order of the day;” thus changing the true English idiom into a phrase which is neither grammar nor sense.—“Thus we say, salts with earthy bases, salts with alkaline bases—*accordingly* as the case may be.” *Nicholson. Dict. Vol.* 1. 198.—That is—*accordingly* that—The case may be; instead of *according* that—that which follows.

- “When any magnet is *broke* in two.” *Cavallo on Magnet*. 74.
- “Differences had *broke* out.” *Henry. Brit.* 3. ch. 1. 3.
- “Though *broke* and crushed.” *Hoole’s Tasso*. b. xi.
- “The cards were *broke* open.” *Rambler*, No. 15.
- “Whose conspicuous merit had *broke* through the obscurity of his birth.” *Gibbon*. ch. 4.
- “An imposthume which is *broke*.” *Pope. Letters*.
- “A murderer, who has *broke* prison.” *Burke*.”
- “Whether *upheld* by strength or chance. *Milt.* 1. 133.
- “By ancient Tarsus *held*—a council to be *held*.” *ibm.* 755.
- “The victory was long *held* in suspense.” *Murphy. Tac.* 2. 63.
- “John was *held* in high esteem.” *Porteus. Lect.* xiv.
- “That being dead wherein we were *held*.” *Rom.* 7. 6.*
- “Shall not be *withheld*.” *Milt.* 7. 117.
- “Not transient acts *beheld*.” *Porteus. Lect.* 8.
- “For treasures better *hid*.” *P. L.* 1. 688.
- “Your life is *hid* with Christ in God.” *Col.* 3. 3.
- “The waters were *hid* as with a stone.” *Job.* 38. 30.
- “The armies *rung* hosanna.” *Milton.* 6. 204.
- “From his school *sprung* the Ionic Sect.” *Enfield.* 1. 145.
- “Limpid water which *sprung* up.” *Rambler.* No. 91.
- “All earth had to her center *shook*.” *Milton.* 6. 219.
- “A free constitution has been *shook*.” *Bol. on Hist.*
- “Too strong to be *shook* by their enemies.” *Atterbury*.
- “The tower *shook* by the destroyer time.” *Armstrong, b.* 2.
- “I *sunk* into a slumber.” *Rambler.* No. 102.
- “Creator him they *sung*.” *Milt.*
- “Some say he *bid* his angels.” *Milt.* 10. 668.
- “He *forbid* hunting and hawking.” *Henry Brit.* 3. ch. 1.
- “This Turk *forbid* him shewing us that cavern.” *Tournefort.* 1. 76.
- “Pope Innocent II. *forbid* him teaching again.” *Encyc. art.* *Abelard*.

* *Holden*, is much used in law language, tho long since neglected by all elegant writers. Our lawyers would do well to discard it, and the still more barbarous *stricken*, and *swollen*.

- "She *bid* them beware of a red Embassy. *Tournesfort*. 1. 186.
- "The sum was *bid*—which had *forbid*." *Milt.* 10. 672. 684.
- "Thrasea was *forbid* the presence of the Emperor," *Murphy Tac.*
- "We are not *forbid*. *Porteus. Lect.* 7.
- "He has *got* the name and idea." *Locke*. 1. 2. 16. It is to be remarked that Locke has scarcely once used *gotten* or *forgotten* in whole volumes of his works—a clear proof of the usage in his days.
- "By natural necessity *begot*." *Milt.* 11. 745.
- "Truth and faith *forgot*." *ibm.* 807.
- "The joy ceases when we have *forgot* the cold." *Rambler. No.* 80.
- "Transient acts—*forgot* as soon as over." *Porteus. Lect.* 5.
- "The muse *forgot* and thou beloved no more." *Pope. Elegy.*
- "I have *chose* this perfect man." *Milt.* 1. 165.
- "As soon as the river was *froze*. *Hume Contin. B.* 4. ch. 3. *Note.*
- "The men *begun* to embellish themselves. *Spect. No.* 434.
- "Rapt into future time the bard *begun*." *Pope. Messiah.*
- "A second deluge learning thus o'errun."
- "And the Monks finished what the Goths *begun*." *Pope. Crit.*
- "Him she approached and lowly thus *begun*." *Hoole. Tas.* 5.
- "Yet the heroes that o'errun regions." *Rambler No.* 78.
- "And blazing forth another course *begun*." *Lusiad. b.* 2.
- "This operator will have *stole* it. " *Swift. tale of a Tub.*
- "Some philosophers have *mistook*." *ibm.*
- "If Diodorus has not *mistook* himself." *Bentley.*
- "Have *took*." Shakespear—was *took*"—*Milton. Comus.*
- "I have *took*." *Prior. Alma.*
- "They had *drank* Chocolate." *Rambler. No.* 101.
- "Albion the poison of the Gods has *drank*." *Armstrong. b.* 3.
- "Until he was assured the sick had *drank*." *Rycaut. Garcillasso. 521 and 843.*
- "The sort which is commonly *drank* at table." *Barrow. Trav.* 61.
- "The remainder is absorbed or *drank* up." *Darwin. Zoon. Lect.* 2.

- “ The warm liquids that are *drank*.” *Beddoes Hyg. Es. 5.**
 “ And tread the path their feet had *trad* before.” *Hoole. Tus. xi.*
 “ Which numbers have *trod*.” *Bacon Introd. Nov. Org.*
 “ When I had *writ* this.” *Locke. 1. 3. 15.*
 “ I *writ* a discourse.” *Swift to Pope.*
 “ The few words I *writ* to you.” *Pope to Gay.*
 “ He *writ* to Lord Godolphin.” *Johnson Life of Garth.*
 “ He probably thought all that he *writ*.” *Life of Prior.*

It is among the excellencies of that cluster of elegant English writers, who adorned and illuminated their country, in the beginning of the last century, that they wrote their native language as it was generally spoke, unfettered by arbitrary rules. To attempt to *fix* a living language, and to found present rules on the usage of speaking in the days of Elizabeth, is as wrong in principle as it will be fruitless.

RULE XXXIX.

Modifiers [adverbs] are usually placed near the words whose signification they are intended to affect.

First. They are placed before attributes: as *truly* wise; *sincerely* upright; *unaffectedly* polite

Secondly. They usually follow a verb when single; as he spoke *eloquently*; and if the verb is transitive with an object following, the modifier follows the object; as “John received the present *gratefully*.”

To this rule, the exceptions are numerous, and not to be classed under general heads. “So it *frequently* happens;” “men *often* deceive themselves”—Indeed, in many cases the position of the modifier makes no difference in the sense, and may be regulated entirely by the preference

* The old participle *drunk* is so effectually obsolete, and so generally used as an attribute only, in the sense of *intoxicated*, that its use as a verbal is not a little ludicrous. “Distilled water has an insipid taste and when *drunk*, oppresses the stomach with a kind of weight.” *Heron's Fourcroy. Vol. 1. 164*—Such an abuse of words is a striking evidence of the mischief done by false rules of grammar.

of sound, in the general structure of the period, provided it is not such as to mislead the reader, in the application of the word.

Thirdly. When one auxiliary and a participle are used, the modifier is usually placed between them or it follows the participle; as "he was *graciously* received," or "he was received *graciously*." The first is the most elegant.

Fourthly. When two auxiliaries are used, the modifier is usually placed after the second; as "We have been *kindly* treated"—But it may follow the verbal, "We have been treated *kindly*;" and in some cases, it may precede the auxiliaries; as "And *certainly* you must have known."

Junius. Letter 8.

Fifthly. When modifiers are emphatical, they may introduce a sentence, and be separated from the word to which they belong, as "*How completely* this most amiable of human virtues *had taken possession* of his soul!" *Port. Lect. 8.* This position of the modifier is most frequent in interrogative and exclamatory phrases.

The modifier *always* is usually placed before the verb.

Never commonly precedes a single verb, except *be*, which it follows; as "We are *never* absent from church on Sunday." It is sometimes placed before an auxiliary; as, "He *never* has been at court;" but it is more correctly and elegantly placed after the first auxiliary, as "He has never been at court"—"he has never been intoxicated."

This word has a peculiar use in the phrase "ask me *never* so much dowry." *Gen. 34.* "The voice of charmers, charming *never* so wisely." *Psalms 58.* The sense is "Ask me so much dowry as *never was asked before*"—an abbreviation singularly expressive of the idea of asking to any amount or extent. Authors not understanding it, have substituted *ever* for *never*, which impairs the force, if it does not destroy the sense, of the phrase. The use of both is now common, but *never* is preferable—"Some agreements indeed, tho *never* so expressly made, are deemed of so important a nature, that they ought not to rest in verbal promise only." *Black. Com. B. 3. ch. 9.*

The use of *here* and *there*, in the introduction of sentences before verbs, forms an authorized idiom of the language; tho the words may be considered as redundant.

The practice may have originated in the use of the hand in pointing, in the early stage of society.

Here, there, and where, originally denoting *place*, are now used in reference to words, subjects and various ideas of which place is not predicable. "It is not so with respect to volitions and actions; *here* the coalescence is intimate."

Hermes. ch. 8. "We feel pain in the sensations, *where* we expected pleasure." *Locke*. 2. 7. 4.

Hence, whence and thence, denoting the place from which a departure is stated, are used either *with* or *without* the preposition *from*. In strictness, the idea of *from* is included in the words, and it ought not to be used. These words also are used not only in reference to place, but to any argument, subject, or idea in a discourse.

Hither, thither and whither, denoting *to a place*, are obsolete in popular practice; and obsolescent in writing; being superseded by *here, there, and where*. This change is evidently the effect of the all-controlling disposition of men to abridge speech, by dismissing useless syllables, or by substituting short words of easy pronunciation, for those which are more difficult. Against this disposition and its effects, the critic remonstrates in vain; and we may rest assured that common convenience and utility are better guides in whatever respects the use of words, than the opinion of men in their closets. No word or syllable in a language, which is essential or very useful, is ever lost.

While is a noun denoting *time*, and not a modifier. In this phrase, "I will go *while* you stay," the word is used in its primitive manner, without government, like many other names of portions of time—a *month, a week*.

We are accustomed to use, as modifiers, *a little, and a great deal*. "The many letters I receive, do not *a little* encourage me." *Spect.* No. 124. Many names are used in like manner, as modifiers of the sense of verbs. "You don't care *sixpence* whether he was wet or dry." *Johnson*.

RULE XL.

In polite and classical language, two negatives destroy the negation and express an affirmative; as "*Nor* did he

not perceive them,"—that is, he did perceive them. This phraseology is not common nor agreeable to the genius of our tongue.*

The following is a common and well authorized use of negatives. "His manners are not inelegant," that is, are elegant. This manner of expression however, when not accompanied with particular emphasis, denotes a moderate degree of the quality.

NOTE.....In popular language, two negatives are used for a negation, according to the practice of the ancient Greeks and the modern French. This idiom was primitive, and was retained in the Saxon; as "Oc se kining Peada ne rixade nane while."—*Sax. Chron.* p. 33. And the king Peada did not reign none while—that is, not a long time. The learned, with a view to philosophical correctness, have rejected the use of two negatives for one negation; but the expedience of the innovation may be questioned, for the change has not reached the great mass of the people, and probably never will reach them; it being nearly impossible, in my opinion, ever to change a usage which enters into the language of every cottage, every hour and almost every moment. Such usages are always regulated by tradition. The consequence is, we have two modes of speaking directly opposite to each other, but expressing the same thing. "He did not owe nothing," in vulgar language, and "he owed nothing," in the style of the learned, mean precisely the same thing. It makes no difference that men of letters denounce vulgar language, as incorrect—Language in a nation should be uniform; the same words should, among all classes of people, express the same ideas—and rash indeed is the innovator who attempts to change an idiom which has the stamp of the authority of thousands of years—[for the idiom in question is certainly as old as the Greek language, which sprung from the Teutonic] and which is so incorporated into the language of common affairs, as to render hopeless every effort towards a reformation. To create essential differences between the language of polite and common life, is a serious evil. In this instance, the people have the primitive idiom; and if the Greeks, that polished nation, thought fit to retain two negatives for a negation, in the most elegant language ever formed, surely our men of letters might have been less fastidious about retaining them in the English. It is not expected that any change can now be effected in the practice of one class of people or the other: but these remarks are intended to suggest a salutary caution against indulging a spirit of innovation, under the pretext of reforming what is supposed to be wrong.

* Milton seems to have understood Latin better than English.

RULE XLI.

Prepositions are followed by the names of objects and the objective case; as *From* New-York *to* Philadelphia; *across* the Delaware; *over* land; *by* water; *through* the air; *with* us; *for* me; *to* them; *in* you; *among* the people; *towards* us.

The preposition *to* is supposed to be omitted after verbs of *giving*, *yielding*, *affording*, and the like; as "give them bread," instead of "give bread *to* them." "Afford him protection;" "furnish her with books." But this idiom seems to be primitive, and not elliptical.

From is sometimes suppressed, as in this phrase, "He was banished the kingdom."

Home, after a verb denoting motion *to*, is always used without *to*; as "We are going home."

In general, the preposition is placed next before a substitute; as *to* him, *for* us—but may be separated from a name by an attribute and definitive; as "in *the busy* scenes of life"—

After the attribute *near*, *to* is often omitted; as "To bring them nearer the truth." *Massillon*. Also after *adjoining*; as "a garden adjoining a river."

The preposition is sometimes separated from the word which it governs; as "With a longing for that state *which* he is charmed *with*," instead of *with which* he is charmed. In many cases, the relative substitute may be suppressed; as "I did not see the person he came *with*;" that is, *with whom* he came—and in other cases, *what* is employed for the word governed; as "I know not *what* person he gave the present *to*."

This separation of the preposition from the word governed by it, and the suppression of the substitute, are most common and most allowable in colloquial and epistolary language. In the grave and elevated style, they are seldom elegant; and never to be admitted to the prejudice of perspicuity; as in the following passage—"Of a space or number, *which*, in a constant and endless enlarging progression, it can in thought never attain *to*." *Locke*, 2. 17. 8.

A separation of the preposition to such a distance from the word with which it is connected in construction, is perplexing and inelegant.

NOTE.....In the use of *who* as an interrogative, there is an apparent deviation from regular construction—it being used without distinction of case; as “Who do you speak to?” “Who is she married to?” “Who is this reserved for?” “Who was it made by?” This idiom is not merely colloquial; it is found in the writings of our best authors.

RULE XLII.

Prepositions govern sentences and clauses or members of sentences; as “The marine acid—dissolves all metals, *without* excepting gold, silver or mercury.” *Ency. art. Mineralogy.*

“*Without* seeking any more justifiable reasons of hostility.” *Hume. 1. 5.*

“*Besides* making an expedition into Kent.” *Hume. 1. 36.*

“*From* what has been said.” *Blair. Serm.*

“*To* the general history of these periods will be added,” &c. *Enfield. Prelim.*

“*About* the beginning of the eleventh century.” *ibm.*

“*By* observing these rules and precautions.” *ibm.*

“*In* comparing the proofs of questionable facts.” *ibm.*

“*For* want of carefully attending to the preceding distinction.” *Enfield. H. Ph. b. 2.*

“*After* men became christians.” *Paley. Evid. ch. 1.*

“*Before* you were placed at the head of affairs. *Junius. Let. 8.*

“Personal bravery is not enough to constitute the general, *without* he animates his whole army with courage.” *Fielding’s Socrates. p. 188.*

“Pray, get these verses by heart, *against* I see you.” *Chesterfield. Let.*

“*After* having made me believe I possessed a share in your affection.” *Pope. Let. 7.*

“Ambition, envy,—will take up our minds, *without* we can possess ourselves in sobriety.” *Spect. No. 143.*

NOTE.....We observe, in the foregoing passages, the preposition has two uses—one is to precede a word to which other words are annexed as necessary to complete the sense—“about the beginning”—Here the sense is not complete—the time is not designated—To define the time which is the object of the preposition *about*, it is necessary to add the words—“of the eleventh century”—*about that time*—So that the whole clause is really the object after the preposition.

The other use of the preposition is to precede names, verbs or other words which are not the object of the preposition, but which have a construction independent of it—as “*after* men became christians.” Here *men* is the nominative to *became*; yet the whole proposition is as really the object governed by *after*, as the word *hour*, in the phrase, *after that hour*. “Against I see you” is a phrase of like construction—No single word is an object or in the objective case after *against*; but the whole affirmation is the object. “*Without* we can possess ourselves,” has a like construction, and though superseded, in a degree, by *unless*, a word of similar import, is a true English phrase—After [this fact] men became christians—Against [that time when] I see you—Without [this fact] we can possess ourselves.

Let us examine the following sentence, “After thus considering what was likely to happen, we are next to enquire, &c.” *Paley. Evid. ch. 2.* Here *considering* refers to *we*; but is it not, with the whole clause, governed by *after* as the object?

“When we would consider eternity a *parte ante*, what do we *but* repeat in our minds the idea of years or ages?” *Locke. 2. 17. 10.* Here *but* has the force of a preposition, or of a verb in the imperative mode—equivalent to *except*—What do we—*except this*—we repeat, &c. The Saxon *beutan*, the original word, is probably, but not certainly, a compound of *be*, the verb—and *utan*, out—but I think it more correct to assign to *but*, in this sense, a place among the prepositions, and governing either a single word or a sentence.

“Man, *but* for this, no action could attend,
And, *but* for that, were active to no end.” *Pope.*

“What with more decency were in silence kept,
And, *but* for this unjust reproach, had slept.” *Dryd. Virg. x. 96.*

“The law never speaks, *but* to command.” *Paley. Ph. 3.*

RULE XLIII.

The modifiers of sentences, *if*, *tho*, *unless*, and *lest* may be followed by verbs in the future tense, without the usual

auxiliars, "as." "If his son *ask* bread, will he give him a stone?"—"If he *ask* a fish, will he give him a serpent?" "Tho he *slay* me, yet will I trust in him." "He shall not eat of the holy things, unless he *wash* his flesh with water." "Lest thou *say*, I have made Abram rich."

Except has a like effect upon the following verb: as "I will not let thee go, *except* thou *bless* me." *Whether* has been numbered also among the conjunctions, which require the conditional mode: but by an egregious mistake. It is not a connective, nor does it imply a condition or hypothesis, but an alternative.

NOTE.....The arrangement of the foregoing form of the verb, in the present tense of the subjunctive mode, is one of the most palpable mistakes that the compilers of English grammars have committed. It seems to have originated in the Saxon and ancient English practice of omitting the personal termination, to express future time—*shall* and *will* not being much used, in ancient times, for this purpose. In consequence of this practice, the translators of the bible, who wrote the style of the age of Elizabeth,* rarely made any difference between a *present uncertainty* and a *future contingency*; so that the present and future tenses of the original are confounded, and the form of the verb in English which comprehends both, has been placed by grammarians in the present tense of the Conditional Mode.—Take the following proofs of this fact.—From the Hebrew.

Deut. 9. 28. Lest the land say—In the original, pen yamaru eartz. lest the land *shall* say—in the future.

Deut. 30. 17. If thine heart *turn* away, so that thou wilt not hear—original—Uam ipene lebebek ula tesemo—if thine heart *shall* turn—in the future.

1 Kings. 8. 31. At asar ichetha ais leroeu—if any man trespass against his neighbor—orig—*shall* trespass.

Job. 11. 10. Am ike lep vichegir vicqueil, umi isibenu—if he cut off and shut up or gather together, then who can hinder him? orig—if he *shall* cut off and *shall* shut up.

Job. 13. 15. En iquetheleni—tho he *shall* slay me—or lo, he shall slay me.

* The present translation of the bible is commonly considered as made in the reign of James I.; but on comparing it with the translations published in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, it is evident, that the last translators merely revised the former copies, altering a few phrases and words; but leaving the body of the style unaltered.

Job. 14. 14. Am imut geber—if a man *shall* die.

Job. 27. 16. Am izeber koper kezar ukechmer ikin melebus—tho he *shall* heap up silver as the dust, and *shall* prepare raiment as the clay.

Gen. 19. 19. I cannot escape to the mountains—pen tedebyeni eroe umeti—lest some evil *shall* take me and I die.

Levit. 25. 29. Uais ki imakar bith—when, or if a man *shall* sell a house.

Malachi. 4. 6. Pen abua vekiti at artz cherim—lest I *shall* come and *shall* strike the earth with a curse.

As a general fact, the original Hebrew verb, which the translators have rendered by a verb without *shall* or *will* or a personal termination, is in the future tense; and the English verb, having the sense of the future, ought to be arranged in grammars under that tense.

This remark is confirmed by the Greek translation of the seventy—who render the Hebrew by a verb in the future or by an aorist, the sense of which, after a sign of condition, is future.

Job. 13. 15. Ean me chirasetai—tho he *should* slay me.

Levit. 22. 6. ean mē lousētai to soma—unless he *shall* wash his body.

Gen. 14. 23. ina mē eipēs—lest thou *shouldst* say—or that thou should not say.

Gen. 32. 26. ean mē me eulogēsēi—except thou *shalt* bless me.

See also *Gen.* 19. 15—*Ex.* 20. 19. and indeed examples in almost every chapter in the Old Testament.

In the New Testament, the aorist, with the sense of a future, is generally rendered by a like form of the English verb. “Take heed lest any man *deceive* you”—that is, *shall* or *should* deceive you. See *1. Cor.* 10. 12.—*Heb.* 3. 12. a future tense,—*Luke* 8. 12. and numerous other examples.

The translation may be considered as correct, but to make it correct, the verbs should in grammars be arranged under the future tense, or an aorist.

For want of attention to the distinction between present uncertainty and future contingency, the translators have confounded two tenses of the original, into one in English. Thus *Mat.* 4. 3. ei uios ei tou theou, which ought to be translated—if thou *art* the son of God—is rendered, if thou *be* the son of God. So also *Luke.* 23. 35. The original is in the Indicative—if he *is* the son of God. So also in *John* 10. 24—1. 25—15. 18. If the world *hates* you; in the Indicative. *Acts.* 3. 39—if it *is* of God.—See also. *John* 7. 17—1. *John*, 4. 1. and 3. 13.

In these and numerous other passages, the original Greek tense is correctly placed in the present tense of the *Indicative*—expressing a condition or uncertainty respecting a *present* fact or event. And our common people who learn the language by tradition, preserve this use of the *Indicative*, which was the primitive use; for the Greeks and English derive it from the same source.

“And shall not God avenge his own elect, who cry to him day and night, tho he *bear* long with them!—*Luke* 18. 7. In the original, tho he *bears* long with them.—The fact is not mentioned as a future contingency—tho he *should bear*; but as a fact admitted—tho he *bears* long with them, still he will be avenged.

“But tho our outward man *perish*, yet the inward man is renewed day by day”—*2. Cor.* 4. 16. The original, *diaptheiretai*, is in the present tense of the *Indicative*—tho our outward man *perishes*, or rather, *is perishing* or *decaying*. The translation, which indicates a future casual event, tho our outward man *perish*, [that is, *should perish*] seems not to convey the Apostle’s meaning, for he evidently speaks of a fact conceded, as present.

I might extend these criticisms to almost every passage in the Bible, in which this pretended present tense of the subjunctive mode is used in our version, and show that the translators have confounded two tenses, which, in the original, are uniformly kept distinct.

To demonstrate the impropriety of that practice, let us attend to the principles of our own tongue.

It has been before remarked that *if*, *tho*, and *unless*, are old Saxon verbs in the imperative Mode, and that the ingenious invention of our ancestors to express a condition or supposition was, to employ a verb, with the sense of *give*, *grant*, *put*, *be it*, that is, *give the fact*. We retain the idiom, and the words employed; but as these have lost their inflections, critics have ignorantly classed them with conjunctions—a part of speech to which they have no more alliance than they have to nouns or adjectives.* We have also certain words of Latin original, employed for precisely the same purpose—*suppose*, *grant* and *admit*, which indeed are not yet misnamed and classed with conjunctions.

The Saxon method therefore of expressing condition, doubt, or hypothesis, was to declare the fact which was to be supposed, by a verb in the *Indicative Mode*, and prefix to this fact or statement, a verb in the *Imperative Mode*, denoting *give*, *grant*, or *suppose*. Thus, “Give his son shall ask bread, will he give him a stone.” *Give*, in the *Imperative* and *his son shall ask bread*, a sentence following *give* as its object.—This is precisely the construction of such sentences of a conditional kind. Now to omit the personal termination of the verb in the hypothetical sentence—“Give, he ask

* *If* his son ask bread, will he give him a stone.” In the name of reason, what single property of a conjunction has *if*? *Tho* ho slay me, yet will I trust in him.” What connecting powers has *tho*? Not the least; and this is equally true of *si* and *nisi* in Latin.

bread," is to convert the sentence into false English, unless we suppose the tense future, and the auxiliary *will* or *shall* suppressed. In the present tense, it is just as bad English, as to omit the termination after the Latin equivalent words *suppose* or *admit*. "Suppose, his son ask bread"—"Suppose, he be the son of God."

Unless, is a verb, *on lysan*, to unloose, release, dismiss, put away, remove. Unless he wash his flesh, he will be unclean. That is, dismiss, (or suppose not to exist) this fact—*he wash his flesh*, and he will be unclean. This shows that the sentence is not English, except we consider *wash* as in the future, and the auxiliary *shall* suppressed. That the tense is future, is not only obvious, from the sense of the verb itself, but from the following clause—If his son (shall) ask bread, *will* he give him a stone? "Unless he (shall) wash his flesh, he *will be* unclean—the last clauses are in the future, corresponding in time with the contingent events expressed in the first clause.

To add further proof of this explanation, some extracts from our best Saxon writings are here offered, showing that the Indicative Mode was actually employed after these signs of condition.

"We witan other eglanð her be easton; ther ge magon eardian, *gif ge willath*, and *gif hwa eow withstent* &c." *Saxon Chronicle*. p. 1. We know other island eastward from this place; there ye may dwell, if ye *willeth* (will) and if any one (who) shall withstand you"—Such is the literal English.

"*Gif wealas nellath sibbe* with us," p. 25. If the Welsh *willeth* not (will not conclude) peace with us.

"*Gif hwa hit doth*." p. 43. If any one *doth* it.

"*Gif hwa this to breketh æni thing*." p. 38. If any one *breketh* this any thing, that is, is guilty of the least violation.

"*Gif any man is*"—p. 67.

"*Gif thar man an ban findeth unforbaerned*"—*Alfred's Orosius*. p. 28. If any man *findeth* a bone unburned.—

"*Gif hy gemunan willath hioro yldrena unclænnessa*." p. 61. If they *willeth* recollect the uncleanness of old times.

"*Gif any man is*"—p. 93. If any man *is*.

"*Gif hi thonne cwethath*" p. 177. "If they then *conceiveth*."

"*Gif we him fulgangan willath*" p. 178. "If we *willeth* devote ourselves to him."

It will be noted that the Saxons joined a verb in what we now call the third person singular, with nouns and pronouns plural—*we* or *they willath*, and this form of the verb after plural nominatives is still in vulgar use—the *horses runs* fast. Indeed this ending *eth* or *ath is*, in the Saxon grammar, given as plural. But the passages cited prove the only point I am defending; which is, that the indicative mode, as the language was originally constructed, follows the signs of condition.

To show that the form of the verb, in conditional sentences, which is commonly called the present tense of the subjunctive mode, is really the future tense, and was so intended by ancient writers, let the following authorities be considered.

“Gif hwa gefeohte on cyninges hus”—Give who *fight* in the king's house.”—*Si quis in regia pugnauerit.* That is, if any person shall *fight* in the royal palace. *L. L. Ina. b. Lambard Trans.*

“Gif hwa fare unaleafed fram his hlaforde.” Give who *go* without leave from his lord. “*Si quis decesserit a domino sine ejus venia.*” If any person shall *depart* from his lord without his permission. *L. L. Ina. 39.*

“Gif hwa slea his thone nehstan mid stane.”

“Give who *slay* (strike) his nearest with a stone.”

“*Si quis percusserit suum proximum lapide.*”

If any person shall *smite* his neighbor with a stone *L. L. Alfred. 16.*

“Gif theof brece mannes hus nightes and wyrthe thære ofslagen”—if a thief *break* open a man's house at night and *be* there slain.—*L. L. Alf. 25.*

These and similar examples without number in the Saxon writings, demonstrate that this form of the verb was intended for a future tense. For first, let it be observed that *shall* and *will* in the Saxon were rarely used as signs of the future tense—2dly. The sense is future and contingent, as every act commanded or prohibited by law must necessarily be—and this form of the verb is usually translated into the Latin future—3dly. The same form of the verb is used in the Saxon, without the sign of a condition. For example.

“Se the slea his agenne theowne esne oththe mennem.” He that *slay* (or strike) his own male or female servant. *L. L. Alf. 17.*

“Se the frione forstæle and he hynne bebygge, swelt se death.” He that *steal* a freeman and *sell* him, let him suffer death. *L. L. Alf. 15.*

“Bute he gebete,” without he compensate—that is, unless he shall make compensation. *L. L. Edmund.*

It is evident that the verbs are here used for the future tense; he that *strike* or *steal*, for he that *shall* strike or steal.

4thly. The same fact may be inferred from the use of the future by the Roman law-givers, in similar cases. So nearly allied are the Teutonic and Latin languages, that some of the pronouns in each are the same words with trivial alterations in orthography, and numerous idioms of the two languages are the same. Now in the early Roman laws, we find the verb after the sign of condition always in the future—Witness the following laws of Romulus and Numa, in their primitive orthography.

“Si pater filium ter *venundavit*, filius a patre liber esto.” If a father *shall sell* his son three times, let the son be free.”

“Sei (si) puer parentis *verberit*”—if a boy *shall beat* his parents.

“Patronus, si clienti fraudem *faxit*, sacer esto.” If a patron *shall defraud* his client, let him be devoted or cursed.

In the same manner without the sign of condition. Qui terminum *exaravit*—he who *shall remove* a land mark.

There can be no doubt therefore that this form of the verb, in which the personal termination is dropped, is a real future tense, and ought to be considered as such by Grammarians. In Grammars it should stand as a future, or an aorist: noting an indefinite time and a contingent act.

Εἰν δὲ ἐκεῖνο διαπρετόν ἐν ἀρχῇ, εἰ ἐστὶν ὑψόθεν τῶν βῆθων τελεῖν. *Longinus, Sect. 2.*

“We are first to enquire whether (or if) there *is* any art in the sublime and profound.” Here Longinus has used the indicative to express a present doubtful fact.

“Quæ [mors] aut plane negligenda est, si omnino *extinguit* animum, aut etiam optanda, si aliquo eum *deducit*, ubi *sit* futurus eternus.” *Cicero. de Senec. 19.*

Death is not to be regarded, if it *annihilates* the soul: and is even desirable, if it *conducts* it to immortality.

Here uncertainty of a present fact is expressed by the present tense of the Indicative, after *si*; but after *ubi*, not a conjunction expressing uncertainty, the author uses, *sit*, in the subjunctive—where the soul *is* or may *be*. So also after *quum*, “quum tanta celeritas animorum *sit*,” since such *is* the activity of the soul. *Ibm. ca. 21.* In which use, no doubt or uncertainty is expressed, but the fact is admitted as true. And after *ut*, “ex quo fit, ut animosior etiam senectus *sit*, quam adolescentia.” *Ca. 20.* By which means old age is rendered more brave than youth.

The use of the subjunctive in Latin was not regulated by the uncertainty of the fact stated; but by certain conjunctions, adverbs and preceding verbs. And a principal use of it was to express what, in English, is expressed by auxiliaries; as in the following examples. “Plures enim dicent, quem ad *modum* hæc *fiant*, quam quem ad modum his *resistatur*.” *Cicero. de Amicitia. 12.*

More men will inform us how these things *may happen*, than how the evil *may be resisted*. “Quid enim refert, qua me ratione *cogatis*? cogitis certe.” *ibm. 8.* Of what importance is it, by what means you may constrain me? You still impose constraint.

“Quod si *comminuas*, vilem *redigatur* ad assem.”

Hor. Sat. 4. 122.

If you *should lessen* it, it *may be reduced* to a paltry farthing.

“Habes auctorem, quo *facias* hoc.” *Hor. Sat. 1. 43.* You have an authority, by which you *may do* this, or for doing this.

"*Quod si in hoc erro, quod animos hominum immortales esse credam, libenter erro*"—*Cic. de Sen.* 23. "For if I err in *this*, *that* I believe the souls of men to be immortal, I willingly err." Here the first verb *erro* immediately subjoined to the conjunction implying condition or uncertainty, is in the Indicative—while the second verb, *credam*, which is not dependent on any word expressing condition, is in the subjunctive.

And here let it be observed that *quod*, in both parts of the sentence, is marked with an accent in our printed copies of the original; when in fact it is a substitute for the following sentence—*quod si in hoc erro—gif which, be it, I err in this—or be that,—or in old English, all be it, I err*—The second *quod* relates immediately to the antecedent *hoc*—*in hoc, quod—in this which follows*.—In neither case is *quod* an adverb or conjunction—in such a wretched state is the grammar of the Latin, as well as the English language!

"*Frequentes—postulant ut signum detur.*" The multitude demand that the signal *should be given*,—or in the elliptical, indefinite form, that the signal *be given* "*Edicunt inde ut abstineant pugna.*" They order that they *should abstain from action*: *Liv. lib. 11. 45.* This is one of the most important uses of the Latin subjunctive Mode.

I have been more full upon this subject, with a view to reconcile the differences between books and colloquial usage. It struck me, at an early period of my studies, as the most monstrous absurdity, that books should teach us a language altogether different from the common language of life. I was determined to satisfy my own mind, which practice is most correct upon principle, and who have made innovations, the learned or unlearned. The result is perfectly satisfactory. In the particular under consideration, the popular practice of using the Indicative Mode, in conditional phrases, when present time is expressed, is perfectly correct. The personal terminations, cannot correctly be dropped after, *if, tho, lest* and *whether*, unless when the tense is future, and an auxiliary, *will, shall* or *should*, is understood.

The use of the present tense of the subjunctive, without the personal terminations was formerly very general. It was reserved for the classical writers of the eighteenth century to lay aside the pedantic forms, *if he go, if it proceed, though he come, &c.* and restore the native idiom of the language, by writing it as men spoke it, and as they still speak it, unless perverted by Grammars.

"If they are notions imprinted." *Locke on Und. p. 15. Lon. 1796.*

“ If principles *are* innate.” *f.* 28.

“ If any person *hath* put such a notion into his head.”—
f. 73.

“ Whether that substance *thinks* or no.” *f.* 82.

“ Whether the soul *doth* think—whether it *has* pleasure or pain—or *be* [is] capable of happiness or misery,” *f.* 83.

“ Tho a shadow *consists* in nothing but the absence of light.” *f.* 110.

“ Whether these his observations *are* justly grounded, I cannot tell. *Spect.* No. 265.

“ If I *am* rightly informed.” *Ibm.*

“ If he *has* not the pomp of a numerous train.” No. 264.

“ Tho mutual esteem *produces* mutual desire to please. *Rasselas.* 29.

“ If he *was* but feared.” *Rambler,* No. 4.

“ If his health *was* impaired.” No. 5.

“ If he *is* born to think.” No. 7.

“ If he *is* dwelling with delight.” No. 8.

“ If he *pretends* to hold him to syllogism.” No. 9.

“ Of which the writer, if he *was* to live now, would be ashamed.” No. 29.

“ If it *was* not for you.” *Pope Letters.*

“ If there *was* no other way.” *Hume continued* 7. *ch.* 2.

“ If the revolution *was* not lawful—if the doctor *was* guilty.” *Ibm.* *ch.* 5.

“ If this *was* the decision of man only.” *Porteus, Lect.* 3.

“ If he *has* declared.” *Ibm.*

“ If the reality *is* proved.” *Lect.* 6. *ibm.*

“ Tho this institution *is* calculated.” *Coxe Trav. Russia.*

“ Unless some powerful motive *animates* this regularity and decency of appearance.” *Anarcharsis Trans* *ch.* 47.

"If a soldier *has* quitted his rank—if he *is* married—if the person *admits* the augmentation—if he *does* not."—*Ibm. ch. 56.*

"If the physician *does* not enjoin a proper regimen—if the patient *deviates* from his injunctions." *Belldoes Hygia. Es. 8.*

"If newspapers *are* scurrilous." *Junius, Let. 16.*

"If no circumstances *are* alleged in his favor—if no allegation *be* [is] made to lessen the force of evidence."—*Ibm. 62.*

"If he *means* Antigonus—if he *means* Demetrius."—*Prideaux. 1. 2.*

"Unless he *thinks* it proper or prudent so to do."—*Blacks. Comment. 1. 2.*

It is needless to multiply authorities—they may be cited without end—and such is THE LANGUAGE. The elegant writers here cited, learnt their native tongue, certainly not in Grammars, but in actual usage, in national practice.—Fortunately they were not fettered by the pedantry of schools, but they found differences between the oral and written language, some of which have crept into all their writings, and now stand as inconsistencies, not unfrequently in the same sentence. I recollect one author who is not chargeable with this fault—Dr. Gregory, in three volumes entitled the "Economy of Nature," has used the Indicative after the signs of condition, without an exception; and it is with pleasure I see such respectable writers restoring the language to its primitive purity.

The poets omit the auxiliary of the future tense, without the sign of contingency—a licence not admissible in prose.

"To morrow, ere fresh morning *streak* the east." *Milt.*

That is, *shall streak.*

The auxiliary is omitted also after a command.

"Gabriel—hath given

"Charge and strict watch, that to this happy place,

"No evil thing *approach* or enter in." *Milt.*

To the false rules of our Grammars, we may ascribe the omission of the personal terminations of verbs after *till* and

before—"At the end of which a new shaft is sunk, and this is done repeatedly, till the shaft *penetrate* to the bottom of the mine." *Heron's Fourcroy*. 2. 248. "The resounding of the rock when it is struck, warns the workmen before this event *take place*." *Ibm.* 249.

It has been remarked under the head of *tenses*, that the present tense is properly used for the future, after words which carry the mind forward to the time. *Till* is a word of this sort—its meaning is, *to the time*, which has such an effect upon future time, that we conceive and speak of it in the present tense.

In the first passage just cited, *shall* may perhaps be supplied—*shall penetrate*—which will render the sentence tolerable; but it cannot be prefixed to *take* in the second passage, and the sentence appears not only incorrect, but ludicrous. The same fault in Pinkerton's *Geography*, renders many passages incorrect, and some ridiculous.

"Tho the Mersey *present* a grand estuary, its course is not of great extent." *Pinkerton's Geography*, v. 1. *Phil.* 82.

This is not English even upon Lowth's principles, for he lays it down as a rule, that when a fact is certain, admitted, or taken for granted, the indicative mode is the most proper—and he condemns this translation—"Tho he *were* a son, yet learned he obedience." "Tho the Mersey *presents*," is the true English idiom.

"A large river, which there divides itself into three branches before it *join* the sea." *Vol.* 2, 135.

"In *Neged*, a young Arab cannot marry till he *have* proved his valor." *Ibm.* 316.

Pinkerton's works abound with similar mistakes which prove the writer to have a very superficial knowledge of *Grammar*; for he carries the false rules of Lowth to an extent never intended by the learned author. The like errors abound in the works of Paley—and are frequent in Dr. Miller's *Retrospect of the eighteenth century*; an elegant work, disfigured only by errors of grammar, into which the author must have been misled by false rules.*

* From a careful survey of the history of our language, I have ascertained beyond any reasonable doubt, that the English Gram-

“Those who hold such doctrine must require that a man so attacked, must, *before he strike* the assailant, stop and ascertain how the pistol is loaded.” *Trial of Selfridge*, p. 160.

I know not whether this inaccuracy is the fault of the Judge or of the reporter; but *strike* cannot be considered here as either future or conditional; it expresses time in that indeterminate manner, which constitutes a principal office of the present tense of the Indicative—It ought to be *strikes*.

RULE XLIV.

Connectives join two or more clauses or members in a compound sentence:—as “Keep thy tongue from evil, *and* thy lips from speaking guile.”

Here are two clauses united by *and*, which continues the sense and prevents the repetition of the verb *keep*.

“I sought the Lord, *and* he heard me, *and* delivered me from all my fears.” Here are three clauses combined into a sentence or period by the help of *and*; but a new verb is introduced in each, and the second connective prevents the repetition of the substitute *he* only.

“A wise son heareth his father’s instruction; *but* a scorner heareth not rebuke.” Here *but* joins the two clauses, but a new character is the nominative to a distinct verb, in the second clause, which exhibits a contrast to the first and no word is omitted.

RULE XLV.

Connectives join single words, which are the nominatives to the same verb, expressed or understood—or words which follow a transitive verb or a preposition in the same case. Connectives also join verbs, attributes, and modifiers. Examples:

mans which have been published within the last forty years, have introduced more errors than they have corrected.

“ *Peter and John* went up into the Temple.”

Here *Peter* and *John* are the nominatives to the verb, and the connective *and* prevents the repetition of the verb and following part of the sentence—*Peter* went up into the Temple—*John* went up into the Temple. *I and you* will go to Boston—*William and Thomas* must go to Washington. Neither *I nor John* was present—*Peter or Henry* will attend. “*I am the way and the truth and the life.*”

In the following, the connective joins words which are the object of a verb or preposition. “*The torch of truth discovers malevolence and envy.*” “*I have dispatched my correspondents with fair words and general civility.*”—*Rambler*.

I esteem him and her and them—*He loves us and you*. It is for *you and me*.

In the following, two verbs in the same tense or mode are joined by a connective. “*Their fondness for allegory dazzled and confounded their understanding.*” *Enfield*.—“*Plutarch taught philosophy and was a voluminous writer.*” *Ibm.* “*All are of the dust and turn to dust.*” “*The idea is likely to sink the deeper and spread the farther.*”

Connectives join attributes and modifiers—as “*He is wise and virtuous.*” “*An orator pleads eloquently and plausibly.*”

The connectives perform a very important office in abridging language, by enabling us to omit words which must otherwise be repeated, Thus when I say “*I esteem religion and virtue,*” two affirmations, “*I esteem religion, I esteem virtue,*” are actually included in the sentence.

When several words or clauses succeed each other, it is not uncommon to omit the connective; as “*We hear nothing of causing the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed.*” *Paley Evid.*

After the connective *than*, there may be and usually is an ellipsis of a verb, a name or other words; as “*There is none greater in this house than I.*” *Gen.* xxxix. 9, that is, *than I am*.

“*In the throne only will I be greater than thou.*” *Gen.* xli. that is, *than thou shalt be*.

“*He loves his money more than his honor,*” that is, *more than he loves his honor*.

“The king of the north shall return and set forth a multitude greater than the former,” *Dan. xi. 13*, that is, than the former multitude.

“I will pull down my barns and build greater,” *Luke 12*, that is, greater barns.

Sometimes other words may be suppressed without obscuring the sense, as “It is better for me to die than to live.” *Jonah 4*. That is, better than *for me* to live.

Precise rules for the ellipsis of words, in all cases, cannot be given. In general, a writer will be governed by a regard to perspicuity, and omit no word, when the want of it leaves the sense obscure or ambiguous, nor when it weakens the strength of expression. But the following remarks and examples may be of some use to the student.

1. When a number of words are joined in construction, the definitive may be omitted, except before the first; as *the sun, moon and stars—a house and garden*—So also when two or more attributes agree with the same name; as a *great, wise and good prince*. But when attributes or names are particularly emphatical, the definitive should be expressed before each—the *sun, the moon and the stars*,

2. The repetition of names adds emphasis to ideas; as “*Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God*,” is more emphatical than “*Christ the power and the wisdom of God*.”

3. An attribute belonging to two or more names, joined by a connective, may be omitted except before the first; as *my house and garden—good qualities and actions—their interest and solicitation*—*Rambler. 56*. Nor does it make any difference that the names are in different numbers, as our attributes have no distinction of number, the same word may be applied to the singular number and the plural; as a *magnificent house and gardens—his house and lands*. But when a precedes the first attribute, this construction is not elegant.

4. In compound sentences, a nominative substitute or name may be omitted before all the verbs except the first;

as I love, fear and respect the magistrate—instead of I love, I fear and I respect. The connective substitute may sometimes be suppressed; as the man I saw, for the man *whom* I saw.

NOTE.....In this particular of the connective substitute, authors often indulge an unwarrantable license. The use of *that* for *that* which is obsolete and not justifiable. “We speak *that* we do know,” is an original English phrase, but has ceased to be used by good writers.

The omission of the substitute in phrases like this—“There was an instance occurred”—for *which* occurred—is found in all our good authors—but it is so gross a violation of syntax, without utility or pretext of any kind, that every writer should avoid it.

5. The verb may often be omitted; as he is wise and virtuous—that is, he is wise, he is virtuous. They go to see and be seen—that is, they go to see, they go to be seen.

After *hence*, *thence* and *whence* a verb is often omitted without occasioning obscurity—as “Hence the flood of vice which over-spreads the land.”

The auxiliars often supply the place of a principal verb; as John loves money better than you do; John has read more books than Peter has [read]; John shall go, but Peter shall not [go].

5. A modifier need not be repeated with every word which it qualifies, the connective *and* rendering it unnecessary; as he spoke and acted *gracefully*. Here *gracefully* belongs to *speaking* as well as to *acting*.

A preposition may be omitted after a connective; as He walked *over* the hills and the valleys—that is, *over* the valleys.

After *like* and *near*, *to* is usually omitted; as “Like three distinct powers in mechanics”—*Blacks. Com.* 1. 2. That is, like *to* three—“Such opinions as seemed to approach nearest the truth”—*Enfield.* 2. 59—that is, nearest *to* the truth.

Likewise after *join* and *adjoin*, *to* is sometimes omitted; as “a garden adjoining the river.”

For is omitted by the poets after *mourn*.

“He mourn’d no recreant friend, no mistress coy.”

Beattie.

NOTE 1.....The common rule respecting connectives is, that they join like *modes* and *tenses*, as well as like cases; or if the tense or mode is changed, the nominative to the additional verb must be

repeated. But this is often false. "*He lives temperately and he has long lived temperately,*" is an instance in which the repetition of the nominative is alledged to be indispensable. This I apprehend to be a great mistake—the sentence is more correct, as well as more easy and familiar, without the last nominative. So when we pass from the affirmative to the negative or from the negative to the affirmative, the subject or nominative is said to be *always* resumed. This is doubtless an egregious error—He is rich, but *he is* not respectable," is not so common a sentence, as "he is rich, but not respectable." The general rule respecting the ellipsis, is, that a word may always be suppressed, when the omission occasions no obscurity or ambiguity. "He is indolent and therefore will be poor," is perfectly good English. But let the rule be put to the test of authorities.

"Not that *he is or ever was*, obliged by these statutes to call a new parliament every year." *Blacks. Com. b. 1. 2.*

Is this incorrect? No man will pretend that this is not an authorized idiom and perfectly correct. And how shall we supply the ellipsis? Not that *he is or he ever was*! What sort of language is this?

"For when a man says gold is malleable, he *means and would* insinuate something more than this." *Locke. b. 3. ch. 10. 17.*

What necessity is there of repeating the nominative before *would*? Not the least. It is impossible to improve the perspicuity of the sentence.

"That *they have* contributed and *will* probably yet contribute in a considerable degree to the abridgment of labor—*Miller's retrospect, vol. 1. 390.*

"But whatever *they were or are.*" *Burke. Reflections on the Fr. rev. 72.*

"The whole *has* been done under the auspices, and *is* confirmed by the sanction, of religion and piety." *ibm.*

"It *has* opened and *will* more and more open their eyes," *ibm. 84.*

"If 1 *have been* born, or *dwell* or *have served* an apprenticeship in one town." *Payley. Phil. b. 6. 7.*

"He neither *receives* nor *can give* delight." *Johnson.*"

"Cowper's exhortation—is not inferior to similar exhortation—in the accomplished translator of Tansillo's poem, the Nurse, by which these enchanting writers *have induced, and will continue* to induce, so many mothers," &c. *Life of Cowper.* Will any person say, this latter sentence is not correct? How will the grammarian supply the nominative? It cannot be done, without repeating a part of the preceding clause—by which these enchanting writers have induced, and *by which they* will continue to induce.—And of what use is this repetition? Does it add any thing to perspicuity

or elegance? Not the least.—Nothing can show, in a stronger light, the falsity of the rule.

“The philosopher who *hath busied* himself in considering their natures, and *thinks* he knows how far, &c.” *Locke b. 2, ch. 8. 3.*

Here a repetition of the nominative *who* before *thinks*, would improve the structure of the sentence, but is by no means indispensable.

“These are the fountains of knowledge, from whence all the ideas we *have* or *can have*, do spring.” *Locke 2. 1.*

“I neither *do* nor *can* comprehend all I would.” *ibm. 2. 17.*

In the two last examples, the repetition of the nominative, instead of improving, would impair the structure of the sentences.

It should however be observed, that the distinction between the Indicative and the Potential Mode in our language, is not well founded—at least as it regards the grammatical construction—The *potential* is in fact an Indicative or Declarative mode, unless when the conditional signs are used—and might more correctly be called the *Potential Indicative*. Certain it is that the connectives unite the Indicative and potential modes, in our language, without a nominative repeated, just as well as they join two verbs in the same tense and mode.

The truth seems to be, men learn rules and apply them almost as mechanically as a parrot—without attending to their correctness or applicability. The rule under consideration was copied from the Latin Grammar and applied to the English Language, without first settling the question, whether in English we have a potential mode or not—a question not fully determined. And how can it be expected that rules should be correct, when the essential preliminary question, concerning the subjects to which they are applicable, has not been settled?

The mischiefs resulting from such a vague manner of instituting Grammar rules, will be fully seen in the perpetual confusion of tenses which recur in almost every author. We are told that conjunctions connect like tenses and modes—and *whether* is a conjunction. Let us see the consequence “If I *should* ask any one, whether ice and water *were* two distinct species of things.” *Locke. 3. 6. 18.*

To resolve this sentence by common grammars, we are to say, that *should ask* is a verb in the imperfect tense of the subjunctive mode, *whether* is a conjunction, and *were*, a verb connected with *ask* by that conjunction. And what sort of language is this—“If I should ask”—a contingent event or hypothesis—of course the time future—“Whether ice and water *were* two distinct things” that is, *were*, in time past, and perfectly past; for *were* by itself never denotes time imperfectly past?

In this way, the author is led to write what he never intended—sheer nonsense. The verb was intended to express a fact of general existence—one which is always true or false—that is, the identity or diversity of *ice* and *water*—a fact existing in nature, and ther-

fore to be mentioned in the present tense indefinite—"Whether ice and water *are* two distinct substances."

"It would seem that inquietude *was* as natural to it as its fluidity." *Gold's An. Nat. ch. 17.*—Here is a similar mistake—the use of the first verb in what is called *past* time, leading the author to use a second verb in the same tense—But *that* is no connective, any more than every substitute in the language—The inquietude of the ocean is a natural property, existing at all times—and the author meant the verb to express that idea. "It would seem that inquietude *is* as natural to the sea as its fluidity." To show this to be the real construction, let the order of the words be changed. "Inquietude *was* as natural to the sea as its fluidity—*that* would seem." This arrangement exhibits the mistake in its true light.—Let the reader attend to the following passages.

"If my readers will turn their thoughts back on their old friends, they will find it difficult to call a single man to remembrance, who *appeared* to know *that* life *was* short, [is short] till he *was* about lose it." *Rambler. No. 71.*

"Upon this supposition the alchemists *went*, who, supposing *that*—all bodies *were* [are] composed of salt, sulphur and mercury." *Encyclop. art. Chemistry. 23.*

"They considered the body as a hydraulic machine, and the fluids as passing through a series of chemical changes; forgetting *that* animation *was* [is] its essential characteristic." *Darwin. Zoon. pref.*

"A stranger to the poem would not easily discover *that* this *was* [is] verse." *Murray's Grammar.*

"From the figure and movements of the feathered tribes, we should be led to imagin that the structure of their organs *was* [is] extremely different from that of quadrupeds—their economy and way of living *required* [require] some variations of their frame." *Smellie Phil. of Nat. Hist. p. 71.*

"Supposing Parliament had a right to meet spontaneously—and if half of the members met [should meet] and half *absented* [should absent] themselves, who shall determin which is the legislative body?" *Blacks. Com. 1-2.*

"Two more were stationed in Dalmatia, in a situation, if a war *broke* [should break] out at their back, to support the other legions; and if a sudden emergence *required* [should require] their presence, ready to advance by rapid marches into Italy." *Murphy Tacitus. l. 264.*

NOTE 2.....The employment of these verbs by the translator is the less excusable, as he had the original to guide him to the true sense—"quæ—si repentinum auxilium Italia posceret, haud procul accirentur." If Italy *should require* sudden aid—the legions *might be called* from a small distance. It is however some apology for

the author, that the Latin imperfect tense has been misnamed or left unexplained, and is as little understood by means of grammar rules, as the English tenses.

Examples of this mistake may be cited without end—but those which I have collected are amply sufficient to show the miserable state of grammatical knowledge. How easy would it have been to detect these blunders, had the parts of speech been understood, and properly classed! Take for example, the passage from Murray—and resolve it according to the explanation of that which is given in the preceding pages—“This *was* verse—a stranger to the poem would not easily discover *that*. What nonsense! But correct the verb. “This *is* verse—a stranger would not easily discover *that*.” The whole error has arisen probably from considering *that* as a conjunction—when in fact it is a representative of the following member of the period—and the sentence is found to consist of two clauses—one hypothetical the other declaratory—“A stranger to the poem, (if he should attempt) would not easily discover *that*—*this is verse*.”

From the practice of connecting like tenses, probably has arisen a similar misapplication of tenses, where no connective is used; as “In this way we *might indicate* which of their elements *existed* [exists] in excess.” *Lavoisier by Kerr*.

“It would be true gold to him and belong to that species, who *included malleableness* in his nominal essence.” *Locke*. 3. 6. 35.

It ought to be who *should include*.—A similar mistake in the following passage is really ludicrous—“I said to him that he should rebuild the Greek cities and give them wise laws, until a proper time *arrived* to restore them to liberty.” *Anacharsis*. 3. 231. It ought to be *should arrive*.

A few authors led by their own sense of right and wrong, [for surely they have had no Grammar to guide them] have occasionally avoided these errors and written the language with correctness. And among these is the translator of *Anacharsis*, notwithstanding the mistake just cited.

“They said that man *is* an animal.” *Anarch*. vol. 4. note.

“He told us that these birds *are* natives of Samos.” *ibm*. ch. 74.

“Sabellius, who openly taught that there *is* but one person in the Godhead.” *Encyc. art. Sabellius*.

“His master had taught him that happiness *consists* in virtue.” *Anarch*. ch. 7.

“D Laertius says, the Egyptians taught that matter *is* the first principle.” *Enfield. Hist. Phil.* 1. ch. 8.

“Anaxagoras affirmed that a pure mind *governs* the universe.” *ibm*. ch. 3. b. 2.

If we examine these sentences, we shall find the time correctly affirmed in each member—The first declares a fact *past*—the last, a fact *now existing*, as well as when the affirmation was made.

“He told us that, these birds *are* natives of Samos”—or according to the idea before explained—these birds *are* natives of Samos—he told us *that*—

Man is an animal—they said that—happiness consists in virtue—his master taught him that.

I have been the more particular in illustrating this part of my subject, to show the necessity of tracing the idioms to their true source, of understanding the principles of construction, and of calling the parts of speech by their true names.

Punctuation.

Punctuation is the marking of the several pauses which are to be observed, in reading or speaking a sentence or continued discourse. By means of pauses, a discourse is divided into periods or complete sentences, and periods into clauses or simple sentences, and these, into phrases.

A period is a sentence complete, making perfect sense, and not connected in construction with what follows. The pause after the period is marked by a point [.] and in speaking, is distinguished by a cadence or fall of the voice.

The members of a period, or clauses and phrases, are all more or less connected in sense, and according to the nearness of the connection, are marked by a comma [,] a semicolon [;] or a colon [:]

The comma is the shortest pause, and is often used to mark the construction, where very little interruption of voice is allowable.

A simple sentence or clause contains an affirmation, a command or a question, that is, one personal verb, with its nominative and adjuncts. By *adjunct*, is meant any phrase or number of words added by way of modifying or qualifying the primary words. Thus when it is said, "Cicero was an orator of a diffuse style," the latter words, of a diffuse style, are the *adjunct* of orator, and the whole forms a complete simple sentence, with one *verb* or affirmation.

A phrase contains no assertion, or does not amount to a proposition.

COMMA.

RULE. I. In general the parts of a simple sentence or clause are not to be separated by any point whatever ; as

“ Hope is necessary in every condition of life.” But when a simple sentence is long, or contains a distinct phrase or phrases, modifying the affirmation, it may be divided by a comma ; as “ To be very active in laudable pursuits, is the distinguishing characteristic of a man of merit.” “ By revenging an injury, a man is but even with his enemy.” In most cases, where a short pause will give distinctness to ideas, a comma is well placed after an important word ; “ To mourn without measure, is folly ; not to mourn at all, insensibility.”

The pause after *measure*, in this sentence is essential to the strength of the expression. “ The idea of beauty is vague and undefined, different in different minds, and diversified by time or place.” *Rambler*.

RULE II. When a connective is omitted between two or more words, whether names, attributes, substitutes, verbs or modifiers, the place is supplied by a comma ; as “ Love, joy, peace and blessedness are reserved for the good.” “ The miseries of poverty, of sickness, of captivity, would, without hope, be insupportable.” *Rambler*. “ We hear nothing of causing the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed.” *Paley*. “ He who loves, serves and obeys his maker is a pious man.” “ Industry steadily, prudently and vigorously pursued, leads to wealth.” “ David was a brave, martial, enterprising prince.” “ The most innocent pleasures are the most rational, the most delightful and the most durable.”

RULE III. Two or more simple sentences closely connected in sense, or dependent on each other, are separated by a comma only ; as “ When our vices leave us, we flatter ourselves we leave them.” “ The temperate man’s pleasures are durable, because they are regular.” “ That all the duties of morality ought to be practiced, is without difficulty discoverable, because ignorance or uncertainty would immediately involve the world in confusion and distress.” *Rambler*. 81.

RULE IV. The sentence independent, detached affirmations or phrases involved in sentences, and other important clauses, must be separated from the other parts of a sentence, by a comma; as "The envoy has returned, his business being accomplished." "The envoy, having accomplished his business, has returned." "Providence has, I think, displayed a tenderness for mankind"—*Rambler*. "The decisions of patronage, who was but half a goddess, had been sometimes erroneous." *Rambler*. "The sciences, after a thousand indignities, retired from the palace of patronage." *ibm*. "It is, in many cases, apparent." *ibm*.

RULE V. A comma is often required to mark contrast, antithesis, or remarkable points in a sentence, and sometimes very properly separates words closely dependent in construction; as "a good man will love himself too well to *lose*, and his neighbor too well to *win*, an estate by gaming." "Prosperity *gains* friends, and adversity *tries* them. "It is harder to avoid censure, than to gain applause.

"Tho deep, yet clear; tho gentle, yet not dull."

RULE VI. A single name in apposition is not separated by a comma; as "the Apostle Peter"—but when such name is accompanied with an adjunct, it should be separated; as "Parmenio, a friend of Alexander's, hearing the great offers that Darius had made, said, "Were I Alexander, I would accept them." "So would I, replied Alexander, were I Parmenio."

RULE VII. Terms of address, and words of others repeated, but not introduced as a quotation, are separated by a comma; as "Wherefore, Sirs, be of good cheer." "My son, hear the counsel of thy father." "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." *Exodus*.

RULE VIII. Modifying words and phrases, as however, nay, hence, besides, in short, finally, formerly, &c. are usually separated by a comma; as "It is, however, the task of criticism to establish principles." *Rambler*.

SEMICOLON.

The semicolon is placed between the clauses of a period, which are less closely connected than such as are separated by a comma.

First. When the first division of a sentence completes a proposition, so as to have no dependence on what follows; but the following clause has a dependence on the preceding, the two parts are separated generally by a semicolon; as “It may be laid down as a maxim, that it is more easy to take away superfluities than to supply defects; and therefore he that is culpable, because he has passed the middle point of virtue, is always accounted a fairer object of hope, than he who fails by falling short.” *Rambler.* In this sentence the part of the sentence preceding the semicolon is a perfect period in itself, and might have been closed with a full point; but the author has added another division, by way of inference, and this is dependent on the first division. The author proceeds—“The one has all that perfection requires, and more, but the excess may be easily retrenched; the other wants the qualities requisite to excellence”—Here the first division makes a complete proposition; but the antithesis begun by the numeral *one*, is not complete, without the last division.

“Economy is no disgrace; for it is better to live on a little, than to ~~out~~ live a great deal.”

“Be in peace with many; nevertheless, have but one counsellor of a thousand.”

“A friend cannot be known in prosperity; an enemy cannot be hid in adversity.”

In general then, the semicolon separates the divisions of a sentence, when the latter division has a dependence on the former, whether the former has a dependence on the latter or not.

Secondly. When several members of a sentence have a dependence on each other, by means of a substitute for

the same principal word, and the clauses, in other respects, constitute distinct propositions, the semicolon may be used; as "Wisdom hath builded her house; *she* hath hewn out her seven pillars; *she* hath killed her beasts; *she* hath mingled her wine; *she* hath also furnished her table." *Prov.* 9.

COLON.

The Colon is used when the sense of the division of a period is complete, so as to admit of a full point, but something is added by way of illustration; as "A brute arrives at a point of perfection that he can never pass: in a few years he has all the endowments he is capable of; and were he to live ten thousand more, would be the same thing he is at present" *Spect.* No. 111.

NOTE.—This point is of little use; the difference between the colon and semicolon is so small, that the two pauses are frequently confounded, as may be seen in our present version of the *Proverbs*. It is said that a colon should be placed before a quotation; but I consider the use of the semicolon as preferable. I conceive the colon might be rejected without injury to the perspicuity of sentences; and punctuation very much simplified, by substituting the semicolon and the full point. That slight dependence of a subsequent sentence upon a preceding one, which is marked by a colon, is also marked by the full point; for we are not to suppose a full point precludes a connection between sentences. Let the following sentences from the *Rambler* No. 31, be cited as an example.

"With the great and ambitious, I would discourse of honors and advancements.—To the rich I would tell of inexhaustible treasures and the sure method to attain them. I would teach them to put out their money on the best interest, and instruct the lovers of pleasure how to secure and improve it to the highest degree. The beauty should learn of me how to preserve an everlasting bloom.—To the afflicted I would administer comfort, and relaxation to the busy."

All the parts of a continued discourse are connected; and often by such nice grades of dependence, that it is not easy to discern, much less to mark the minute distinctions. I have never examined any author, whose use of the points is either accurate or uniform; and in particular the colon is every where confounded with the semicolon or the period.

PERIOD.

The Period or full point marks a completion of the sense, a cadence of the voice, and the longest pause used between sentences. It closes a discourse also, or marks a completion of a subject, chapter or section.

The full point is used also after initials when used alone ; as after N. S. for New Style ; and after abbreviations ; as *Croc. Anglic.* for *Crocus Anglicanus.*

To these may be added,

The dash—which marks a break in the sentence or an abrupt turn ; as “ If thou art he—but O how fallen !”

The interrogation point ? that closes a sentence which asks a question ; as “ How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity ?”

The exclamation point ! which is used after sudden expressions of surprise, or other emotions ; as “ O happiness ! Our being’s end and aim !”

The parenthesis () and hooks [] include a remark or clause, not essential to the sentence in construction, but useful in explaining it or introducing an important idea. They mark a moderate pause, and the clause included is read with a depressed tone of voice ; as

“ Know then this truth (enough for man to know)
Virtue alone is happiness below.” *Pope.*

It will be readily seen that the sentence is not at all dependent on the parenthetical clause ; but the converse is not true, for that clause has a dependence more or less remote, on the sentence. Thus, *enough for man to know*, is not intelligible without connecting it with the parts of the sentence preceding and following. So in this passage ; “ If any one pretends to be so sceptical, as to deny his own existence (for really to doubt of *it*, is manifestly impossible) let him enjoy his beloved happiness”—*Locke. 4. 10. 2.* The included clause here is connected with the preceding part of the sentence, and *it*, is a substitute for *existence*.

With regard to the duration of the pauses, it may be observed that the comma, semicolon, colon and full point, may bear to each other the proportion of one, two, four and

six ; and the interrogation point and exclamation point may be considered each as equal in time to the colon or period. But no precise rule can be given which shall extend to every case ; the length of the pauses must depend much on the nature of the discourse, and their respective proportions may be often varied to advantage by a judicious speaker.

*Prosody.**

PROSODY is that part of Grammar which treats of the pronunciation of words, and the laws of versification.

Pronunciation is regulated principally by *accent* and *quantity*.

Accent is a particular stress of voice with which a certain syllable of a word is uttered, and by which it is distinguished from the others. Thus, in pronouncing *probability*, we lay a greater stress of voice upon the third syllable, than upon the others—the voice naturally resting upon that, and passing over the others with rapidity and a slight enunciation. This stress of voice on a particular part of a word, is equally necessary to the ease of utterance and the melody of speaking.

In addition to the accent which may be called primary, there is, in pronouncing words of many syllables, a secondary accent, less distinct than the principal accent, but evidently distinguishing some one syllable from those which are unaccented. Thus in the word *indiscriminate*, the principal accent is on the third syllable ; but the first syllable is evidently uttered with more force of voice, than the second and two last syllables. The final cause of both accents

* The substance of the remarks under this head was published more than twenty years ago. For some of the observations I am indebted to Sheridan's Art of Reading ; but for more of them, to the Honorable John Trumbull, Esq. one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Connecticut. His rules of metrical composition, originally published in my Grammar and afterwards in my Dissertations on the English Language, are probably the best which have been written.

is the *ease of pronunciation*; and by this, should both be regulated; for that manner of pronouncing words which is most easy for the speaker, enables him to utter the several syllables with the most distinctness, which is consistent with a rapid communication of thoughts; and this is necessary to render his enunciation agreeable to his hearers. Hence no rules of pronunciation drawn from the termination of words, from their etymologies, or from the practice of popular speakers, should be suffered to interfere with this fundamental principle—the *case of utterance*—for a forced, unnatural accent is not only painful to the speaker, but utterly destructive of melody.

The accent may fall on a vowel or on a consonant. When it falls on a vowel, the vowel is long—as in glōry, tāble, lāwful. When it falls on a consonant, the consonant closes the syllable, and the preceding vowel is short; as in habit, gratitude, deliverance.*

* It may be thought that I am captious in criticising the works of English authors, or of others who have written on this subject, but the propriety of detecting error, wherever found, supersedes the necessity of apology.

It has been the practice of most English authors to place the marks of accent, in all cases, over the vowel of the accented syllable—a practice probably borrowed from the Greek language. Thus in Johnson's Dictionary, the vowel *a* in *hābit* as well as *o* in *hōly*, has the mark of accent, for which reason the mark is no guide to the true sound of the letter, and a learner would be led to give to *a* its long sound thus, *lā-bit*—as well as to *o* its long sound in *hōly*.

But this is not the worst evil. The rules for dividing syllables, from Dilworth to Murray, are not only *arbitrary*, but false, and absurd. They contradict the very definition of a syllable given by the authors themselves. Thus Lowth, defines a syllable to be “a sound either simple or compounded, *pronounced by a single impulse of the voice*, and constituting a word or part of a word.” This definition is copied and followed by Murray. But in dividing syllables, no regard is had to the definition—for *manifest*.—Lowth divides thus *ma-ni-fest*. Here the first syllable *man* is pronounced with a *single impulse of the voice*—according to the definition; yet in writing, the syllable is split—the *constituent part* of a word, is divided into *two parts*—that which is to be pronounced with a *single impulse of the voice*, is so separated, as to require *two impulses*. A syllable in pronunciation is an *indivisible thing*; and strange as it may appear, what is *indivisible* in utterance, is *divided* in writing;

The *quantity* of a syllable is the time in which it is pronounced. In English this time is *long* or *short*—long as in *frāme*, *denōte*, *compensātion*—short, as in *thāt*, *nōt*, *mēlon*.

The accent has no small influence in determining the length of a syllable, by prolonging the sound of the vowel; but, in many words, vowels have their long sound, tho not under the accent, as in *nosegāy*, *agitāte*.

There are some general rules for accenting syllables, which may be discovered by attending to the analogy of formation. Thus words ending in *tion* and *sion* have the accent on the last syllable save one; as *protection*, *adhesion*; words ending in *ty* usually have the accent on the last syllable except two, as *vanity*, *hostility*.

Few of these rules however are so general, that the exceptions to them are not almost as numerous as the words which fall within the rule; and therefore the accent of words is best learnt from a dictionary and general usage. The rules laid down for this purpose in several works of distinction, are so numerous and subject to many exceptions, that they tend rather to embarrass, than to assist the student.

Most prosodians who have treated particularly of this subject, have been guilty of a fundamental error, in considering the movement of English verse as depending on long and short syllables, formed by long and short vowels. This hypothesis has led them into capital mistakes. The truth is, many of those syllables which are considered as *long* in verse, are formed by the shortest vowels in the language; as *strength*, *health*, *grand*. The doctrine, that long vowels are requisite to form long syllables in poetry, is at length exploded, and the principles which regulate the movement of our verse, are explained; *viz. accent* and *emphasis*. Every emphatical word, and every accented syllable, will form what is called in verse, a long syllable. The unaccented syllables, and unemphatical monosyllabic words, are considered as short syllables.

when the very purpose of dividing words into syllables in writing, is to lead the learner to a just pronunciation. Thus Murray, tho he admits that a “syllable is short, when the accent is on the consonant” yet separates that consonant from the syllable—as in *me-lon-ci-vil-ti-mid*. Most of the English elementary books which I have seen are able to the same objection.

But there are two kinds of emphasis; a natural emphasis, which arises from the importance of the idea conveyed by a word; and an accidental emphasis, which arises from the importance of a word in a particular situation.

The first or natural emphasis belongs to all nouns, verbs, participles and adjectives, and requires no elevation of the voice; as,

“Not *half so swift* the *trembling doves* can *fly*.”

The last or accidental emphasis is laid on a word when it has some particular meaning, and when the force of a sentence depends on it; this therefore requires an elevation of the voice; as,

“Perdition catch my soul—but I *do* love thee.”

So far the prosody of the English language seems to be settled; but the rules laid down for the construction of verse, seem to have been imperfect and disputed.

Writers have generally supposed that our heroic verse consists of five feet, all pure Iambics, except the first foot, which they allow may be a Trochee. In consequence of this opinion, they have expunged letters from words which were necessary; and curtailed feet in such a manner as to disfigure the beauty of printing, and in many instances, destroyed the harmony of our best poetry.

The truth is, so far is our heroic verse from being confined to the Iambic measure, that it admits of eight feet, and in some instances of nine. I will not perplex my readers with a number of hard names, but proceed to explain the several feet, and show in what places of the line they are admissible.

An Iambic foot, which is the ground of English numbers, consists of two syllables, the first *short* and the second *long*. This foot is admitted into every place of the line. Example, all Iambics.

“Where *slaves* *once* *more* their *native* *land* behold,

No *fiends* *törmënt*, no *christians* *thirst* for *gold*.”

Pope.

The Trochee is a foot consisting of two syllables, the first *long* and the second *short*. Example.

“ *Wārms* in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glōws in the stars, and blossoms in the trees.”

Pope.

The Trochee is not admissible into the second place of the line ; but in the third and fourth it may have beauty, when it creates a correspondence between the sound and sense.

“ Eve rightly call’d *mōthēr* of all mankind.”

“ And staggered by the stroke, *drōps* thē large ox.”

The Spondee is a foot consisting of two long syllables. This may be used in any place of the line.

1. “ *Gōd* *lāfe* be now my task, my doubts are done.”

Dryden.

2. “ As some *lōne* *mōuntain*’s monstrous growth he stood.”

Pope.

But it has a greater beauty when preceded by a Trochee.

“ *Lōad* thē *tāl* *bār*k and lanch into the main.”

3. “ The mountain goats *cāme* *lōunding* o’er the lawn.”

4. “ He spoke, and speaking in *prōud* *trīumph* spread,
 The long contended honors of her head.”

Pope.

5. “ Singed are his brows, the scorching lids *grōw* *blāck*.”

Pope.

The Pyrrhic is a foot of two short syllables ; it is graceful in the first and fourth places, and is admissible into the second and third.

1. “ *Nōr* in the helpless orphan dread a foe.”

Pope.

2. ————“ On they move,
Indisō. ūbly firm.” ————*Milton.*

3. “ The two extremes appear like man and wife,
 Coupled togethēr *fōr* the sake of strife.”

Churchill.

But this foot is most graceful in the fourth place.

“ The dying gales that pant *ū.ōn* the trees.”

“ To farthest shores the ambrosial spirit flies,
Sweet to the world and gratefŭl tō the skies.”

The Amphibrach is a foot of three syllables, the first and third short, and the second long. It is used in heroic verse only when we take the liberty to add a short syllable to a line.

“ The piece you say is incorrect, *whŷ tŭke ĭt,*

“ I’m all submission, what you’d have *ĭt, mŕke ĭt.*”

This foot is hardly admissible in the solemn or sublime stile. Pope has indeed admitted it into his Essay on Man :

“ What can ennoble sots or slaves ōr cōwŕds,
Alas ! not all the blood of all thĕ Hōwŕds.”

Again :

“ To sigh for ribbands, if thou art sō sĭl’ŷ,
Mark how they grace Lord Umbra or Sĭr Bĭlly.”

But these lines are of the high burlesque kind, and in this stile the Amphibrach closes lines with great beauty.

The Tribrach is a foot of three syllables, all short ; and it may be used in the third and fourth places.

“ And rolls *ĭmpetŭŭs tō* the plain.”

Or thus :

“ And thunders down *ĭmpetŭŭs tō* the subject plain.”

The Dactyl, a foot of three syllables, the first long and the two last short, is used principally in the first place in the line.

“ *Fŭ ŭŭs* he spoke, the angry chief replied.”

“ *Mŭrmŭrĭng,* and with him fled the shades of night.”

The Anapest, a foot consisting of three syllables, the two first short and the last long, is admissible into every place of the line.

“ Cŕn ŕ bōsōm sō gĕntlĕ rĕmŕin,
Unmoved when her Corydon sighs ?
Will a nymph that is fond of the plains,
These plains and these valleys despise !
Dear regions of silence and shade,
Soft scenes of contentment and ease,

Where I could have pleasingly stay'd,
If ought in her absence could please."

The trissyllabic feet have suffered most by the general ignorance of critics; most of them have been mutilated by apostrophies, in order to reduce them to the Iambic measure.

Thus in the line before repeated,

"*Murmuring*, and with him fled the shades of night,"
we find the word in the copy reduced to two syllables, *murm'ring*, and the beauty of the Dactyl is destroyed.

Thus is the following :

"On every side with shadowy squadrons deep,"

by apostrophizing *every* and *shadowy*. the line loses its harmony. The same remark applies to the following.

"And hosts infuriate shake the shudd'ring plain."

"But fashion so directs, and moderns raise

On fashion's mould'ring base, their transient praise."

Churchill.

Poetic lines which abound with these trissyllabic feet, are the most flowing and melodious of any in the language; and yet the poets themselves, or their printers, murder them with numberless unnecessary contractions.

It requires but little judgment and an ear indifferently accurate, to distinguish the contractions which are necessary, from those which are needless and injurious to the versification. In the following passage we find examples of both.

"She went from op'ra, park, assembly, play,
To morning walks and pray'rs, three times a day;
To pass her time 'twixt reading and bohea,
To muse and spill her solitary tea;
Or o'er cold coffee trifle with the spoon,
Count the slow clock, and dine exact at noon;
Divert her eyes with pictures in the fire,
Hum half a tune, tell stories to the 'squire;
Up to her godly garret after sev'n,
There starve and pray, for that's the way to heav'n."

Pope's Epistles.

Here *e* in *opera* ought not to be apostrophized, for such a contraction reduces an Amphibrachic foot to an Iambic. The words *prayers*, *seven* and *heaven* need not the apostrophe of *e* ; for it makes no difference in the pronunciation. But the contraction of *over* and *betwixt* is necessary ; for without it the measure would be imperfect.

PAUSES.

HAVING explained the several kinds of feet, and shown in what places of a verse they may be used, I proceed to another important article, the pauses. Of these there are two kinds, the *cesural* pause, which divides the line into two equal or unequal parts ; and the *final* pause which closes the verse. These pauses are called *musical*, because their sole end is the melody of verse.

The pauses which mark the sense, and for this reason are denominated *sentential*, are the same in verse as in prose. They are marked by the usual stops, a comma, a semicolon, a colon, or a period, as the sense requires, and need no particular explanation.

The cesural pause is not essential to verse, for the shorter kinds of measure are without it ; but it improves both the melody and the harmony.

Melody in music is derived from a succession of sounds : harmony from different sounds in concord. A single voice can produce melody ; a union of voices is necessary to form harmony. In this sense harmony cannot be applied to verse, because poetry is recited by a single voice. But harmony may be used in a figurative sense, to express the effect produced by observing the proportion which the members of verse bear to each other.*

The cesural pause may be placed in any part of the verse : but has the finest effect upon the melody, when placed after the second or third foot, or in the middle of the third. After the second :

“ In what retreat, inglorious and unknown,
Did genius sleep, when dullness seized the throne.”

* Sheridan's Art of Reading.

After the third :

“O say what stranger cause, yet unexplored,
Could make a gentle belle reject a lord?”

In the middle of the third :

“Great are his perils, in this stormy time,
Who rashly ventures, on a sea of rhyme.”

In these examples we find a great degree of melody, but not in all the same degree. In comparing the divisions of verse, we experience the most pleasure in viewing those which are equal; hence those verses which have the pause in the middle of the third foot, which is the middle of the verse, are the most melodious. Such is the third example above.

In lines where the pause is placed after the second foot, we perceive a smaller degree of melody, for the divisions are not equal; one containing four syllables, the other six, as in the first example.

But the melody in this example, is much superior to that of the verses which have the cesural pause after the third foot; for this obvious reason: When the pause bounds the second foot, the latter part of the verse is the greatest, and leaves the most forcible impression upon the mind; but when the pause is at the end of the third foot, the order is reversed. We are fond of proceeding from small to great, and a climax in sound pleases the ear, in the same manner as a climax in sense delights the mind. Such is the first example.

It must be observed further, that when the cesural pause falls after the second and third feet, both the final and cesural pauses are on accented syllables; whereas when the cesural pause falls in the middle of the third foot, this is on a weak syllable, and the final pause, on an accented syllable. This variety in the latter, is another cause of the superior pleasure we derive from verses divided into equal portions.

The pause may fall in the middle of the fourth foot; as,

“Let favor speak for others, worth for me:”

but the melody, in this case, is almost lost. At the close of the first foot, the pause has a more agreeable effect.

“ That’s vile, should we a parent’s fault adore,
And err, because our fathers err’d before ?”

In the middle of the second foot, the pause may be used, but produces little melody.

“ And who but wishes to invert the laws
Of order, sins against the eternal cause.”

Harmony is produced by a proportion between the members of the same verse, or between the members of different verses. Example :

“ Thy forests, Windsor, and thy green retreats,
At once the monarch’s, and the muse’s seats,
Invite my lays. Be present sylvan maids,
Unlock your springs, and open all your shades.”

Here we observe, the pause in the first couplet, is in the middle of the third foot ; both verses are in this respect similar. In the last couplet, the pause falls after the second foot. In each couplet, separately considered, there is a uniformity ; but when one is compared with the other, there is a diversity. This variety produces a pleasing effect.* The variety is further increased, when the first lines of several succeeding couplets are uniform as to themselves, and different from the last lines, which are also uniform as to themselves. Churchill, speaking of reason, lord chief justice in the court of man, has the following lines.

“ Equally form’d to rule, in age or youth,
The friend of virtue, and the guide to truth ;
To *her* I bow, whose sacred power I feel,
To *her* decision make my last appeal ;
Condemn’d by *her*, applauding worlds in vain
Should tempt me to take up my pen again ;
By *her* absolv’d, the course I’ll still pursue ;
“ If *Reason’s* for me, *God* is for me too.”

The first line of three of these couplets, has the pause after the second foot ; in this consists their similarity. The last

* Sheridan.

line in three of them, has the pause in the middle of the third foot; they are uniform as to themselves, but different from the foregoing lines. This passage, which on the whole is very beautiful, suffers much by the sixth line, which is not verse, but rather hobbling prose.*

The foregoing remarks are sufficient to illustrate the use and advantages of the cesural pause.

The final pause marks the close of a line or verse, whether there is a pause in the sense or not. Sentential pauses should be marked by a variation of tone; but the final pause, when the close of one line is intimately connected with the beginning of the next, should be merely a suspension of the voice without elevation or depression. Thus :

“ Of man’s first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,” &c.

When these lines are read without a pause after the words *fruit* and *taste*, they degenerate into prose. Indeed in many instances, particularly in blank verse, the final pause is the only circumstance which distinguishes verse from prose.

EXPRESSION.

One article more in the construction of verse deserves our observation, which is *Expression*. Expression consists in such a choice and distribution of poetic feet as are best adapted to the subject, and best calculated to impress sentiments upon the mind. Those poetic feet, which end

* Churchill has improved English versification, but is sometimes too incorrect. It is a remark of some writer, “That the greatest geniuses are seldom correct,” and the remark is not without foundation. Homer, Shakespear, and Milton, were perhaps the greatest geniuses that ever lived, and they were certainly guilty of the greatest faults. Virgil and Pope were much inferior in point of genius, but excelled in accuracy. Churchill had genius, but his contempt of rules made him sometimes indulge a too great latitude of expression.

in an accented syllable, are the most forcible. Hence the Iambic measure is best adapted to solemn and sublime subjects. This is the measure of the Epic, of poems on grave moral subjects, of elegies, &c. The Spondee, a foot of two long syllables, when admitted into the Iambic measure, adds much to the solemnity of the movement.

“While the clear sun, rejoicing still to rise,
In pomp *rolls round* immeasurable skies.”

Dwight.

The Dactyl, *rolls round*, expresses beautifully the majesty of the sun in his course.

It is a general rule, that the more important syllables there are in a passage, whether of prose or verse, the more heavy is the stile. For example :

“A past, vamp’d, future, old, reviv’d new piece.”

“Men, bearded, bald, cowl’d, uncowl’d, shod, unshod.”

Such lines are destitute of melody, and are admissible only when they suit the sound to the sense. In the high burlesque style, of which kind is Pope’s *Dunciad*, they give the sentiment an ironical air of importance, and from this circumstance derive a beauty. On the other hand, a large proportion of unaccented syllables or particles, deprives language of energy ; and it is this circumstance principally which in prose constitutes the difference between the grave historical, and the familiar style. The greatest number of long syllables ever admitted into a heroic verse is seven, as in the foregoing ; the smallest number is three.

“Or to a sād variety of wōe.”

The Trochaic measure, in which every foot closes with a weak syllable, is well calculated for lively subjects.

“Softly sweet in Lydian measures,
Soon he sooth’d his soul to pleasures ;
War he sung is toil and trouble,
Honor but an empty bubble,” &c.

The Anapestic measure, in which there are two short syllables to one long, is best adapted to express the impet-

uosity of passion or action. Shenstone has used it to great advantage, in his inimitable pastoral ballad. It describes beautifully the strong and lively emotions which agitate the lover, and his anxiety to please, which continually hurries him from one object and one exertion to another.

“I have found out a gift for my fair,
I have found where the wood pigeons breed;
Yet let me that plunder forbear,
She will say 'twas a barbarous deed.
For he ne'er could prove true, she averr'd,
Who could rob a poor bird of her young:
And I lov'd her the more when I heard
Such tenderness fall from her tongue.”

The Amphibrachic measure, in which there is a long syllable between two short ones, is best adapted to lively comic subjects; as in Addison's *Rosamond*.

“Since conjugal passion
Has come into fashion,
And marriage so blest on the throne is,
Like Venus I'll shine,
Be fond and be fine,
And Sir Trusty shall be my Adonis.”

Such a measure gives to sentiment a ludicrous air, and consequently is ill adapted to serious subjects.

Great art may be used by a poet in choosing words and feet adapted to his subject. Take the following specimen.

“Now here, now there, the warriors fall; amain
Greens murmur, armor sounds, and shouts convulse the plain.”

The feet in the last line are happily chosen. The slow Spondee, in the beginning of the verse, fixes the mind upon the dismal scene of woe; the solemnity is heightened by the pauses in the middle of the second and at the end of the third foot: But when the poet comes to shake the plains, he closes the line with three forcible Iambics.

Of a similar beauty take the following example.

“She all night long, her armorous descant sung.”

The poet here designs to describe the length of the night, and the music of the Nightingale's song. The first he does by two slow spondees, and the last by four very rapid syllables.

The following lines, from Gray's Elegy, written in a country church yard, are distinguished by a happy choice of words.

"For who, to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
This pleasing anxious being e'er resign'd?
Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
Nor cast one *longing, lingering* look behind?"

The words *longing* and *lingering* express most forcibly the reluctance with which mankind quit this state of existence.

Pope has many beauties of this kind.

"And grace and reason, sense and virtue split,
With all the rash dexterity of wit."

The mute consonants, with which these lines end, express the idea of *rending asunder*, with great energy and effect. The words *rash* and *dexterity* are also judiciously chosen.

In describing the delicate sensations of the most refined love, he is remarkable for his choice of smooth flowing words. There are some passages in his *Eloisa and Abelard*, which are extended to a considerable length, without a single mute consonant or harsh word.

OF READING VERSE.

With respect to the art of reading verse, we can lay down but a few simple rules; but these may perhaps be useful.

1. Words should be pronounced as in prose and in conversation; for reading is but rehearsing another's conversation.

2. The emphasis should be observed as in prose. The voice should bound from accent to accent, and no stress

should be laid on little unimportant words, nor on weak syllables.

3. The sentential pauses should be observed as in prose; these are not affected by the kind of writing, being regulated entirely by the sense. But as the cesural and final pauses are designed to increase the melody of verse, the strictest attention must be paid to them in reading. They mark a suspension of voice without rising or falling.

To read prose well it is necessary to understand what is read; and to read poetry well, it is further necessary to understand the structure of verse. For want of this knowledge, most people read all verse like the Iambic measure. The following are pure Iambics.

“Above how high progressive life may go!
Around how wide, how deep extend below!”

It is so easy to lay an accent on every second syllable, that any schoolboy can read this measure with tolerable propriety. But the misfortune is, that when a habit of reading this kind of meter is once formed, persons do not vary their manner to suit other measures. Thus in reciting the following line.

“Load *the* tall bark, and lanch into the main,”

many people would lay the accent on every second syllable; and thus read, our poetry becomes the most monotonous and ridiculous of all poetry in the world.

Let the following line be repeated without its pauses, and it loses its principal beauty.

“Bold, as a hero, as a virgin mild.”

So in the following.

“Reason, the card, but passion, is the gale.”

“From storms, a shelter, and from heat, a shade.”

The harmony is, in all these instances, improved much by the semipauses, and at the same time the sense is more clearly understood.

Considering the difficulty of reading verse, it is not surprising to find but few who are proficient in this art. A knowledge of the structure of verse, of the several kinds

of feet, of the nature and use of the final, the cesural and the semicesural pauses, is essential to a graceful manner of reading poetry ; and even this without the best examples, will hardly effect the purpose. It is for this reason, that children should not be permitted to read poetry of the more difficult kind, without the best examples for them to imitate. They frequently contract, in early life, either a monotony or a sing song cant, which, when grown into a habit, is seldom ever eradicated.

Remarks on the received System of Grammar.

Lindley Murray has given, for a Praxis, or Example of Grammatical Resolution, the following sentence.

“ The worthy Emperor Titus, recollecting once at supper, *that* in that day, he had not done *any* body a kindness, exclaimed, “ Alas ! *my* friends, I have lost *a* day.”

Without reciting the resolution given of this sentence, a part of which is correct, I would observe that it contains three or four palpable errors. The first is, that the author calls the first *that*, a conjunction, when in fact it is a substitute or representative of the following member of the sentence—*he had not done any body a kindness*—recollecting *that* fact. It is, in the language of common grammars, a “ *demonstrative pronoun*”—pointing directly to a whole declaration, or fact stated.

2. *Any*, before *body*, the author calls “ an adjective pronoun”—and *my* before *friends*, “ a possessive pronoun.” A pronoun he defines to be “ a word used instead of a noun,” as all other writers have done before him. But what nouns do *any* and *my* stand for ? *My*, if it stands for any thing, stands for *of, me, friends of me* ; in which case, it stands for a pronoun and a preposition—or if it represents *of Titus*, it stands in the place of a noun and a preposition. As for *any*, the reader is left to exercise his invention in discovering the noun which it represents. Lowth calls *any* a definitive ; and *my* a “ pronominal adjective.” The latter denomination is just—*an adjective, or attribute formed from a pronoun*. Johnson calls *my* a

“ possessive pronoun ”—but Lowth is the most correct. This is one of the many instances in which Lowth's grammar has been altered for the worse.

3. In the last clause of the sentence, Murray calls *a*, the indefinite article—“ I have lost *a* day,” A more suitable example cannot be selected to show the miserable state of our Grammars, and how mechanically men learn to repeat words without meaning and propositions which are false ; moved, age after age, by the impulse of custom, in the common road of error. Titus, in the passage under consideration, recollected at supper that on *that* day, just ended, he had done no act of kindness—and exclaimed, I have lost *a* day. The last words *a day* are as determinate as possible—referring directly to the preceding description, on *that day preceding the supper*.—yet we are told that *a* is the *indefinite* article, used in a *vague* sense to point out one single thing of the kind, in other respects *indeterminate*. The truth is, *a*, in this clause of the sentence, denotes simply *one*—I have lost *one* day. Whether the day is determinate or indeterminate, is a circumstance not at all depending upon *a*.

There is an oversight in this resolution which deserves notice. In this clause—“ he had not done any body a kindness ”—the government of the words *any body* is omitted. Either *done* must govern two objects, or *to* is understood before *any body*—had not done *to* any body a kindness.

Another Example.

“ Tho affliction be our lot, we may be the happier for it.” In this sentence Murray calls *tho* a conjunction. And what is a conjunction ? “ A conjunction, says Murray, is a part of speech that is chiefly used to connect or join together sentences, so as out of two to make one sentence : it sometimes connects only words.” Again, “ Conjunctions connect the same moods and tenses of verbs, and cases of nouns and pronouns.”—I leave it to the compiler himself and his friends, to reconcile the example with the rule and definition ; and to discover what is the *connecting* power of *tho*, in the sentence cited.

Be, in the first part of the same sentence, “ is a verb neuter,” says the compiler, “ present tense, third person sin-

gular, in the subjunctive mood, being governed by the conjunction *tho*." Now it happens that *tho* is an obsolete verb, in the imperative mode, signifying *grant* or *allow*, and retaining precisely its original signification—"grant, affliction be our lot"—This explanation demonstrates the impropriety of the use of *be*—it ought to be *is*—according to popular usage, which delivers the language, from generation to generation, as it was made, and preserves it from corruption.

These examples are selected from Murray's Grammar, not with a view to prejudice the public against that work in particular; for it is a good compilation of the rules of grammar, which have been heretofore received. My design is only to expose the *errors* and *defects of the system*, which teaches rules that are false or words without meaning.

A PRAXIS.

Or Example of Grammatical Resolution.

"If the excellence of Dryden's works was lessened by his indigence, their number was increased; and I know not how it will be proved, that if he had written less, he would have written better; or that indeed he would have undergone the toil of an author, if he had not been solicited by something more pressing than the love of praise."

Johnson's Life of Dryden.

If, the imperative mode of the verb *give*, formerly written *gif*, the regular imperative of the Saxon *gifan*—used to introduce a supposition of what is expressed in the following words.

the—a definitive, used to limit the sense of *excellence* in its application to, "Dryden's Works"—*that particular excellence*.

excellence, a name or noun, the nominative to the verb *was*, or the subject of the passive verb *was lessened*.

of—a preposition, preceding Dryden's Works, and showing the relation of those words to *excellence*, which relation is that of property or possession—*of* the works of Dryden.

Dryden's, a proper or appropriate name—that is, a name belonging to an individual, and not to a species—in the possessive case, governed by *works*.

works, a name in the plural number, following *of*.

was lessened—the passive form of the verb *to lessen*, in the past tense, indefinite, conditional mode, third person singular, agreeing with *excellence*, its nominative. This form of the verb is composed of the substantive verb *was*, and the participle or verbal in *ed*.*

by—a preposition.

his—an attribute agreeing with *indigence*.

indigence—a name in the singular number, following the preposition *by*.

their—an attribute, agreeing with *number*.

number—a name, the nominative to *was increased*.

was increased; the passive form of the verb *increase*, in the past tense indefinite of the Declarative mode, third person singular, agreeing with *number*.

and—a connective of the two sentences, the preceding and the following—The sense is complete at *increased*, and there the sentence might have been closed; but as other clauses are added by the writer, the pause is marked with a semicolon.

I—a substitute for the writer's name, or a personal substitute—nominative case to *know*.

know—a transitive irregular verb, affirming a fact, and therefore in the Declarative mode—first person singular, in the present tense indefinite, agreeing with *I*.

* If Johnson had followed the common grammars, or even his own, which is prefixed to his Dictionary, he would have written *were*—"If the excellence of Dryden's works *were* lessened"—Fortunately this great man, led by usage rather than by books, wrote correct English, instead of grammar.

not—a modifier of the verb *know*, rendering the affirmation negative.

how—a modifier of the verb, *will be proved*.

it—a substitute of neuter gender, nominative case—representing the subsequent part of the sentence—the nominative to *will be proved*—inceptive, that is, introducing the verb, before the sentence or clause which is the real nominative.

will be proved—the passive form of the verb *prove* in the future tense, third person singular, agreeing with the nominative *it*.

that—a substitute representing the same part of the sentence as *it*—how *it* will be proved—viz—*that* which follows.

if—as before—an obsolete imperative verb, used as a modifier of the sense, introducing a condition.

he—a substitute for Dryden—nominative to *had written*.

had written—a transitive verb, in the prior past tense, indefinite, subjunctive or conditional mode, third person singular, agreeing with *he*.

less, an attribute in the comparative degree, here used as a substitute for a *smaller quantity*, the object after the transitive verb, *had written*.

he—a substitute for Dryden, nominative to *would have written*.

would have written—the irregular verb *write*, in the prior, past tense indefinite, potential mode, third person singular, agreeing with *he*.

better—an attribute qualifying the action of the verb *would have written*—describing the manner of action—in the comparative degree.

or—a connective of the sentences between which it stands, and expressing an alternative.

that—a substitute representing the part of the sentence which follows—the words, *I do not know how it will be proved*, are here understood before *that*.

indeed—a modifier, or rather a compound of *in* and *deed*—a preposition and name.

he—as before—nominative to *would have undergone*.

would have undergone—the irregular compound verb *undergo*, in the prior past tense of the potential mode—agreeing with *he*, the third person.

the—a definitive, limiting the sense of *toil*, to a particular kind—the toil of an author.

toil—a name or noun, in the singular number—the object after the transitive verb, *would have undergone*.

of—a preposition.

an—a definitive, limiting the subsequent word to *one* person, without designating the particular person.

author—a name in the singular number, following *of*.

if—as before, expressing a condition.

he—a substitute as before, nominative to *had been solicited*.

had been solicited—the passive form of the verb *solicit*, rendered negative by the modifier *not*, in the prior past tense of the conditional mode, third person singular agreeing with *he*.

by—a preposition.

something—a name, composed of, *some*, and *thing*—following *by*.

more—an attribute of the comparative degree, used to modify the sense of *pressing*.

pressing—a verbal or participle of the present tense of the verb *press*; but used as an attribute of the preceding word *something*.

than—a connective, uniting the following words in construction, with the preceding.

the—a definitive, restraining the sense of *love*.

love—a name, the nominative to the verb *is* understood.

of—a preposition.

praise—a name—following *of*.

Critical Notes.

“ I persecuted this way unto *the* death. *Acts* 22. 4.

As no particular sort of death is here intended, the definitive *the* ought to have been omitted. *Lowth*.

“ When he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into *all* truth.” *John* 16. 13.

As the sense is probably *all evangelical* truth, and not other kinds of truth, *Lowth* supposes the definitive *the* ought to have been used ; *all the truth*, agreeable to the original Greek. This criticism is probably just ; but the student must be cautious of following implicitly the use of the Greek article ; for nothing is less determinate ; and *Lowth* himself acknowledges that it has puzzled all the Grammarians to reduce the use of it to any clear and certain rules. In the New Testament, it is often used in passages where it is not admissible in an English translation. *Math.* 3. 8. “ Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance ”—in the Greek, worthy of *the* repentance. Verse 11.—“ Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear ”—in the original, whose *the* shoes. In the same verse—“ He shall baptize you with *the* Holy Ghost ”—in the original, with Holy Ghost. *Math.* 18. 8. It is better for thee to enter into *life* halt or maimed—in the original, into *the* life. Same chapter, verse 2.—“ And Jesus called a little child unto him ”—in the original, there is no definitive—And Jesus calling child—Verse 3. “ Except ye be converted and become as *little* children ”—in the original, as *the* children.—*Math.* 22. 13. “ There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth ”—in the original, there shall be *the* [or this] weeping—and *the* gnashing of *the* teeth. Ch. 24. 3. “ Upon the mount of the olives.” *Rom.* 7. 1. “ Know ye not, brethren, [for I speak to them that know *the* law,] how that *the* law ; ” in the original, I speak to them that know *law*.

Verse 2. "For the woman that hath a husband, is bound by the law"—in the original bound by *law*. *Verse 8.* "For without the law, sin was dead." *orig.* Without *law*. *Verse 21.* "I find there a law." *orig.* I find there *the law*. A multitude of similar passages may be cited to prove how little is the analogy between the Greek and English Languages, in regard to the use of the definitives.

But to place this fact in a stronger light, let it be observed, that the Greeks used both the article or definitive in conjunction with the pronoun *this*—that is, two definitives with the same word. *Rom. 7. 24.* "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death." *orig.* from the body of *the this death*, or *the death this*. *Math. 4. 3.* "If thou art the son of God, command that these stones be made bread." *orig.* *the these stones*. This is a common idiom of the Greek, and one utterly repugnant to the genius of the English.

Equally singular is the use of the Greek article, before proper names—*Math. 2. 22,* "He turned aside into the parts of Gallilee." *orig.* —into the parts of *the Gallilee*. *ch. 17. 1.* "Jesus taketh Peter." *orig.* *the Peter*.—*ch. 3. 1.* "Preaching in the wilderness of Judea" *orig.* of *the Judea*.

We cannot therefore draw any general inference, respecting the extent of the signification of words in English, from the use of the Greek article. Indeed there are many cases where this article must be omitted, or utterly pervert the true meaning. *Math. 11. 8.* "Behold they that wear soft clothing, are in kings houses."—in the original—in the houses of *the kings*. *ver. 11.* "among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John, the Baptist." in the original, them that are born of *the women*.

In other cases, the English *the* must be used where no article is found in the Greek, as in *Math. 11. 5.* *The* blind receive their sight—*the* lame walk—*the* lepers are cleansed—and *the* deaf hear." Here is no article in the Greek, but in English, it cannot be omitted, except before *lepers*.

Of the arbitrary and uncertain use of the definite article, the French language furnishes abundant proof.

"L'avarice est de tous les vices, le plus odieux."

The avarice is the most hateful of all the vices.

“Le gouvernement doit avant toutes choses protéger les propriétés.” *The government ought before all things to protect the properties.* “Theophraste loue l’hospitalité et il a raison.” *Theophrast praises the hospitality, and he has reason.* *Barrett, Trans. of Cicer. de Off.*

The use of the *le* before names of general application, is wholly arbitrary and useless, but established by custom.

Some author, I think Blair, boasts of the superiority of the English, over the Latin language, in the use of articles. This is a great error. The Latin *unus* is the English *an*—and *is, ille, hic* answer all the purposes of *the, this* and *that*. The Romans used these definitives when they wanted them, nor is any part of their writings left obscure for want of other articles.

“Truly, this was *the* son of God.” *Math. 27. 54.*—Lowth supposes that *the* should be *a*, as this was spoke by a pagan who probably believed in a plurality of Gods.

So also in *Dan. 3. 25.*

In this passage, “About *an* eight days.” *Luke 9. 28.* *an* is redundant or improper. *Lowth.*

“Nevertheless; Asa *his* heart, was perfect with the Lord.” *1. Kings. 15. 14.* This mode of expressing possession is obsolete.

“The more shame for *ye*.” The use of *ye* in the objective is admissible only in the comic and burlesk style. *Lowth.*

In popular practice, *that* and *this* are often followed by *there* and *here*—that there house.—this here tree. This idiom is probably as old as Language—and is not a corruption.—It existed in the Celtic—*an tigh od*—that house there—and the French language has preserved it—*Cette maison la.*—It might have had its origin in the poverty of the primitive languages of the world; or it might have proceeded from the practice of pointing to objects described, or from the Saxon genitive of *this*; *thisere*; but in the improved style of modern language, it is unnecessary, and in English, is confined to the vulgar and colloquial style.

“ I had rather,” is probably a mistake for “ I would rather,” but the error, at least in colloquial language, seems incorrigible.

“ The rules of our religion, from which we *are* swerved.” *Tillotson*. The passive form of *swerve* is obsolete. “ Flee thee away”—“ *Was entered* into a conspiracy”—“ *To vie charities*”—“ Take pains to *agree* the sacred and profane chronology”—are incorrect; for intransitive verbs do not admit the passive form, nor an object after them.

Succeed, tho’ numbered among intransitive verbs, has obtained a general use in a transitive sense—“ Succeed the means of grace,” is the customary language of divines and well authorized.

“ If Jove this arm succeed” *Pope*.

In the words *abed*, *ashore*, &c. and before the participles, *acoming*, *agoing*, *ashooting*, *a* has been supposed a contraction of *on* or *at*. It may be so in some cases; but with the participles, it is more probably a contraction of the *ag* and *air* of the Celtic nations. In the Galic dialect, the regular participles are formed by prefixing these particles—as, *ag iarridh*—seeking. In the Irish the participle is formed by prefixing *ag* to the infinitive—as *ag radh*—saying—*ag ithe* eating. This particle, in a rapid enunciation, has lost the consonant and become *a*.

“ In him who is, and him who finds, a friend” *Pope*.

Lowth condemns this use of a noun in the nominative and objective at the same time; but without reason, as the cases are not distinguished in English.

In the use of *mistaken*, there is a singularity, which deserves notice. When applied to persons, it is equivalent to being wrong or in an error. “ I am mistaken—you are mistaken”—mean, I am in an error, you are in an error. But applied to things, it signifies *misunderstood*; his words or opinions are *mistaken*, that is, *misunderstood*.

As used for *that* in the following sentence, and in similar cases, Lowth condemns as improper or obsolete—“ the relations are so uncertain *as* they require a great deal of examination.” *Bacon*. This use of *as* is obsolete; but

is genuine English—as being a word of the same class and import as *that*.

It is a popular mistake to use *wives* for the possessive *wife's*. “It is at my *wife's disposal*” is correct; but not, at my *wives disposal*.

On the other hand, printers err in using *proves* for *proofs*, in the plural.

Latter refers both to *time* and *place*—*later*, to time only. *Priestley*.

We sometimes hear the *strongest* of the two, used for the *stronger* of the two. In such cases, the comparative degree is the more correct.

Then and *above* are often used as attributes; the *then* ministry; the *above* remarks; nor would I proscribe this use. It is well authorized and very convenient.

Johnson observes, “A has a peculiar signification, denoting the proportion of one thing to another; as “the landlord hath a hundred *a* year.” But the only peculiarity of this use, is, that no preposition is employed. This and similar expressions are the primitive idiom of the language—as men originally communicated ideas chiefly by names, verbs and attributes, without connectives. The expression is perfectly good English.

Averse, in Lowth's opinion, should be followed by *from*; but why, any more than *repugnant*, or *unwilling*? Practice has established the use of *to*, with propriety.

The verb *lay* is often used for *lie*—I will *lay* down. *Lay* is transitive—I will *lay myself* down. When no object follows, the intransitive verb *lie* should be used; *let him lie down*.

The word *rather* is used to express a small degree of excess; “She is *rather* profuse in her expenses. In like manner is used *full*; “the coffee is *full* strong.” *Priestley*.

The signification of words in construction, sometimes depends on the tone of voice with which they are uttered; thus, “I cannot find *one* of my books,” if uttered without any peculiar force of voice upon *one*, means that *one* of my books is missing. But with an emphasis upon *one*, it means that all are missing. Thus, if I say “No laws are better than the English,” the word *no* uttered without em-

phasis makes me declare the English to be the best laws—with emphasis, it makes me affirm them to be worse than none.

In the following sentence, an important distinction is made by the definitive *a*—"He behaves with *a* little reverence." This is positive and rather praises, than dispraises. But omitting *a*—"He behaves with *little* reverence," and I rather dispraise the person. Thus, when I say "There were few men present," I speak of the number as inconsiderable by way of diminution—But there were *a* few men present," I intend to represent the number in the most favorable light. *Priestley*.

When we say "half *a* dollar," we mean in value only—but "*a* half dollar," means a coin or piece of money.

In this mode of expression, "He looks him full in the face," *the* is used for *his*, which is rendered unnecessary by the use of *him* preceeding. *Priestley*.

There are many grammatical errors in the writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, which Lowth, Priestly, Blair and Campbøll have enumerated in their respective works, and many of them are copied into Murray's Grammar. But the greatest part of them are now so perfectly obsolete, that students are in no danger of learning them, either from books or common practice; and it seems to be inexpedient to swell the size of a modern Grammar, by criticisms upon modes of writing no longer used.

On the Grammars of the Greek, Latin and French Languages.

I have remarked in the Preface, that many of the alterations introduced into this work, are as applicable to other languages as to the English. This subject deserves illustration.

It is an unquestionable truth, that the particles or indeclinable parts of speech, are mostly or all derived from the *declinable*, and chiefly from names, verbs and attributes.

Bonar, in a disquisition on the subject,* and Jones in

* Transactions of the Royal Society at Edinburgh. Vol. 5.

his Greek Grammar, have attempted to trace the eighteen Greek prepositions, to their radicals, and Jones has succeeded in satisfying my mind, as to most of his etymologies. I will not here enter upon this subject—but will offer a few examples to show how imperfectly the original of words, and the true structure of sentences, have been understood.

“For I know *that* in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” *Rom.* 7. 18. Here the first *that*, in Greek *oti*, is called a conjunction; whereas it is the neuter pronoun—that is, a substitute for the following part of the sentence—“In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing—I know *that*.” Similar examples of the use of this word, are to be found in every page of *Greek*.†

“The boys attend school, where they spend their time in learning the principles of justice—and they say *oti ephi touto erkontai*”—*Xenoph. Cyroped.* 1. Here *oti* represents the following part of the sentence—they say *that* (which follows) *they come for this purpose*. The *touto*, is a substitute for the first part of the sentence—the boys go to school for this purpose—to learn justice.

The principles explained in this work throw much light on what are called impersonal verbs. *Mark.* 1. 2. As *it is written* in the prophets “*Behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee*—” Here the whole passage cited is the nominative to *gegraptai* that *is written* in the prophets. In English *it*—precedes the verb, but, as has been observed, it is the representative of the sentence which follows.

“Sed animadvertendum est diligentius, quæ natura rerum sit.” *Cicero de off. lib.* 2. 20. Here the last member of the sentence is the real nominative to the verb *est*—what is the nature of things, is to be considered.—It is observable that in this form of construction, where a sentence or member is the nominative, the participle or attribute is of the neuter gender.‡

“Quamquam te, Marce fili, annum jam audientem Cratippum, idque Athenis, abundare oportet præceptis in-

† *Oti* and the Latin *ut*, as well as *that*, are probably the Hebrew *at*.

‡ Yet some verbs appear to be really impersonal, as *pugnatum est sub muris*.” It was fought under the walls.

stitutisque philosophiæ"—*ibm.* 1. 1. "Altho, Marcus, it behoves you, who have now attended Cratippus a year at Athens, to be well furnished with the precepts and maxims of philosophy"—Here the last part of the sentence is really the nominative to *oportet*. To be well initiated in the principles of philosophy *becomes* you my son, who enjoy the advantage of the institutions of Cratippus, at Athens, the seat of science and the arts. The same remark is applicable to *licet, libet, lubet, placet, &c.* "Si placet tibi audire" if to hear pleases you.

"Homo autem, (quod rationis est particeps, per quam consequentia cernit,) facile totius vitæ cursum videt." *ibm.* ca. 4. In this sentence, we find *quod* marked as an adverb or conjunction; but in fact, it is the representative of the following clauses—Man—(that he is a partaker of reason, by which he discerns consequences,) readily sees the whole course of life. We usually translate *quod* in such cases, by *because, as* or *since*; but these words amount, when scrutinized, to the same thing—they are only different terms to express a reason, cause or purpose; and if *that* does not as readily suggest the idea, it is solely from the influence of habit. In examining the principles of language, we are not to rest satisfied with knowing what it *is*, in popular understanding, but how it was made and of what materials it is composed.

No Latinist wants to be informed that *quamobrem* is the union of *quam ob rem*, in one word—as are *quomodo, quare, interea, præterea*—nor that *qualibet*—is *quam* or *quid*—and *libet*—what you will—as *quamvis*—is, *quam* and *vis*, in a like sense—*quaqua* is the mere reduplication of the relative in the ablative case—*cò*, translated *thither* is merely the ablative of the pronoun—and *hic*, whether relating to a person or place, is the same word—*hic, he* or *this man—hic, in this place.*

But the French exceeds all languages in the number of nouns, verbs and adjectives, which are thrown into the common sink of adverbs, conjunctions and prepositions. Thus *autre fois, aujourd'hui, cependant, autour, autant, pour-quoi, peut-être*, are denominated adverbs—*autant que pourvu que, a condition que, de sorte que, pendant que* are called

conjunctions—*concernant, suivant, attendu, joignant, pendant, excepté*, all regular verbals or participles, are classed among the prepositions. Yet it would be far better to resolve all words and phrases according to their original principles, as far as it can be done. “ Il est, *peut être*, difficile de ranger sous l'ordre de la nature la divination qui vient de l'art and de l'étude.” *Morabins. Trans. Cic. de Divin. liv. 1.*

It is difficult to rank, in the order of nature, the divination which proceeds from art and study—all this—*peut-être*—may be. In strictness, the whole sentence or proposition which is affirmed to be *possible*, is the nominative to *peut-être*. *Ce pendant*—that pending, admitting that to be the fact, is the case absolute or independent. *Pendant que*, that depending, during that—*fournu que*—that being provided.—“ J'ai quelque chose a vous dire *concernant* cette affaire.” I have something to say to you, *concerning* that affair. Here *concerning* retains its verbal signification, as in English, and relates to or agrees with the preceding part of the sentence.” *J'obeis suivant vos ordres.*” I obey, *following* your orders. “ Il travaille toute la semaine *excepté* le dimanche. He labors the whole week, *sunday excepted*—that is, sunday being excepted—the case independent.—*Parce que*—because—that is, *for that which* follows—*Parce que* il pretend qu'il y a dans la nature des signes des choses—Par, the preposition, *ce* the pronoun or definitive, and *que* the substitute representing the following part of the sentence. “ *Soit qu'* il parte ou qu' il demeure. *Whether* he goes or stays—that is, *Be it, soit que*—be that fact which is expressed by *il parte*—*que* is a substitute or relative referring to the following affirmation—*il parte*—and the nominative to *soit*. In the second member of the sentence *soit* is understood before *que*.

The sentence fully expressed would stand thus ; *soit que*—il parte ; ou *soit que*, il demeure. Be that, he goes ; or, be that, he remains.

These criticisms, already extended to an inconvenient length, considering the limited nature of this work, may serve to show the reader, how artificial and arbitrary are the distribution and denominations of the several species of words, in our grammars, and how ill calculated are the common rules to illustrate the origin or the true princi-

ples of language. Before a language can be correctly understood, words must be traced to their source, their radical significations explained, their mutations, contractions, and combinations, developed. It is not the English language only whose history and principles are yet to be illustrated; but the grammars and dictionaries of all other languages, with which I have any acquaintance, must be revised and corrected, before their elements and true construction can be fully understood.

CORRECTIONS.

Preface, page 7. l. 19. insert *no* after *of* p. 17. note. prefix *g* to *cares*; and read *of legene*. p. 26 (in some copies) l. 7. read *mediums*. p. 28, l. 16. for *vituls* r. *vitals*. p. 30. at bot. for *contradictions* r. *contractions*. p. 221. l. 10. for case r. ease.











