AN ESSAY ON GRAMMAR.

AN

ESSAY ON GRAMMAR;

THE PRINCIPLES OF WHICH

ARE

EXEMPLIFIED AND APPENDED

IN

AN ENGLISH GRAMMAR;

BY

JAMES P. WILSON, D. D.
Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, in the City of Philadelphia.

"GRAMMATICI CERTANT, ET ADHUC SUB JUDICE LIS EST."
Hor.

PHILADELPHIA:
SOLD AT THE SOUTH WEST CORNER OF MARKET AND SECOND STREETS.
William Fry, Printer.
1817.

PRÆFECTO,

SOCIISQUE HONORATISSIMIS

UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINÆ SEPTENTRIONALIS:

NEC NON

CURATORIBUS EXIMIIS

ACADEMIÆ NOV-ARCÆ,

DELAVARIENSIUM,

CONAMINA HÆC BREVICULA

AD GRAMMATICAM ILLUSTRANDAM,

IN USUM JUVENTUTIS

DESTINATA,

DICAT, DEDICAT

AUCTOR.

CONTENTS.

PART I.—OF LETTERS.

CHAPTER I.—Of the origin of our alphabet.

	Page
There was one original language	1
Of picture-writing, and hieroglyphics	2
Of syllabic writing, and of the invention of letters	3
The letters termed Samaritan are the oldest known	4
The first Hebrew writings were in that character	5
The Cadmean letters were the same	6
The completion of the Greek alphabet	*ibid.*
The first Latin letters were Cadmean	7
The changes of the Greek letters, modern	note (*f*) *ibid.*
The first language of Britain unknown	8
Of the Celts, Goths, and Saxons	9
The English language, from whence	10
The origin of our capital letters	11, 20

CHAPTER II.—Of the sounds of the letters.

Sounds are imperfectly denoted by letters	21
Of vowels, diphthongs, and consonants	22
The Hebrew vowels were not points	23
Of the ancient sounds of the Greek vowels	24, 25
Of the Greek consonants	26
Of the sounds of the Latin vowels and diphthongs	27
Of the use of the Latin consonants	28
Of the vowels and diphthongs of our language	29
Of mutes, semivowels, and liquids	30
Of the modulating effects of our consonants	31, 32
Of the necessity of a distinct articulation	33
Letters should not fluctuate with sounds	34
Of syllabication in Greek, Hebrew, and Latin	35, 38
English words should be divided as spoken	37

Chapter III.—Of quantity.

	Page
Syllables were long, short, or common	39
Of quantity; position, and cæsura	40
Of the lengths of Greek vowels, diphthongs and syllables	41, 42
Of Latin quantity, of derivatives, of increases	43
Words distinguished in poetry by their quantity	44
Accent is much substituted in English for quantity	45
Yet some attention to quantity is necessary	46
English quantity very different from the kind of sound	47
Some modern rules of English quantity erroneous	48

Chapter IV.—Of accents.

Written words at first distinguished only by final letters	49
Words spoken are distinguished by accents	*ibid.*
Accent, what. Hebrew accents	50
Greek marks for accents when introduced	51
In Greek and Latin no accent before the antepenultima	53
Why the circumflex in Greek is never on the antepenultima	*ibid.*
The ancient reading of Greek is lost	54
Latin poetry now chiefly read by accent, not quantity	55, 64
Written languages, though dead, understood with certainty	56
Emphasis, what. Its importance	57
Poetry of Anglo-Saxons	in note, 58
Of accent in our language	59
Secondary accents in English	60
Rules of accents in our language	61
How derivative words are to be accented	62
Ancient quantity not suited to English words	63
Examples of modern, and Russian Greek	64

PART II.

Chapter I.—Of the classification of words.

Ancient distributions of the parts of speech	67
The names of the classes now in use	68
A less comprehensive distribution to be rejected	*ibid.*
The Hebrew roots perhaps originally monosyllabic like the Chinese	69

Chapter II.—Of nouns.

	Page
Of common and proper names, and abstract terms	71
The dual number modern; the plural when excluded	72
The origin of several of the plural terminations	73
Genders naturally but two. The neuter in the Hebrew referred to one of them	74
The epicene genders of the Greeks and Romans	75
Of the genders in English	76
Cases in Latin and Greek, what their uses	80, 85
Of the vocative and genitive cases	77
The dative and ablative cases when used	78
Prepositions unnecessary to Latin genitives and datives	79
The species of each of the cases divided into declensions	80
Declensions are an unnecessary classification	*ibid.*
A synopsis of the Greek dialects	in note, 81
English nouns are free from cases and declensions	83
Of the possessive termination	85

Chapter III.—Of articles.

Articles are definitive words of different classes	86
The origin of the words ἄρθρον and *articulus*	87
English articles when to be used	88
There is no indefinite article, unless comparatively	*ibid.*
The Greek ὁ is not always a pronoun in the Ilias	89
It is a pronoun without an adjunct, and then only	*ibid.*
It limits the generality of its adjunct, and demonstrates	90
It is not the subject of a proposition and its adjunct the predicate. Nor does it anticipate, nor suppose the participle of existence, except when alone	*ibid.*
The chief utility of the Greek article	91, 95
When the noun following καὶ should be anarthrous	93

Chapter IV.—Of adjectives.

Different opinions about the nature of adjectives	96, 100
English adjectives have not gender, number, or cases	101
They admit different terminations for different degrees	*ibid.*

Chapter V.—Of pronouns.

The name pronoun may mislead, substitute is better	105
The English pronouns. The different persons	106

Page
Distinctions of gender necessary only in the third person - 107
Subjects and objects have different substitutes - - - 108
My, thy, his, its, &c. possessive pronominal adjectives - 109
Ours, yours, &c. are nouns, substituted both for the possessor and the thing possessed; are subjects or objects of either number - - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Why reciprocal pronouns have no nominative cases - - 110
Of the nouns *own* and *self*. Of *who, what, &c.* - - - - 111
Of conjunctive pronouns. Of ὅτι, *quod*, and *that* - - - 112
The origin of *cujus* and *cui* - - - - - - in note, 113
As and *so* ought not to be restored to the pronouns - - 114

Chapter VI.—Of verbs.

Verbs were originally radical, not compounded - - - 115
Greek and Latin terminations of verbs were from the Scythians *ib.*& 118
A verb what: cannot consist of two distinct words - - - 116
Of the verb of existence: contained in every verb - - 117
Verbs have not active, passive, and neuter forms in Latin - 119
Of neuter-passives, derivatives, inceptives, &c. - - - 120
Of Greek verbs active, passive, and middle - - - - *ibid.*
Hebrew verbs have voices; English but one - - - 121
The distinction into active and passive radically incorrect - *ibid.*
Scaliger and Sanctius deny that any verbs are neuter - 122
Various divisions of verbs - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Of divisions of sentences; of modes - - - - - 123
The Greek optative mode rarely expresses wishing - - 124
In Hebrew and in English, imperatives and infinitives are themes *ibid.*
Past imperatives are inconceivable. Infinitives and imperatives when present partake of the future - - - - - 125
Greek imperative aorists perhaps belong to the futures - *ibid.*
An infinitive in Hebrew and English is ονομα ρηματος; in Greek and Latin, it is ονομα ρηματικον. - - - - - - - *ibid.*
The Latins had no futures of the infinitive - - - - 126
Latin gerunds are nouns formed of the neuter of the participle in *dus*, and should rarely govern the case of the verb - - 127
The Greeks used infinitives, and had no gerunds - - 128
Eo cubitum, is better than *eo cubare*, because the latter includes the action - - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Nouns of the fourth declension are all verbals, and the supines seem to belong to them - - - - - - - - *ibid*
The Hebrew and English verbs have no subjunctive modes 129
In Latin there are a present, past and future of imperfect actions, and the same number of tenses of the perfect - 130

Page
The Greeks have respect also to actions, as definite or aorist - 131
The various compound tenses of English grammarians have produced uncertainty, and are without authority - - 132
English verbs have a present and a past, and no other tense - 134
The resolution of the Greek and Latin tenses in order 135, 152
The Greek dual was borrowed from the Moeso-Goths - - 153
English participles are destitute of persons, genders, cases and numbers; but have time either present or past - - 154
The participle in *ing* expresses an action as imperfect, and may be referred to the past or to the future - - - - *ibid.*
English present participles signify actively, but may passively; the past, passively, but may signify actively - - - 155
Of the force of the different Greek and Latin participles - 156, 161
Of defective verbs in Greek, Latin and English - - 161, 162

Chapter VII.—Of adverbs.

Adverbs express a quality of an action or quality - - - 163
Any part of speech may be used adverbially - - - 164
In Latin, prepositions without cases expressed or implied, become adverbs - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Adverbs in the sense of nouns govern the genitive - - *ibid.*
Many adverbs in the Greek and Latin are resolvable into other parts of speech or phrases - - - - - - - - 165
The Greeks by suffixes to some of their adverbs made a diversity of place, by prefixes to others rendered them interrogative - - - - - - - - - - - - 166
Of the different effects of two negatives in Greek, Latin and English - - - - - - - - - - - - 167
Of adverbial inseparable particles - - - - - - 168

Chapter VIII.—Of interjections.

An unnecessary imitation of the brutes - - - - - 169
The greater portion might be rescued and restored to their own classes of words - - - - - - - - - 170
The different cases which follow them may be referred to other causes - - - - - - - - - - - - 171

Chapter IX.—Of prepositions.

Prepositions express the relations of their nouns - - 172
Confusion would result by resolving them into verbs - - 173
When applied to moral subjects they are used by analogy - 174
Participles put absolutely are deemed prepositions - - *ibid.*

Page
The Greek and Latin prepositions - - - - - - 175
No preposition in English changes the termination of its noun substantive - - - - - - - - - - - 176

CHAPTER X.—Of conjunctions.
The names of the particles less important than their sense - 177
Of the different uses and effects of conjunctions - - 178
Conjunctions are convenient, not absolutely necessary - - 179
They connect like cases, &c. only when the sense is similar 180
Of the different kinds of conjunctions - - - - - - 181
Of several species of English conjunctions - - - - 182
Greek expletives add emphasis - - - - - - - 183

PART III.—OF SENTENCES.

CHAPTER I.—Of the constituent parts of a sentence.
Syllogistic reasoning has yielded to the forensic - - 184
Phrases are too various to be taught individually - - - 185
Construction of sentences somewhat analogous in different languages - - - - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
A simple sentence contains a subject, and a verb - - - *ibid.*
The difference between a simple and a compound sentence 186
The several kinds of sentences, according to the meanings *ibid.*

CHAPTER II.—Of the subject of a proposition.
The place of the subject in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English respectively - - - - - - - - - - - 187
What may be a subject, and when to be expressed - - *ibid.*
An obscure connexion of the subject and verb ever embarrasses 188
The second person of each of the English tenses is distinguished *ibid.*
Artificial concords are to be strictly observed - - - 189
Nouns of multitude used collectively are singular, distributively, plural - - - - - - - - - - *ib.* & 212
The infinitive only impersonal, other parts have subjects - 190
Articles, adjectives, and participles may stand with subjects or predicates, without assertion - - - - - - 191
In Hebrew and English, pronouns agree with the nouns they represent - - - - - - - - - - - - 192
English adjectives are determined to their nouns by collocation 191-2

Page

Degrees of qualities variously denoted - - - - 193
Origin, possession, &c. how expressed in Greek, Latin and English - - - - - - - - - - - - 194
Words absolute, are nevertheless constructed - - - 195, 6

Chapter III.—Of the copula.

Language was never destitute of words of affirmation - 197
The verb contains the copula, but never that only, when alone *ibid.*
The copula naturally exhibits the quality of the proposition 198
There are many verbs, which may simply connect the terms *ibid.*
Such verbs are followed by nouns, in the state of their subject 199
The copula may be blended with either terms or both - - *ibid.*

Chapter IV.—Of the predicate.

Of the diversity of collocation in different languages - - 201
Objective terminations are artificial marks to prevent uncertainty - - - - - - - - - - - - - 202
The verb has but one object. Perhaps there are no neuter verbs 203
Genitives in Greek and Latin are not governed by verbs - 204
Tanti, &c. are genitives of nouns, governed by nouns - - 205
Genitives, datives and ablatives are adapted to the relations 206
Supines are originally nouns, and governed as such - - 207
A sentence conjoined for an infinitive is a predicate - - 208
Impersonal verbs are such only by inattention to their subjects 209
The various uses of the pronoun *it* - - - - - - *ibid.*
In Hebrew and English, relations are expressed by prepositions 210
Gerunds in *dum* are often verbal nouns, and subjects - *ibid.*
Of the government of genitives and ablatives, of place, in Latin 211
Adjectives may be followed by nouns or verbs - - - 212
The instrument requires not a preposition, because its relation is clear - - - - - - - - - - - - 213
The same prepositions have different senses with different cases 214
Of prepositions in Latin and English - - - - - - 215

Chapter V.—Of conjunct sentences.

Of the origin and effects of different conjunctions - - 217
In Greek, and Latin, modes are adapted to the conjunctions 218
Conjunctions, when imperatives, did not require subjunctive modes - - - - - - - - - - - - 219
Verbs of potentiality are still used, to enforce conjunctions *ibid.*
The Greek, Latin, and English have each corresponding conjunctions - - - - - - - - - - - - 220

Page

The Hebrew vau is strictly always conjunctive - - - 221
Vau is made an ingenious device, for the reduction of Hebrew perfects and futures, to those of modern languages - 221,3

CHAPTER VI.—Of interjected sentences - - 224

CHAPTER VII.—Of the division of sentences by points.

Periods, colons, and commas were originally rhetorical sentences, members, and subdivisions - - - - - 225
Lines terminating accordingly, resemble blank verse - 226
Before words were divided by spaces, the uncial letters were sometimes divided by upper, middle, and lower points - *ibid*
The Greek language received the Latin semicolon as a mark of interrogation in the ninth century - - - - 227
The Latins afterwards inverted it, for a note of the same kind *ibid.*
Punctuation, whether the study of the orator or grammarian, is still somewhat uncertain - - - - - - 228
Of the comma, semicolon, colon and period in English - - 229
Of the notes of interrogation and admiration; of the parenthesis and dash - - - - - - - - - - - 230

APPENDIX.

An English grammar exemplifying the essay.

INTRODUCTION.

Language, grammar, and its parts defined - - - - iii

PART I.—OF LETTERS.

Of letters and of syllables; of vowels, diphthongs and consonants; of quantity and accent - - - - - - - *ibid.*

PART II.—OF WORDS.

The parts of speech - - - - - - - - - - v
Of nouns - - - - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Of articles - - - - - - - - - - - - vii

Page

Of adjectives - - - - - - - - - - - viii
Of pronouns - - - - - - - - - - - - x
Of verbs - - - - - - - - - - - - xii
Of adverbs - - - - - - - - - - - - xx
Of interjections - - - - - - - - - - - *ibid.*
Of prepositions - - - - - - - - - - - xxi
Of conjunctions - - - - - - - - - - xxii

PART III.—OF SENTENCES.

Of simple sentences and their constituent parts - - - - xxiii
Of compound sentences - - - - - - - - xxiv
The rules of syntax, or construction - - - - - xxv, xxxi
Of the division of sentences by points - - - - - xxxii
Examples of the resolution of sentences - - - xxxiv, xl
Various combinations of verbs resolved - - - - - xli

PART IV.—OF VERSIFICATION.

Of poetry, and the several kinds - - - - - - - xlvii
English verse is accented and rhythmical - - - - - xlviii
The nature and kinds of English feet - - - - - - *ibid.*
The several species of Iambic poetry - - - - - xlix
Of Trochaic, Anapæstic, and Sapphic verse - - - - - l

ERRATUM.

Page 162, line 13. Dele "*; will, would; wis, wist; wit, wot*"

AN ESSAY ON GRAMMAR.

PART I.

OF LETTERS.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE ORIGIN OF OUR ALPHABET.

THOUGHTS are not the objects of the external senses; to communicate ideas, voice and gesture must have been among the first means resorted to by the human kind. Words are but audible signs or arbitrary symbols; yet, language, affording more certainty and greater variety than action, has, from the earliest period, been the medium of mental conference.

The analogy of words in different languages, even when spoken by nations the most remote from each other, is so frequent and clear, that, after ample deductions have been made for credulity, and imagination, the similarity points us to a common origin.(*a*) It is difficult to discern how communities could have existed without language, and equally so to discover how language could have obtained, in a peopled world, prior to society. The transition from silence to speech, implies an effort of the understanding too great for man. Plato attributes the primitive words of the first language to a divine origin. Revelation teaches, that Deity gave man

(*a*) Gen. xi. 7. does not prove the formation of new languages.

the faculties of understanding and speech, and then incited him actually to exert the power, he possessed.

What degree of perfection, language at the first possessed, cannot now be ascertained. But it is possible, that it may have, in particular instances, declined below its original standard. In the savage state, man reflects but little upon the past, and anticipates still less of the future. His ambition rarely extends beyond the energies of his body, and the feats of personal prowess. His language is figurative, and impassioned. But progressive improvement must substitute refined expression and sentiment, in the place of voice, and gesture; strength of reason and perspicuity, instead of figure and passion.

The means of communicating thought are various. To perpetuate the knowledge of events, picture-writing is supposed to have been adopted at an early period. Examples of this mode are derived from the ancient Egyptians, from the Mexicans, and other Indians of North America. Intellectual and moral subjects, are thus capable of representation, only by analogy. Hieroglyphics were of sensible objects, supposed to be connected with religion. This method of communication was limited, inefficient, and ill adapted to the exigencies of man.

The Chinese characters denote things, or ideas, rather than words. To learn their language, is to acquire whatever of science they have attained; this is an immense labour of many years. They have elementary signs, which express genera. Under these the species are classed. Their various characters are said far to exceed the number of the words in their language.

Syllabic writing has been, and is much used in Asia; and also by the Abyssinians and Ethiopians. The Ethiopic alphabet contains twenty-six consonants, each combined with seven vowels; or rather, each, besides the simple

character, which includes a short *a*, may be subjected to six alterations to denote *a* long, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, and *y*; thus making one hundred and eighty-two letters; to which are added twenty other syllables, in every one of which *u* is sounded, making in the whole two hundred and two letters, or syllabic characters. Symbolical or hieroglyphic representations are less convenient, than characters for things and ideas: and these are far to be postponed to signs for words and syllables. The syllabical mode of writing must, in its turn, yield the palm to letters, which can, with greater variety, denote the modulations of the voice used in speech. Double letters are an approximation of syllabic writing, and not justified by necessity; yet they contract words, and diminish labour.

The conflicting claims of different nations to the honour of the invention of alphabetical writing, have been often examined; but the question remains to this day undecided.

The accounts of antediluvian pillars, derived from Manetho by Eusebius; and of Seth's, in Josephus, possibly the same story metamorphosed, are manifestly, unworthy of credit. The books of Enoch are no doubt fabulous; the story probably sprang from the historic fact, that he prophesied. The law at Sinai, on tables, was not the first writing; unless there was disobedience to a previous command to write. (*b*) Moses has left nothing in opposition to the fact of the existence of writing before his day.

The book of Job, if its beginning and conclusion be excepted, shews by its style, its name of the Supreme, its silence with respect to Israel and Pharaoh, and other circumstances, that it was written before any other part of the Old Testament. There appears no valid reason to believe that Cadmus was before Moses, he was perhaps

(*b*) Exod. xvii. 14.

contemporary with Joshua. The letters he carried to Greece were not his own, but Eastern characters. It gratifies the propensity of the mind to admiration, to attribute to individual invention, the efforts and proficiency, which have resulted from the gradual progress of human genius and experience. Cadmus, it is probable, carried with him the alphabet, which he had learned in Phenicia, and deserves no more honour than the mariner, who carries our letters to a distant shore. (*c*) But that it consisted of sixteen letters only, we learn from tradition, not fact.

The writings delivered to Israel by Moses, are more ancient than any others, at present known to the civilized world. That they were at first in another alphabet, is probable from the almost entire agreement of the pentateuch in words, but not in letters, with that of the Samaritans; from the medals, and coins dug up at Jerusalem; (*d*) and from the ancient testimony of the Jews themselves. (*e*)

(*c*) "Literas semper arbitror Assyrias fuisse; sed alii apud Ægyptios, alii apud Syros repertas volunt. Utique in Græciam intulisse è Phœnice Cadmum."—Plin. 7. 56.

(*d*) "If we ascend" says Kennicott "to 135 and 140 years before Christ, we find the letters of all the genuine Jewish shekels approaching nearly to the Samaritan. And if we ascend two hundred years higher, the letters on several inscriptions found lately among the ruins of Citium in Cyprus, approach still more nearly to the ancient Samaritan, or which is the same thing to the ancient Phœnician. The famous Sigian marble, whose inscription is fixed by Chishull at six hundred years before Christ, exhibits Greek letters very similar to the Phœnician, from which they were taken, which Phœnician letters are properly styled, the ancient Samaritan." "Jerome tells us that the word

(*e*) Vide Walton's Prolegom. 3. 32.

The antiquity of the Hebrew language, whatever might have been its first alphabet, is supported by the simplicity of its structure, its uniformity in the letters of its roots, and from their being all verbs. The names in the fragments of Sanchoniathon, preserved by Eusebius, show that the Phenician was a dialect of the Hebrew, which contained its primitives. The Chaldee alphabet, in which the Old Testament has reached us, is more beautiful than any ancient character known. The Syriac and Arabic containing initial, middle, and final forms for each letter; and in general affording the advantage of connecting the letters together, so as to make, in many instances, each word a distinct character, plainly discover at the same time refinement, and posteriority. On the contrary, the letters of the Old Testament stood together without spaces between the words, which bore no mark of distinction, except when they ended with final letters, which were only five; or when they terminated a line. The inhabitants of Canaan, including the Jews and Phenicians, it is generally admitted, used at a very early period the letters, which are denominated Samaritan. They were preserved by the Samaritans, but derived by them from the ten tribes. These, a little changed, are the Phenician, and frequently confounded with them. They are twenty-two; which correspond letter for letter unto, and may bear the names of the Chaldee, or present Hebrew letters. The Syriac letters are the same also in order and force; and almost in names.

word יהוה Jehovah was expressed in some Greek manuscripts in his time in the ancient Samaritan letters. Origen also about an hundred and fifty years more early, affirms that in the accurate Hebrew manuscripts the same name of God was expressed not in the (then) modern, but in the (then) ancient letters, meaning the Samaritan."

The present Greek alphabet of capitals, was formed from the Samaritan or Phenician, almost letter for letter; they bear, in general, the Syriac names. Instead of Vau, Tzadde, and Koph, the Greeks adopted Bau, Sanpi, and Koppa, merely as numerical letters, ϵπισημα *known*, not read.

Zeta, Theta, and Xi, being compounded letters, and unnecessary, were not, at first, adopted from the Eastern alphabet. Thus they had the sixteen Cadmean letters, Α, Β, Γ, Δ, Ε, Η, Ι, Κ, Λ, Μ, Ν, Ο, Π, Ρ, Σ, Τ. Aristotle and Pliny supposed Υ, and Φ, to have been also Cadmean letters; and Scaliger admits Υ. Thus the two former suppose the Greek alphabet to have contained, besides the ϵπισημα, or silent, eighteen; and the latter seventeen letters. But Φ was not an Eastern letter, and Upsilon, when distinct from Vau, for which they had Bau, could not have come from Phenicia, unless the Samaritan Vau, like the Chaldaic, had been used both as a vowel and consonant, and the Greeks had made only the consonant a numerical letter, and transferred the vowel to another place. Montfaucon, to maintain the number sixteen, rejects Η, and receives Υ.

If the ϵπισημα were afterwards introduced, then Upsilon may have been Vau. This agrees also with the tradition that Theta, Xi, Phi and Chi, were added to the Greek alphabet by Palamedes, at a very early period; and Zeta, Heta, Psi and Omega, by Simonides, some centuries afterward. The Greeks wrote in capitals, and left no spaces between their words. Original words in that language, if ending in consonants, terminated generally in Ν, Ρ, Σ, Ξ, or Ϟ. But they were not careful to finish a line, and word together, as appears by many monumental inscriptions, existing to this day. The smaller Greek characters, now so generally in use, are

said to have been introduced between the seventh and ninth centuries. (*f*)

The Latin are said to have been originally the same with the Cadmean letters. Pliny to prove this, refers to a very ancient Athenian inscription, in these letters, NAVSIKRATES. TISAMENO. ATHENAIOS, that is Ναυσικρατης Τισαμενου Αθηναιος. Here E is put for H, TH for Θ; O for OY; S for C, or Σ; and R for P. (*g*)

The change of the Greek letters from the left to the right, obtained about four hundred and fifty years before the Christian era. Antecedently to that time, there was a period, when writing was in alternate lines from left to right, and from right to left; this was denominated Βου-

(*f*) By a careful recurrence to the inscriptions on the coins and marbles of the Greeks it is found, that their twenty-four letters remained very much the same from the days of Alexander unto the beginning of the Roman empire. The large uncial square letters, H, M, N, Π, and the round ones Ϲ, for epsilon, Θ, O, C, for sigma, Ξ not the capital Xi, ω, which was nearly a double Omicron, instead of the present large Omega, continued until the seventh century. Then the accents appear to have been introduced, also the forms of the letters became narrower. In that century, the Phi and Psi appear to have been first extended above the horizontal range of the other letters; as Rho and Upsilon had been wont to be continued below the line, at least from the fourth, but it would seem not in every instance. In the two next centuries the Chi extended below the line, the Tau above, and sometimes below the line. The asper, and tenuis were as a small τ lying upon its side to the right, or left, perhaps in imitation of the respective parts, of the H, which had been the aspirate. The acute and grave accents were such as they are in our day; but the circumflex was as the two united at their upper ends.

(*g*) Vide note at the end of the chapter, p. 11.

βουφηδον, from its resemblance to the going and returning of oxen drawing the plough.

The ancient Greek language abounds in variety of terms, derived, as well as its alphabet, from the east, and affords copiousness of expression. To it, therefore, recourse is generally had, for terms which may represent the origin, nature, use or design of modern inventions in arts and sciences. And from it suitable words are framed with the utmost facility.

The Latin, or Roman language derives its names from Latium, and Rome. It possesses many words from various sources; but it is chiefly of Greek origin, and came, mediately or immediately, from Asia. It flourished with the empire of the west, and, as a living language, fell with it. The commencement of its decline is dated from the removal of the seat of government to Constantinople. Charlemagne a little revived it in Europe; but it is now a dead language, as well as the ancient Greek.

What was the language of the Cassiterides,(*h*) and Cynetæ, is not known. Whether they, or some other people, inhabited Britain, before the Southern Celts, or Gauls, took possession, is involved in much obscurity. These were chiefly driven into Ireland and Caledonia, by the Northern Celts, who had invaded, and in part taken possession of England, before the arrival of the Romans.

Scots and Picts are, it seems most probable, names of reproach. Caledonian, or rather Galedonian was from Gaul, and Dun, that is Gaul of the mountains. It seems certain, that three centuries before the Christian era, the Irish, Scots, and Picts spoke the same language. This was the Celtic, and without an alphabet. The Gaelic, it is presumed, is, in its essential parts, the same language, continues to be spoken in the north of Scotland at this day, and is written in our own alphabet.

(*h*) They were islanders, and dealt in tin.—Herod. Plin.

From the invasion of Julius Cæsar, about ninety years elapsed, before England could be fairly said to have been subjugated by the Romans. But from the middle of the first century, the Latin began to be a public language in England; and continued to be such, until about the middle of the fifth century, when the Britons, being abandoned, and left almost defenceless by the Romans, invited the Saxons to be their allies, by whom they were subdued, and at length forced to receive the language of their conquerors.

The Saxons were Goths; who, as well as the Celts, had emigrated, in more ancient times, from Asia. The Runic letters, said to have been possessed by the Goths, were not, if they existed at so early a period, in general use with the Saxons. The new possessors remained, with a few tolerated exceptions of learned men, unlettered, until, their habits becoming changed, and written laws for their government necessary, the Roman alphabet was, with some alterations, adopted. (*a*)

Whilst the Latin was necessarily the diplomatic, the Anglo-Saxon was the common language of England, (*b*)

(*a*) The Saxon letters were A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, R, S, T, Ð, that is th, U, Ƿ, that is w, X, Y, Z. Their small letters were the Roman also, except that ð was d, ſ was f, ȝ was g, ꝛ was r, ſ was s, ꝛ was t, þ was th, ƿ was w, ẏ was y.

(*b*) The gross ignorance, and barbarous manners of these hardy wanderers, after an almost incessant conflict for one hundred and fifty years with the natives, prevailed. Yet there arose in successive ages, individuals, who, though unable either to correct the manners, or enlighten the minds of the Saxons; nevertheless prevented the total extirpation of learning. About the middle of the seventh century, a large collection of Greek and Latin books were by Theodore Celix brought into England. Schools of learning,

until the invasion of William the Norman, about the middle of the eleventh century. He ordained, that all proceedings should be carried on in the king's courts, in Norman French, instead of the English, or Anglo-Saxon; and promoted, as far as he could, that language. He had still greater success in introducing the modern Gothic, Capetian, or Black letter. This alphabet supplanted the Anglo-Saxon; and was, itself, in the end, happily displaced by the Roman characters, which were revived, with a few alterations, and still continue in general use for the English, and some other languages, wherever they are written.

The English contains much of the Saxon language, and has consequently a very close affinity with the German; a few words must be Celtic; many have been derived from the Latin; and a large proportion of these, through the channel of the French. Also ancient Asiatic roots, introduced by all these means, exist in English words, in greater numbers, than is generally supposed. By commerce, arts, or science, almost every nation has contributed to our stock of terms. And the rich variety of them, with other advantages, has rendered the English language, probably, inferiour to none of the living languages of our day.

erected in Ireland, by those who had escaped the sword of the Saxons, began soon to reflect a little light upon England. In the first of the eighth century the venerable Bede taught and wrote; Alcuin followed his example at Cambridge for a time, and then went over to Charlemagne. In the ninth century, Alfred the great, made an ineffectual struggle to promote the knowledge of letters. He was a proficient in grammatical science, and instituted a professorship of that kind, in the university of Oxford. Nevertheless the incursions of the Danes, their savage cruelties, and other causes countervailed these, and other, still more feeble, efforts in the tenth century.

A NOTE TO CHAPTER I. p. 7.

That our capital letters were derived from the Phenician, or Samaritan alphabet, through the Greeks and Romans, is generally known. "In Græcis, says Chishull, præcipue spectanda est omnimodo illa, quam præ se ferunt, ad Phœnicias similitudo.—Cadmæis Phœnicibus eædem fuere literæ, quæ et Samaritis postea Israeliticis fuerunt; Samaritis eædem, quæ et Judæis, ipsorum fratribus, ad asportationem usque Babylonicam." It may be gratifying to the curious to offer some conjecture, concerning the probable steps, by which the respective changes obtained. It is a subject, upon which few have expressed their thoughts; but many inquisitive minds must have decided for themselves.

As the Samaritan letters, and the oldest Phenician were substantially the same, and each exactly corresponded to the Chaldaic, or those vulgarly denominated Hebrew, in order, and force, they are respectively here referred to by the names of the latter.

A

The Samaritan Aleph was written thus,  , the Phenician thus,  , the Chaldaic thus, א. The Greek Alpha was A, or A, the outside lines of the ancient Aleph, being placed transversely within. The inscription ΙΣΟΚΡΑ ΤΗΣ ΒΕΟΔΟΡΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ *Isocrates Theodorou Athenaios*, exhibits both forms of the Alpha. The Chaldaic seems to have been formed from the Phenician, and all of them originally from the Samaritan, which was used, it is presumed, by Moses. The name Alpha is Syriac, as are most of the other names of the Greek letters. The Syriac letters accorded in number, and effect, respectively, with the Samaritan, and Chaldee.

B

Beth, in the Samaritan pentateuch is thus,  ; the Phenician, thus,  ; the Chaldaic thus ב. The ancient Greek

Beta was thus, 𐤁; which was turned to the right, and rounded to B. The successive changes are obvious.

C

Gimel, of the Samaritans, was written thus, 𐤂. The ancient Greek Gamma, from it, was thus; ⅂; which was afterwards turned to the right; Γ. The Latins seem to have adopted the Greek Sigma, C; which is still a Greek Sigma; as in APICTEAC. Or they may have turned the Chaldee Caph כ, to the right, whilst partially imitating the Greek Γ. And as they dropped the use of K, they appropriated C to its purposes; never reading it as we do for Sigma. But this change must have been gradual, as they wrote agna, acna; legiones, leciones; lege, lece; pugna, pucna, &c. The hard sounds of C, and G, being nearly alike, and resembling the Italic *C*. A discrimination in the Gaelic is at this time nearly imperceptible.

"Prævaluit postquam Gammæ vice functa prius C."—Auson.

D

The Samaritan Daleth was thus, 𐤃; their Resh thus, 𐤓. The Phenician Daleth was thus, 𐤃, their Resh thus, 𐤓. The ancient Greek Delta was Δ, and also D, and their Rho was thus, 𐤓. Changed to the right, their Rho became P, and Ꝑ. The Romans used for Delta and Rho, two letters, D, and R. The progress of mutation is immediately obvious from the characters themselves. In like manner from the ancient Daleth 𐤃, came the Chaldee ד; and from the ancient Resh 𐤓, their Resh, ר. They preserved the similarity between the ancient Daleth and Resh, the angular point only distinguishing the same letter in their alphabet. The Syriac Dolath and Risch have also an equal resemblance of each other.

E

The Samaritan He was written thus, 𐤄; the Phenician thus, 𐤄; the ancient Greek character, Ǝ. It was changed to the right, E, was named only by its sound, and became

the Latin E. The Greek Ε, ψιλον, must have received this name after the aspirate Η became a vowel. The gradation is discernible. But the Chaldee ה seems to have been formed from the Samaritan, by a change wholly of another kind.

F

The Samaritan letter, which next succeeds in the order of the alphabet, is Vau,  ; the Phenician is thus,  . The Æoles had a letter of different forms, imitating these, V, and F; sometimes a lenis, and at others an asper, written thus, αυως, αF ως for αως, that is, ηως, *Aurora*. The Roman F was this Digamma, so called from its resemblance of two Gammas, a larger and smaller, in the same perpendicular line. It had probably the effect of *ph* before a consonant, and of V before a vowel. Thus, whilst the Greek alphabet had originally no letter at this place, but the merely numerical character ξ, or επισημον Βαυ, the contraction of Sigma Tau, ϛ, which was like the Vau; the Æoles, and afterwards the Latins, supplied the place of the Vau with a consonant. Εσπερα was *Vesperа*, ιστης *vestis*, ηρ *ver*, ις *vis*, Εστια *Vesta*, ιδω *video*, ομω *vomo*. It has been observed that the F, or Digamma, was truly επισημον; because it may be omitted without affecting the word in an etymological point of view. Thus Fιλεη is ιλεη, Fαναξ is αναξ, Foικος is οικος, Fαρηρ is αρηρ, &c. The Romans had not the double letter Φ, they therefore also used F, in its place; thus φερω was *fero*, φυγη was *fuga*.

G

This letter stands, in the Roman alphabet, in the place of Zeta in the Greek, and Zain in the ancient alphabets. Zeta not having been a Cadmean letter, as all the original Latin letters were, Zed could not have been inserted among the letters of the Latins at this place, without changing their order. That the Romans used C for G, is proved by the column raised in honour of Druilius, where these words occur, MACISTRATOS, LECIONES and CARTACINIENSIS. We have seen under the third let-

ter, that this form of the Greek Sigma had been adopted by the Latins, had the power of a Chaldee Caph, and superseded their K. As they also used it for Gamma, which two purposes were very distinct, it is a fair conclusion that the trifling alteration at the foot of the G, which distinguishes it from the C, was added to prevent confusion; and that, in the simple form, it might have had the force of Kappa, whilst, with the addition it possessed the force of a Gamma.

H

The Samaritan Heth was thus, 𐤇; the Phenician thus, 𐤇; the Greek Heta, thus, H; which was adopted by the Romans. With this letter the Greeks occasionally aspirated Κ, Π, and Τ, before they had adopted Χ, Φ, and Θ, the two last of which were either round or square, Φ or ⊕, Θ or ⊟. The Romans ever continued it as a note of rough breathing; such it is presumed as they received it from the Greeks; who at first, only used it as an aspirate, as ΗΕΡΟΔΟC, *Herodos*, ΤΗΕΟC, *Theos* and ΗΟΔΟC, *hodos*, *via*. At length it became a long vowel, and Ε was chiefly restricted to the short sound; in reference to which Plato says "ου γαρ η εχρωμεθα αλλα ε το παλαιον." The Latins hereby had an advantage not possessed by the Greeks, for they could write Abraham, and the Greeks only ΑΒΡΑΑΜ. Because vowels when long contained two times, and were sounded as if repeated; it has been supposed, that Η was originally two letters of the same kind, facing each other, ⊟; and afterwards connected into one character. But this is imagination, not fact, for Η was not at first a vowel; and it might have been as easily formed from the ancient character, as was the Π of the Chaldees. But the asper and lenis do resemble the parts of a divided Η, thus, ⊦ and ⊣; in books written soon after the seventh century.

I

This letter the Latins obtained from the Greeks. The name is Syriac, but the character is Cadmean. The Greeks ever deemed it a vowel, and formerly wrote it in full

shape, after those vowels, to which they subjoined it, in latter times, as a point. But the Romans used it *also* as a consonant, in which the Masorites agreed with them. The Samaritan and Phenician Jod, was thus,  ; the Chaldaic was thus, י. Scaliger said, he wondered how the Ionians and Chaldeans conspired together, to use the same form of this letter, when both departed from the Phenician character; for he says, it is certain, that the Ionians did not receive it from the Chaldeans. But Dr. Kennicott observes that "the Yod occurring very frequently would be gradually reduced from the Samaritan form , to the Hebrew form י. The Sidonian money has exactly the Samaritan character of this letter." But we read in the Farnesian inscription, the Greek I; as ANA⊗EΜA. KAI ⊗ONION *αναθημα, και χθονιων* or *καὶ αχθονιων.*

K

The Samaritan Caph was thus,  ; the latest Phenician, from it, was thus, . The Greek Kappa, named from the Syriac, was thus, , before it was turned to the right, K. This the Latins adopted, as Ausonius shows;

"Cappa fui quondam Bœotia, nunc Latium K."

But this letter was chiefly superseded by C, which Suidas terms *Καππα Ρωμαϊκον.* The Chaldee Caph ↄ was an improved form of the Samaritan.

L

The Samaritan Lamed was thus, ; the Phenician, much the same, thus, . One form of the Greek Lambda was this Lamed inverted, thus Λ; another was a nearer resemblance of L, which was adopted by the Latins. The Chaldee Lamed, ל, bears a similitude of the Samaritan, but is not more nearly allied than the Roman.

M

The Samaritan Mem nearly resembled their Caph and was thus , the Phenician was like it, thus, . An ancient Greek Mu was thus, . Another was turned to the left, thus, ; and afterwards changed to the right, thus, ,

which became ᛗ, and afterwards the Roman M. The Chaldee ם, though unlike the Roman, bears some affinity to that, which was their common original.

N

The Chaldee or modern Hebrew Nun, is a very close imitation of the Samaritan, which was thus, 𐤍. The Phenician was thus, 𐤍. The ancient Greek Nun, was thus, ᚾ; inclined to the left, perhaps to distinguish it from the Pe, which was perpendicular. It was afterwards changed to the right, thus, ᚿ, which became ᚿ and N. These successive alterations of character followed those of the Mem. The small Greek Nu which is not ancient, is supposed to have been made by omitting the line on the left, and thus ν resembles a Vee.

O

The Samaritan Ain was triangular, thus 𐤏. The Phenician was quadrangular above, and triangular below, thus, 𐤏. The Greek was quadrangular □, and also circular, O. The latter supplanted the former, and was adopted by the Latins. When the Omega or great o, was first introduced, it was distinguished by two arms at the bottom, like feet; "κυκλος ποδας εχει βραχεις δυο." As there had been square, and round Omicrons, so arms were attached to each, thus, ω Ω, the square resting on one of its angles. Of this, the monumental proofs are numerous. The two arms might denote that it was equal to two Omicrons. The small Omega was two Omicrons, ω. o is often found for ου, this was its Greek name when used as a negative particle. At length, Upsilon was placed over it, and the contraction υ was adopted. The Chaldee, or present Hebrew character resembles the triangle of the Samaritans, with a line from the lower angle, inclining to the left, ע.

P

The Samaritan Pe 𐤐 much resembled their Nun; a similarity also existed between the Phenician Pe 𐤐 and their Nun. The Greeks formed their ancient Pi thus ᚿ, like

their ancient Nun; a character nearly the same as the Pe, final, of the Chaldeans. When they changed their letters from the left to the right, they wrote it Γ; afterwards it was made Isosceles Π, or, as Scaliger and Montfaucon both observe, the Greeks raised the Phenician Pe, which lies on one side, into an erect position. The Latin P is but the Ionic Ρ a little rounded. Thus the Greek Rho was completely formed in the Latin P.

Q

This was not a Chaldaic letter, nor derived by the Latins from the Greeks. The Greeks, between Pi, which was eighty, and Rho, which was an hundred, adopted the numerical letter κοππα for ninety, which was merely ϟπιϭημον. The Samaritan Koph was thus, P, which the Phenician and Chaldee somewhat resembled, and the Latin Q is not more distant. The Romans sometimes adopted C in its place, as in cujus and cui, and on some coins COVINTUS is found for Quintus. It was deemed an unnecessary letter by some of the Romans, who rejected it.

R

The formation of this letter was given under D. quod vide ante.

S

The Samaritan Shin was thus, 𐤔. The Phenician was thus, Ш. The Greeks had also a Sigma, thus, Ш, which they more frequently wrote perpendicularly, thus, Σ, and sometimes thus, Ⲥ; as appears from many inscriptions still in existence. But they made it most conveniently thus, C, which often occurs in our day in modern editions of the Greek Testament. Lastly, they used S, for sigma, which is the Roman character. On the coin of Adrian is found KAISAR SEMNOS AΔRIANOS. Upon which it is observed, SEMNOS means Σεβαϛος, that is, Augustus. And S is used in the Greek inscription, before mentioned to have been

referred to by Pliny, to prove that the Latin were the Cadmean letters.

T

The origin of this letter has been a subject of controversy. Origen and Jerom pronounced the Samaritan Tau to be like a cross; this Scaliger denies, with his accustomed severity. The Tau resembled the Aleph of the Samaritans, except that it had but one of the antennæ on the right hand side. It was written thus,  . Surely there is some resemblance of a cross, though the transverse arms be not horizontal. The letters on the shekels dug up at Jerusalem, Scaliger admits, were Samaritan. On some of these the Tau is written thus,  , on others, thus,  . From the Samaritan therefore, the Cadmean Tau may have been formed, nay, must have been derived; because, except the Phenician, which is deemed the Samaritan, no other Tau, of which we have knowledge, is sufficiently ancient. The Roman, all admit to have been the Greek Tau. It appears to have been the last letter of the Cadmean alphabet, as it was also of the Samaritan, and of the Chaldee and Syriac, which originated from the same source.

V

That this letter was derived by the Latins from the Greeks, is evident. For it was early used by the Greeks. In the ancient Farnesian inscription is the word MARTVS (μαρτυς) where the V is evidently a vowel. Aristotle assigned it a place among the Cadmean letters. Whether it was introduced by the Phenicians or not, it must have been taken from their Vau, of which it bears the form, and thus mediately from the Samaritan, as has been alleged under F, where its use as a consonant is shown. On the coin of Augustus his name appears in these letters AVГVCTOC. But the Roman vowel had not the sound of the Greek. It had also two other forms, thus, Y, and  . The latter is frequent in monumental inscriptions. It was named from its sound, and afterwards was termed ψιλον,

most probably to distinguish it from ου. But the Samaritan Vau may have been used, as the Jews did the Chaldaic, both for a vowel and consonant; and whilst the consonant was επισημον, the vowel may have been removed to a lower place in the alphabet.

W

The name of this letter is double U, its form, that of a double V. It existed, but not under its present name, in the Anglo-Saxon and Mœso-Gothic alphabets, from which we derived it. In each of them it somewhat resembled a Y; it obtained its present form, that it might be distinguished from that letter. It has been substituted by gu, and v, in modern Latin, and by υι in Greek.

X

The Samaritan Samech was thus,  . The Phenician, more easily constructed, thus,  . The Greek Xi, in its most ancient form, was thus,  . Of which turned to the right, Ausonius says

"Meandrum flexusque vagos imitata vagor ξ."

Though it appears on ancient monuments, it was one of the last letters received by the Greeks from the East. Accordingly ξενος, and ιεραξ were written by the Æolians χσενος and ιερακς. The latter Greek character was Ξ; from this, it is presumed, the Latins formed in time their X; which stood for cs, as vixit for vicsit. But they received it at a late period, as appears by its being near the close of their alphabet, and from other letters occupying its place in some words, as ascia, from αξινη *an ax*. In Greek also we read ΑΜΦΙΑΝΑΚΣ for αμφιανακ. Scaliger affirms that it came into use before the days of Augustus.

Y

This letter was obtained by the Romans from the Greeks, who considered it as one of the forms of Upsilon. They adopted Y only as a vowel, and always for Upsilon of the

Greeks, never accounting it as any other than a Greek letter. The instances in which the Romans changed Upsilon into the Latin u, are very rare, and have been attributed to their vanity of appearing independent. Quintilian has acknowledged a sweetness in the Greek Upsilon, to preserve which the Romans substituted Y in Zephyrus; and that the Roman u would have produced a rough and barbarous sound. Ausonius has also justly observed, that the sound of the Latin u was unknown to the Greeks. He denominates it *ferale*, *dismal*. It is thought he alludes to the solitary *Tu Tu* of the ulula, or bird of the night, mentioned by Plautus.

Z

The Samaritan Zain was written thus,  . The Phenician thus,  ; from whence the Greek Zeta Z, has come; but its name is Syriac. There was a form of this letter common to the Phenicians or Samaritans, and to the Greeks; it was thus,  . The Greeks also made it thus,  . It was tardily adopted by the Latins. Before it was introduced into Greece, Gamma appears to have been sometimes used in its place. But Z is a double letter, and is compounded of δς, σδ, or σσ. Thus Ζευς, *Jupiter*, was Δσευς, Δσιος, and Διος. Ζυγος was σδυγος, &c.

As numerous characters may be seen, of various degrees of innovation, from the large uncial letter of the Greeks in the fourth century, unto the small Romaic letters, now used in the schools; so the transitions, marked above, must have been gradual, and perhaps often unperceived.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE SOUNDS OF THE LETTERS.

EASE in utterance is generally coincident with pleasure in hearing. These are desirable objects, but of secondary importance. It is of the essence of speech, that words, whether spoken or written, should be intelligible, and adapted to the meaning with precision. Written, they are less impressive than when uttered; but may convey ideas with equal certainty and precision. That they may be productive of such effects, the reader must be supposed to possess antecedently a knowledge of their determinate signification. Spoken language is incapable of a just representation by characters; but the latter may communicate, to persons in distant times, and places, some, though it be an imperfect, representation of the expressions of which they are the arbitrary signs; and have the advantage, vastly important to man, of greater permanency.

As letters represent the sounds of spoken, so do they become the elements of written language; but hearing and vision differ not more, than words spoken and written. Letters are rarely used separately to denote any determinate thing; but some of those, which can be sounded alone, are occasionally words, and even sentences. Letters are characters, which primarily denote sounds, or the modulations of them. When the sounds are significant, such combinations of characters, as well as the sounds, which they denote, are called words; and both, by common consent, stand for ideas.

Man is an imitative creature; he may utter sounds, which he has heard; but until he has heard them, no description of the organs of speech, and of their exercise

in making such unknown sounds, can enable him clearly to conceive of, much less to utter them.

The written words of a dead language may be as clearly, and perhaps more certainly understood, than those of a living one; whilst the sounds of the words, and even of the letters, of which they are composed, may have been lost.

Letters are naturally divisible into those which denote simple sounds, and others which modify such sounds; the former are denominated vowels, the latter consonants. This division of letters is not more common, than natural. The Greeks had their φωνηεντα and συμφωνα; and the Latins their vocales, and consonantes; from these have been derived the names, *vowels* and *consonants*. The letters, which in one alphabet correspond to vowels or consonants respectively in another, are with few exceptions, also consonants or vowels. A combination of two vowel-sounds uttered in the time of one, in Greek or Latin, was termed a diphthong; of three concurrent vowels, the first was deemed a consonant; but in English several may be thus united.

In many instances, also, consonants are audible beyond the sounds of their vowels, respectively; but should not, without them, constitute syllables. There is a vowel sound so rapid, as to exclude the discernment of the kind, to which it is most allied. This was often used in the Hebrew, and other ancient languages. Some words contained no other vowels, and these being omitted in writing, such words have only consonants. Origen, who has given us Hebrew words written in Greek letters, supplied different vowels of the Greek for such short, and implied ones in the Hebrew; and seems not to have known the Masoretic subjected vowel-points. The Hebrew manuscripts were at that time probably, like the Samaritan, destitute of them. Of this opinion was the

learned Kennicott, who says, "the invention of them, is "so very modern, the authority of them, therefore, is so "very little; and the direction given by them must be "so very frequently erroneous, that I feel a real concern, "when I find writers descend to such solemn trifling." If adopted, they leave us still ignorant of the original sounds of the Hebrew words; for scarcely two read them alike. Admit the points, and thereby, in numerous instances, original literal characters, corresponding to vowels in other alphabets, must be put to silence; and that although not being radical, they could have been introduced for no other purpose, but to denote sounds.

No alphabet exists, that is perfect. For to be such, sounds which are distinct, should never be denoted by the same character; nor should different characters represent the same sound. As long as a language continues a living one, the written words must, to be intelligible, be spoken in their known sounds. But when it is dead, and consequently known only by written characters, such necessity has ceased, and the practicability also of reading them as they were formerly spoken, is, in lapse of time, to a great degree, if not entirely, lost.

If the Hebrew language was at any period spoken, as it is now most generally read with the points, never could an alphabet have been farther removed from a spoken language, than that must have been. But the points being removed, the sounds of Hebrew letters, are such as we give to the correspondent ones, in modern languages. With little variation, we pronounce those letters as we read the Greek and Latin alphabets. Thus the words of the dead languages, excepting in a few peculiarities, recognised by all, are read by the people of the respective nations in Europe, nearly as they read their own.

The present reading, or rather singing, of the Rab-

bins, though differing among themselves, according as they have been educated in one nation, or another, is professedly conformed to the Masoretic reading. This is old enough to accord with the known modes of reading Greek and Latin, in ancient times, in some particulars. Thus, ch and g, are ever hard. It is therefore proper to retain these sounds in Hebrew names, which have not been modernised, or changed by public use.

The Greek letters have reached us under many advantages; nevertheless it is chiefly from the letters themselves, not voices, that we are to discover the true mode of uttering them.

That the Heta, with the Greeks, was sounded as *a* in *fate*, and not as *e* in *meet*, seems probable, because Eustathius quotes Cratinus, as giving βη, βη for the bleating of sheep; and they have not, it is presumed, lost their ancient voice of complaint. In like manner, if *e*, in the English name of the herb *beet*, has the same sound that it had formerly in βῆτον, *betium*, and *beta*, Greek and Latin names for the same herb, the sound of this vowel also is ascertained; for Augustine, whose testimony must be competent, affirms the sound of the letter, and the *e* in the name of the herb, to have been the same. If these be the ancient sounds of the vowels η, and ε, then *a* was not like *a* in *fate*, nor *e* in *beet;* but must have been either as *a* in *fall*, *fat*, or *father*. Before Heta and Omega were introduced for the long sounds of the ancient E and O, these letters had each a long as well as a short sound, and Omicron had a third sound resembling the diphthong ου, which was adopted in its place. (*a*)

Upsilon had the sounds of the vowel *y*, and of the word *you* in English. The Latins borrowed the softer Greek letter *y*, to avoid the sound of their rough *u*. About the other vowel-sounds there is less difficulty.

(*a*) Vid. Let. O. p. 16 ante.

The Greek diphthongs, which were made by prefixing α, ε, or ο, to ι, or υ, were termed εὐφωνοι, of *pleasant sound.* When ιῶτα was subscribed, which could be only under ᾱ, η, or ω, it was necessarily quiescent, to prevent three measures in the same syllable. These were denominated διφθογγοι αφωνοι *silent.* When υ was annexed to η, or ω; or ι to υ, these, being difficult to reduce, respectively, to one compounded sound, were termed κακοφωνοι *of bad sound.* But υι is believed to have been a proper diphthong. The contracted form of ου, by placing Upsilon over the Omicron, thus, ȣ, is of very great antiquity. But even the vowels, constituting proper diphthongs, are sometimes to be read distinctly, when standing together; whereof notice is often given by a diæresis, or two points superscribed. It is said that αι was a sound more open than η, which we have seen, resembled the long *a* in *fate.* Aristophanes tells us that αυ was like the barking of a dog, and consequently it must have been similar to *ow* in *vow.* But it is by us more usually sounded as *awe.* The ευ was pronounced as yew. Οι as in the English word *toil.* (*b*)

Of the Greek consonants nine are mutes; of which three are denominated labials Π, Β, Φ; three dentals, Τ, Δ, Θ; and the remaining three, Κ, Γ, Χ, are referred to

(*b*) Because the Greek Epsilon bore the name ΕΙ, and the Omicron was called ΟΥ, Epsilon has been said to have had three sounds, the long Ε, the short Ε, and the diphthong ΕΙ; and in like manner the Omicron was long, short, and a diphthong, as ου; but by the introduction of the Heta and Omega, and also of those two diphthongs, the proper discrimination was maintained in the written language. That the ΕΙ was sounded like the Latin E appears evident from this, that the Romans changed the Greek ΑΙ, ΟΙ, and ΕΙ into AE, OE, and E; as Æneas for Αινειας, and Moesia for Μοισια.

the palate, as their organ. The first in each of those classes is smooth, the last rough, or aspirated; and B, Γ, Δ are intermediate, both with respect to effort in utterance, and in roughness of sound. The smooth, intermediate, and rough, are often changed for each other; but always of the same organ; these are on this account termed cognate.

Λ, M, N, P, and sometimes Σ, are denominated liquids, or gliding letters; as they readily follow mutes, although they do not precede them. They are distinguished also by the name immutables, because they are rarely changed in the cases of nouns, or tenses of verbs, for other letters; but sometimes among themselves, and ν frequently also is changed into γ, κ, or ξ; or is omitted before ζ or σ.

As θ, χ, and φ are but τ, κ and π aspirated; so ξ is σ affixed to κ, γ, or χ; and ψ is σ in the same manner affixed to π, β, or φ. The former are not strictly double, though compounded; but Ξ, Ψ, and Z are double letters, or abbreviations. The letter ζ is denied to be σ with τ, δ, or θ; because this combination seems to have been avoided in the Greek language; but this objection is so far from being conclusive, that it might prove the substitution to be universal. Sigma is frequently changed into one of the dentals in imparisyllabic cases, and takes their place often in future tenses.

The Greeks had no consonant V. For it they used β, or ου, as Σεβηρος, *Severus*. Ουεσπασιανος, *Vespasianus*. The Æolians, who aspirated their words, substituted the F, which is, with questionable propriety, termed digamma; thus υλη was FYAFH, of which the first aspirate became s and the other v, in Latin, sylva. The Cretans used B in the place of the Digamma. The F was adopted by the Romans, as a letter, and used sometimes for V, when the vowel V followed.

Of the Latin vowels A, E, I, O, U, Y, two are sometimes consonants, J, and V.

Of the consonants, ten are considered mutes, B, C, D, F, G, J, P, Q, T, and V. Two, X, and Z are double letters composed of c s, and d s; and are therefore, with s, termed hissing letters; but Z was much softer than X. H is an aspiration, and L, M, N, and R, are termed liquids, as in Greek.

The sound of A, it is very generally agreed, was either that of *awe*, or of *a* in *father*. E was like *a* in *mate*, when long; but when short it was sometimes as *e* in *met*, and in other instances, like *i* in *magister*. The third sound of the Roman e was found in Greek words, when e was substituted for ei; as in *Homereus*. This is said to be the reason, that there were some accusatives, made at pleasure, in *em* or *im*. And ablatives in *e* or *i*. The vowel I, when long, was like *i* in *fine;* for Quintilian makes it equivalent to the diphthong *ei;* but when short, it was sounded as in *fin*. *O* was long as in *note*, or short as in *not;* but sometimes so rapid as to be scarcely distinguishable from a very short *e*, or *u*. U was not pronounced by the Romans as the English *you*, but like *o* in *who*, or *oo* in *moon*. The short *u* resembled in utterance *u* in our pronoun *us*, and partook of the short *o*, or *i*. Υ was acknowledged by the Romans to be Greek, and a very pleasant letter, to which none in their language corresponded.

In all Latin diphthongs terminating in *I*, except *oi*, *i* appears to have been the predominating sound; as indeed it seems itself to be diphthongal. Cæsar was Kaeesar, or as the German Keyser. *Au*, and *eu*, they acknowledged to be the same as in Greek, but a little shorter. Quintilian has observed, that when three vowels come together in Latin, one of them becomes a consonant.

The mutes *B*, *P*, and *V* have, in Latin, a strong affinity. Also *V*, *F*, and *PH*, possess a similarity. These affinities of sound have occasioned many substitutions of these letters for each other, in that language.

Also their *C*, ϙ, *G*, and *J* were allied in sound. ϙ was held by some to be superfluous, because it merely supplied the place of *CU*. U ever accompanies ϙ, but neither forms a position, nor becomes a diphthong. *C* supplied the place of *K*, having ever the hard sound. *G* also was pronounced, with *e*, or *i*, roughly, as with *a*, *o*, or *u*. J was put sometimes for *ζ*, in words derived from the Greek, and had the effect of *dg* in English.

H, among the Romans, was a fluctuating letter; sometimes much used even where not written, both before vowels and after consonants; but, with some, this became a subject of ridicule. In words borrowed from the Greek, they used it as an aspirate, chiefly after *P*, *R*, and *T*. The *CH* was sounded like *K*, or a hard *C;* yet not precisely, for it must have been aspirated.

F, which from its form was denominated Digamma, but more probably took its shape from the Samaritan, or Phenician Vau, was used as an asper, or H; and therefore these two letters often took each other's places, as fostem for hostem, and heminas for feminas. Neither of them, with a consonant, rendered a preceding vowel, long by position, at that time, as H yet does not. The Greek asper, the Æolic F, the Roman V consonant, and the H, were all used for the same purpose, and sometimes confusedly, as ἑσπερα, Fεσπερα, hesperus, vespera.

In English grammars, our language is generally admitted to have six vowels, and these are the same as in the Latin. If by vowels be meant, not the characters, but clear, and distinct sounds, effected by a single impulse of the voice, there may be more, and some think we have at least twice that number. How many precisely there are, is a matter of nice discrimination, and seems not to be agreed. When those sounds which are denominated by some, vowels, are deemed by others diphthongs, the discrimination must be as unimportant, as it is uncertain.

Diphthongs should be so uttered, as to render every vowel, in the compound, effective, or even discernible; and it is presumed that this should be accomplished, in the time occupied in pronouncing a long vowel. In a few instances in the Greek, and Latin, the diphthong is not longer than a shortened vowel. The transition of the voice from one vowel of the diphthong to another, how rapid soever, must require a change in the position of the organs of speech, and cannot be said to be no more than a single impulse of the voice.

As it is important to a clear, and pleasing pronunciation, that the speaker should have an accurate knowledge of the letters, and syllables of the words, which he uses; so it is important, that he should know the vowels, of which the diphthongs are compounded. Nevertheless most speakers condense the vowels of diphthongs, and utter the compound so much in the manner of a simple sound, that diphthongs in the English language may be conveniently classed, in general, under the vowel sounds, which they most nearly approximate. (*c*)

No.	*Vowels.*	*Similar Sounds.*	*Examples.*
(*c*)1.	a in tale,	ai, ao, ay, e, ea, ei, ey,	fail, gaol, bay, there, great, reign, they.
2.	a in far,	au, ea,	aunt, heart.
3.	a in call,	au, aw, awe, o, oa, ou,	caul, hawl, awe, for, broad, sought.
4.	a in hat,	all, ua, i,	shall, guaranty, sirrah.
5.	e in me,	æ, ea, ee, ei, eo, ey, ie, i, oe, oi,	Cæsar, meat, beer, deceit, people, key, yield, machine, antœci, turkois.
6.	e in met,	ai, ae, ea, ee, ei, ie, oe, oi, uy,	said, Dædalus, head, see, heifer, friend, fœtid, chamois, obloquy.
7.	i in hire,	ei, eye, ie, oi, ui, uy, y,	height, eye, die, join, guide, buy, why.

When sounds are interrupted, or modified by the organs of speech, such changes are denoted by characters, differing, with a few exceptions, from the vowels, as has been mentioned; and are from their concurrence in pronunciation termed consonants.

Among these, the mutes, or those which can only be heard with vowels, in our language, or with difficulty without them, are *b*, *c*, hard, *d*, *g*, hard, *k*, *p*, and *t*, to which *h* and *q* have been added.

Others, which, without concurrent vowels, may have an obscure sound, capable of continuation, have been denominated semi-vowels. These are *f*, *g*, soft, *j*, *s*, *v*, *x*, and *z*. And to these are added *l*, *m*, *n*, and *r*, but others refuse them the denomination of semi-vowels. These last are termed liquids, because the modulations of sound,

No.	*Vowels.*	*Similar Sounds.*	*Examples.*
8.	i in fit,	ai, e, ee, ei, ia, ie, oi, o, ui, u,	captain, yes, breeches, surfeit, marriage, sieve, tortoise, women, guilt, busy.
9.	o in note,	au, eau, eo, ew, oa, oe, oo, ou, ow,	hautboy, beau, yeoman, shew, moan, foe, door, mould, blow.
10.	o in who,	oe, oo, ou, ui, wo,	shoe, moon, *to* wound, recruit, two.
11.	o in nor,	a, eo, ou,	what, George, cough. This sound differs a little when followed by an *r* and a *t*.
12.	u in cube,	eau, eu, ew, ewe, ieu, iew, ue, you,	beauty, feud, new, ewe, adieu, view, true, yȕ.
13.	u in cup,	e, ea, i, o, oo, ou,	her, earth, sir, won, flood, rough.
14.	u in bull,	œu, oo, o, ou, ue,	manœuvre, wool, wolf, would, blue.
15.	ou in noun,	ow,	cow.
16.	oi in toil,	oy,	joy.

which they denote, are easily effected, after mutes, by the organs of speech.

The letters *c* soft, *d*, *s*, *t*, and *z* are occasionally sibilant; *h* is generally an aspirate.

Consonants, denominated from the organs exercised in uttering them, are divided into Labials, *b*, *f*, *m*, *p*, *v;* Dentals *d*, *g*, soft, *j*, *s*, *t*, *z;* Gutturals *c* hard, *g* hard, *k* and *q;* and Nasal, *n* and *ng*. Letters of the same organ are sometimes interchanged, as *b* into *p*, *f* into *v*, *d* into *t*, and especially in words springing from ancient roots. (*d*)

(*d*) B has the same effect with every vowel, except that before t or after m, it is silent.

C has the effect of s before e, i, and y; of k, before a, o, and u. Before t or z, and after s it is silent; except in *sceptic*. But ch is usually like k, in words from the Hebrew, Greek and Latin; after c or n like sh; often as tch; and in *choir* and *chorister* it resembles qu and cu.

D modulates very uniformly every sound. It approximates j before e, i, and u. And is sometimes improperly introduced before *ge*, both in writing and speaking.

F resembles ph before, and gh after a vowel. It is nearly allied to v.

G is hard before a, except in gaol, o, u, l, and r. It is soft before e, except in some monosyllables, or when g terminates the syllable, and the next begins with e; also before i, and y; but there are are many exceptions, especially in final syllables. G is silent before m, or n, in the same syllable. Gh, when following a vowel or diphthong, in the same syllable, sometimes resembles f; at other times ck, but is most frequently silent.

H, a sign of breathing, is said to be often silent in the beginning of words, after r, or ending a word after a vowel; but it should have, in most instances, some effect, however small. Its influence with different consonants, as c, g, p, and w, is various.

J is like the soft g.

Neither vowels nor consonants alone, can constitute articulate sounds: as the latter require the former, to make them audible; so the former, without the latter, are indeterminate. Consonants form, and distinguish the

K is a hard c, and silent after it. It begins in such cases to be omitted, especially in words from the Latin. It should be silent before n.

L is quiescent before d, f, k, l, m, or v in the same syllable. When e follows it, in a final syllable, the e is imperfectly sounded before it.

M and N have each a uniform effect, except that n is silent after m in the end of a syllable. N going before the consonants g, and k, can scarcely affect the syllable; but it is otherwise, following them.

P has a uniform effect; except, that it is silent sometimes before s, and t, in the first of words; almost so between m, and t, and in the word *receipt*. It has a close affinity with b. When aspirated by a following h, it has nearly the effect of an f.

Q has ever an u after it; which is not sounded in words derived from the French. But q has then the force of a k, or hard c. In other instances, u after q has the effect of a w.

R, before e final, has its effect after the vowel in some instances; also after o in *apron*, *iron*, &c. but with little propriety. It should be only heard, the transition ought to be as rapid as possible, and never acquire the sound of wr.

S has a sharp sound as in *this;* and another resembling z, as in *these*, which is sometimes aspirated as in *pleasure*. S may be silent as in *isle*. It often resembles *sh* as in *passion*.

T, besides its most natural effect, easily glides into s, sh, or ch. But such changes of s, and t, because they spring from an erroneous indistinctness, ought to be avoided, where the charges of affectation and pedantry can be escaped. Th, with some impropriety, is said to have two

sounds of the vowels. Every articulate sound, and in a larger sense, every sound, though not modulated, if it constitute part of a word, or be itself intelligible, is denominated a syllable. Syllable, from συλλαβὴν, imports a collection of letters; yet a single letter is acknowledged by grammarians to be, in some instances, a syllable, a word, a sentence, or even an epistle.

Words should be read as they are spoken, and spoken, if public usage will allow, as they are written. Perhaps nothing contributes more to distinctness of articulation, than a correct knowledge of the division of words into syllables; and nothing is more important to prevent misapprehension, than a distinctly articulate pronunciation.

In our language, neither are the words formed with a view to the alphabet; nor the letters, which denote them, always adjusted with precision to the sounds of the words; since letters are in many instances multiplied,

sounds sharp, and flat; as in *think*, and th*e*re; or in *death* and *boo*th. T is often silent.

V is allied to f, has one effect, and is not silent. U modulates, as a consonant, different vowels: as *assuage*, *desuetude*, *languid*, *quote*.

W is a consonant at the beginning of a word. When aspirated, the h is written after, but sounded before it. It is nearly silent before r.

X has the force of ks after a vowel; but if the next vowel be accented, it resembles gz. At the beginning of a word, it has the influence of z.

Y, at the end of a syllable, is a vowel, and is sounded as i, or e; but when at the beginning, it is a consonant; and its effects are uniform.

Z resembles s, in the modulation of sounds, and is accounted flat; which is in opposition to its name izzard, if the meaning be s hard. It is aspirated, sometimes, before e, i, or u. In a few instances it is silent.

where the same effect, in point of sound, might have been better produced by fewer characters. The written words of the Hebrew language, on the contrary, were certainly formed upon the old Hebrew, usually called the Samaritan or Phenician, alphabet; or some other, containing the same number of letters, of correspondent effects; because the roots, with a very few exceptions, and these no doubt modern, are verbs, consisting of three radical letters, expressed or understood; and it is possible, that every radical word, was originally a monosyllable.

If the sounds of syllables, and words, could be rendered stable in our language, it would be a useful work to throw off every silent letter, represent the sounds by the fewest characters, in the most simple manner, and never permit the same character to stand for different sounds. The public advantage would be some compensation for the loss of the radical meanings of words, and a loss would in such event very soon be universally incurred.

The same work must also soon be repeated, for the fluctuation of language can no more be prevented, than that of the winds and waves.

Whilst the respective sounds of the syllables, which belong to the same English word, are rarely individually significant, the letters are some guide to the correct knowledge of the written words, since they generally direct the reader to their origin, and radical import. Thus it often happens, that the numerous letters, which are thrown into the same syllable, and might be substituted by fewer, as far as regards the sound, are of great utility to the intelligent reader or hearer, who thereby recognises the radical sense of the word. It should be a rule in speaking the compound words of every language, to divide the sounds, or syllables in such manner, that the original words may not be obscured. This was a

rule with the Greeks; and their compound words, which are exceedingly numerous, are evidently constructed, so as to give facility to its practical application.

The same rule was prescribed also by the old Latin grammarians, and to this discrimination of radical words, all the rules, which obtained in the division of syllables, were made to yield.

In other instances, where one consonant only came between two vowels, it was used to modulate the last. If two consonants of the same kind intervened between two vowels, the syllables were to be divided between the consonants. All other consonants went with the vowel, that followed them, provided a word existed in the language, which began with those consonants. This practical rule existed also in the Greek language, but with some exceptions. Two mutes did not commence a syllable, unless they were both smooth, intermediate, or rough; but $\varepsilon\kappa$ might precede a middle, or a rough. Nor were the cognate mutes τ, δ, θ ever placed before the rest. Because the letters φ, χ, θ, were naturally aspirated, being π, κ, τ, respectively with an h, they were not doubled.

A liquid, as λ, μ, ν, or ϱ, did not immediately precede one or more of the nine mutes in a syllable, nor a liquid in the beginning of a word, except μ before ν.

It is supposed from the use of short vowels in the ancient languages of the East, and from the number of words in the Hebrew, which, read without points, have no vowel character, that every consonant in that language, except it were at the end of a word, was followed by a short vowel; that where a short vowel had been spoken, none was written, if thereby the root could be reduced to three letters; and that the sound of such vowel was nearly the same, of whatever kind it might have been. This has been exemplified in the last sylla-

ble of *father*, which must retain the same sound with any vowel substituted for the *e*; if it be equally short.

Many of the changes of the mutes, and of other letters in Greek words, are wholly useless, but for their more convenient pronunciation in the beginning of syllables; for, if the syllabic division had been made between the intervening vowels, in the manner of the moderns, such substitutions would have in many instances disfigured the word, and rendered its origin obscure, without helping its sound.

If the above rules were generally in use in those three languages, when living, it must be understood, that their effects were discernible chiefly in discourse. The speaker must have rarely confounded syllables, or been in danger of being misunderstood, except when he adopted an unusual collocation of his words.

In our language, distinctness of pronunciation is the chief difficulty. To give every letter its effect, and every syllable its distinct articulation, can never be acquired from written English words; for the letters have frequently different sounds, where the characters are in all respects the same. A painful attention must be paid to a just division of syllables, and to the articulation of them by those, who pronounce according to the most approved usage in the best circles in society, and also a knowledge of the etymology and most received import of words must be gained, before the party can speak, so as to stand the test of just criticism.

The rules of syllabication anciently pursued in Latin, and Greek, have been pronounced to be remarkably erroneous as applied to English; and in our day it indicates a wish in those grammarians, who continue them, rather to abide by old usages, than to adopt the manner of speaking derived words, in present use. In English those rules must be abandoned, for, as it has been

justly affirmed by an eminent lexicographer, it is in vain to divide according to them such words as *a-dage*, *a-gony*, *a-lum*, *ba-nish*, *bo-dy*, *herb-age*, *mu-sket*, *whi-sper*, *clu-ster*, *stand-ard*, when they are universally pronounced *ad-age*, *ag-ony*, *al-um*, *ban-ish*, *bod-y*, *her-bage*, *mus-ket*, *whis-per*, *clus-ter*, *stan-dard*.

In general, in our language, syllables are divided so as to make the parts of compounds distinguishable, when the sense of each part is preserved; but when a secondary idea is intended, it is otherwise; thus *re-create* and *rec-reate*, *re-petition* and *rep-etition*, *re-formation* and *ref-ormation*, are different words, have different meanings, and are differently divided into syllables, yet the letters are the same. But the rule is said to be this; if the compound was formed in the language, whence we have taken it so compounded, the division of syllables may not be made according to the more remote roots; but if the compound were made first in English, the original words are to be kept distinct.

One intervening consonant is generally to go with the following vowel, unless the former is long and accented; but when there are more, they are divided in such manner, as that nothing but custom, or a painful attention to tables, can ever communicate the knowledge of it.

The divisions of the letters into syllables should, unquestionably, be the same in written, and spoken language, as often as the syllables are divided; otherwise the learner is misguided, and seduced by false representations, into injurious errors.

In some instances we depart from the division of the Latins, and substitute accent for long quantity; thus, flō-ridus, frī-gidus, we pronounce flór-id, fríg-id. In other words the same division of syllables, has been adopted, which had existed before, in the Latin. To unravel the reasons of conformity, or departure, is at least as dif-

ficult, as it is useless to censure, or condemn. Every one will find it most convenient to submit to the public voice, without venturing to oppose rules, however reasonable, to general usage.

But whilst the tyranny of public sentiment silences opposition, good sense can never concede, that the syllabication of our language ought to be applied to the dead languages, without admitting also, that their respective prosodies ought to be suffered to go into oblivion.

A careful attention to the etymology, and syntax, of those languages, is nevertheless much more important, than labour expended upon the pronunciation of them; since the former are necessary to understand ancient writings, and are capable of very perfect development; whilst the latter is too far lost, to be ever correctly regained. Yet it is wilful perversion, however sanctified by public example, knowingly to depart from the ancient rules, relative to the division, and quantity of syllables, which merit to be known, though defectively; and will probably continue to be thus understood, when the present pronunciation of our language shall have passed away for ever.

CHAPTER III.

OF QUANTITY.

VOWELS, in written language, are characters, denoting the sounds, which we utter in pronouncing words; and consonants are letters, which stand for different modulations of such sounds, effected by the organs of speech. Those consonants which are denominated semivowels, and which may denote imperfect sounds, are not used to form syllables without vowels, in either of the languages here treated of, for a vowel is supposed or written in every syllable, even in the Hebrew.

"Syllable, (says Longinus,) is the genus; the short, the "long, and that, which is termed common, are species of "it."—"A short syllable is that which has a short, or "shortened sound; not at the end of a word; nor having "more than one simple consonant between it, and the "vowel of the syllable next following."—"All short "syllables are equal, and all long ones are equal; the "long ones are διχρονοι having each two times; and the "short ones are μονοχρονοι having one time; hence we say, "a dactyl is τετραχρονος having four times; and a pyr-"rhic is διχρονος having two times."

The length of time we occupy, in pronouncing a syllable, is termed its quantity. Which, in a syllable short by nature, is accounted one measure; if lengthened by a position before consonants, which protract its sound, it is one and a half, and will serve for a long syllable in poetry; if the vowel be long by nature, but shortened by its position before another vowel, which expedites its pronunciation, its quantity is one and a half; and it may serve for a short syllable in poetry. If the vowel be long by nature, and is not shortened, its quantity is

two. Η and Ω were long by nature; but when shortened by an easy transition to another vowel sound, as in δηϊω, and ζωης,(a) they were nevertheless longer than Ε and Ο. The quantity of a syllable was calculated upon the supposition, that it commenced with a consonant, terminated with a vowel, and was followed by a syllable of the same kind. The rapidity was increased, if the open vowel sounds succeeded each other, without the modulating effort, which a consonant at the beginning of the next syllable, either in fact, or supposition occasioned. But delay was interposed, if the preceding syllable was terminated by a consonant, which shut the mouth, until another effort, occasioned by a succeeding consonant, was made, as a modification of the sound of the following vowel. Also if the next syllable began disadvantageously, as with two mutes, the former vowel was long.

The position was held to be weak, changeable, and having no effect in prose, if a short vowel ended a syllable, which was followed by a mute and liquid, for the next syllable was uttered with convenience. Yet this circumstance did not render short those vowels, which, in particular words, have ever been deemed long.

Diphthongs were deemed, respectively, one sound, or syllable; and were each equal to two short vowels, or one long one; they rarely were so much shortened by a position before another vowel, as to be accounted no more than a short vowel. (b) A cæsura, or syllable in Greek, or Latin poetry, cut off at the end of a word, by the termination of a foot, was somewhat lengthened, both by its separation from the preceding foot, and by the ending

(a) Hom. Il. ϗ. 240. Theocrit. xxix. 20.

(b) Yet this sometimes happened, as αι in γεϱαιους, οι in ποιης, υι in υιος.—Theocrit. xxix. 21. Hom. Il. ζ. 130.

of the word; and therefore though the vowel had been naturally short, it was by these circumstances so lengthened, as to be fit to become the first syllable of either a dactyl, or spondee, which was necessarily its invariable condition in hexameter verse.

The last syllable of every Greek and Latin verse was accounted either long, or short, according to circumstances. It might have been hurried into the next line, though naturally long, without regard to its quantity, when the subject invited, and the next verse commenced with a vowel, or a mute and liquid. Or if such last syllable was naturally short, yet a pause might have been made at the end of the verse, which had the effect to lengthen the syllable.

A, I, Υ, were denominated doubtful vowels; H, Ω, long by nature, E and O, were naturally short. Diphthongs, and syllables contracted, and circumflexed, were generally long.

Any vowel, whether long, or doubtful, was liable to be made short by its position before another vowel, or diphthong; either because the hiatus might otherwise have been too great; or because, as is before mentioned, the transition of the voice was thereby facilitated. On the contrary, doubtful or short vowels became long by their position before two single consonants, or a double one, but not if λλ, or σ immediately followed. They were held to be common, if placed before a mute followed by λ, or ϱ, or before κ, μ, or π.

When grammarians say, as many of them do, that long vowels and diphthongs were sometimes made short; and short, and doubtful vowels occasionally made long, by placing them respectively before a single consonant, and especially a liquid; there must either have been opposite effects from the same causes, or they have mis-

taken the true ones, and thereby produced uncertainty in their rules concerning quantity.

The position of a long, or doubtful vowel, before another vowel, or diphthong, in numerous instances, has manifestly failed to make them short respectively; but the poetry demanded these exceptions. Hexameter verse requires, that any vowel should be long, when preceded, or followed, by two short syllables. Α, and Υ were generally long, when in the penultima, if followed by a vowel. Ι penultimate was short before ϱ, in other instances long. But Α, Ι, and Υ, were short, when they were final; to each of these rules there were, nevertheless, numerous exceptions. (*c*)

(*c*) Professor Dunbar has furnished the following rules, in aid of the critical reader of the Ilias; and has supported them by numerous examples. It is hoped they may prove, in some degree, an antidote against the modern rage for the digamma.

"1. A long vowel or diphthong at the end of a word, before another vowel or diphthong, is always short, except in cæsural syllables, which must be uniformly long.

"2. A long vowel or diphthong, in the beginning or middle of a word, before another vowel or diphthong, is always long.

"3. A long vowel, or diphthong, preceding a short vowel in the end of a word, elided in consequence of the next word beginning with a vowel, remains long before that vowel.

"4. A vowel naturally short, frequently forms the first syllable of a foot, whether at the beginning of a verse, or in the middle of a word, in consequence of the ictus metricus or swell of the voice upon that syllable.

"5. A syllable naturally short, when it happens to be the cæsura, is, for the same reason, made long.

"6. The conjunction καὶ ought never to be the first syllable of a foot, before a word beginning either with a vowel or diphthong."

The Romans did not always preserve the quantity of the Greeks, in words derived from them; particularly they shortened their penultimate, and lengthened the antepenultimate syllables. But diphthongs, and contracted syllables they made long. They shortened a vowel when immediately succeeded by another, with very few exceptions; and made a vowel long before x, and z; and also before j, if it were followed by a vowel; or before two consonants, if both were, or at least one was, in the same word; and sometimes also when the vowel terminated one word, and the consonants began another.

When a mute followed a vowel, not naturally long, in the same syllable, and the next syllable began with l, or r; or with m, or n, in words derived from the Greek, such vowel might have been pronounced either as a long, or short one.

Derivatives, and compound words, generally, in Latin, but not always, followed their primitives, and simples. Prepositions in compound words were mostly short; except a, e, de, se, and di. In other compounds a, and o were for the most part long; whilst e, i, and u, were short. Preterites and supines, of two syllables, had the first long.—But reduplications in preterites, were, in general, both short.

The second person singular, of the present tense of the indicative mode in the active voice, real or supposed, was the standard of every verb, both in the active, and passive voices; and every additional syllable was deemed an increase, but the last syllable was numbered as if original, and was never an increase, its quantity being generally certain.

When the genitive had a syllable more than the nominative, its penultimate was a singular increase; and the same vowel was so denominated in the other cases singular, or plural, which were formed from the genitive. A plural increase was the excess of syllables above

the genitive singular; or it was the penultimate of those plural cases, which have a syllable more than the nominative plural, for the ultimate syllable was never an increase.

A, e, and o, increases of verbs, and plural cases, were long, i, and u, short, except *būbus*. But the first increase of the fourth conjugation was long. The singular increase of the second declension was short. A, and o, increases of the third declension, were long; e, i, u, and y, short.—But the exceptions to several of these rules were numerous. Still more numerous were the exceptions to the rules for final syllables; but in general a, i, u, c, n, as, es, and os, in the ends of words were long; o, doubtful; e, y, b, d, l, r, t, is, us, and ys, were short.

These rules are not generally founded upon known principles, but are taken from examples found in the poets; whose authority also extends to the numerous words, and syllables, of the Greek, and Latin languages, for which no rules have been made. They wrote, it is presumed, more from a knowledge of the sounds given by the public to particular words, than from any rules, or principles, by which quantity in syllables was directed.

The meanings of words consisting of the same letters are ambiguous in prose, until discovered from the connexion; but in numerous instances they are rendered certain by the quantity, in poetical writings; a circumstance which fully proves, that such words were so distinguished by the sounds in speaking, as rarely to produce uncertainty. Thus legis, from lex, has e long, from lĕgo, e short; sēdes a *seat*, has the first syllable long, sĕdes a verb, the first short; ĕs, from sum, is short, but ēs, from edo, is long; cĕcĭdi, from cado, has the two first syllables short, but cēcīdi, from cædo, has the penultima long; the compounds of cado have i short, the compounds of cædo have i long; ambītus, the participle, has i long,

ambĭtus, the noun, has i short; fīdes, the noun, has i short, fīdes, the verb, has i long; īdem, masculine, is long, ĭdem, neuter, is short; dīco to *speak*, is long, dĭco to *dedicate*, short; vōces, from vox, has o long, vŏces, from voco, has o short; ōs, a *mouth*, is long, ŏs, a *bone*, is short; dŭcis, the noun, has u short, dūcis, the verb, has u long. But vīs, the noun, and vīs, the verb, are both long; custōdis, whether noun or verb, has o long; decōris, from decorus, or from decor, has o long, but decus, decŏris, has o short. The present and perfect tenses, are often distinguished by a short penultima in the former, and a long one in the latter, in the singular number; thus devĕnit and devēnit; effŏdit and effōdit; exĕdit and exēdit; effŭgit and effūgit. In the plural, i, in ĭmus of every perfect tense, Indicative and Potential, is short; but in the present of the fourth conjugation it is always long; of the third, short. These distinctions, however, afford no help in prosaic authors.

It is too late to decide upon the harmony of the Greek, and Latin languages, with certainty; but from all that we can learn of the sounds of their letters, their quantity, and accent, it does not appear probable, that English words could be spoken agreeably, or even, in our age, intelligibly, by their rules.

The numerous consonants, which precede, and follow, in many instances, the same vowel, and sometimes have each their own effect upon the syllable, we learn by custom to unite with facility; and they produce not only variety, but harmony.

In the grammar of our language, the subject of quantity appears in a great measure to be superseded by the rules for accents; accented syllables being, in English poetry, frequently substituted for long syllables in Greek, and Latin. Dr. Johnson seems to have considered accent, and quantity, in our language, to have been the same

thing. This others have asserted also, or at least they have conceded the point. But both existed, distinctly, in the Greek, and Latin languages.

If accent mean stress of voice, and quantity the time taken in pronouncing a syllable, they are different things with us. Thus in the words *cubic* and *elliptic* the penultimas are both accented; but in the first, *u* is long, in the last, *i* is short.(*d*) That accent supplies the place of length of time, in pronouncing many syllables in English, must be admitted.

The same substitution of accent for quantity existed in the Anglo-Saxon poetry. Quantity in Saxon words not having been necessary to poetry, it has been rarely, with respect to our language, a subject of inquiry. In derivatives from Greek and Latin words, the quantity, which was often certain in the primitives, has generally yielded to modern accentuation; whereby many a short syllable occupies the place of a long one, and answers all the purposes of versification. Yet still some knowledge of quantity, in our language, is essential to distinctness of pronunciation, and rhetorical smoothness; but it must be acquired by imitation of, and converse with, correct speakers, rather than from written rules, which are very imperfect. (*e*)

(*d*) But ellīpsis from ελλειψις has i long.

(*e*) It is some proof of the limited progress of the knowledge of quantity in English, that it has been affirmed, that there is no syllable long by nature, for every one may be pronounced short at pleasure. This is a mistake with respect to the characteristic of a syllable long by nature, for the ancients acknowledged, that these might be shortened by circumstances. It is perhaps true, that there is not a vowel in English, the long sound of which, as it is denominated, may not be shortened, that is, reduced in the time of utterance, at the will of the speaker.

The ancients were prevented by their mode of dividing syllables, from attending to the accentuation of consonants. The moderns, who are more addicted to the annexation of consonants to the foregoing syllables, make them, as frequently as they do the vowels, the subjects of accents in the Greek, and Latin languages, as well as in the English. In doing this, they hurry to the consonant, and shorten the vowel; (*f*) but when they accent the vowel, the sound is thereby lengthened.

The office of consonants is to modulate the sounds of vowels; but if we give to the semivowels a prolongation of the respective imperfect sounds, of which they are capable, before or after we have uttered the sounds of the vowels, which they accompany, we wholly relinquish propriety, in reading Greek, and Latin; and the melody of our own language will be thereby probably impaired.

The quantity of a vowel is very different from the kind of its sound; and many, if not each, of the kinds of vowels may be prolonged, or shortened; for example, the first a in fātalist, fătality; fäther, färcical. When the quantity is short, there is a rapid transition to the next consonant, or vowel; and we insensibly acquire the habit of associating such consonant with the preceding short vowel. Some writers, and teachers of grammar make this the test of a short syllable; but it is not a universal rule, for many syllables are long, which terminate with a consonant; as, ālms, āncient, āngle, cālm, Cāmbridge,

(*f*) It seems not a little singular, that an exactly contrary effect was wont to arise from the junction of the following consonant to the sound of the vowel next preceding. "Vocalem brevem, positione, quam vocant, ante duas consonantes fieri longam, omnes norunt, ejus quippe sonus conflictu quasi consonantium tardatur, ut *in-gens*. Sin vero sequentes consonantes ad proximam syllabam promoveri possunt, fit communis: dici enim potest vel *pāt-rem*, vel *pă-trem; smarāg-dos*, vel *smară-gdŏs*."

dānger, mānger; and others are short which terminate with a vowel, as Cătо, Crĕūsa, Cĭcĕro, cŏherent, Rŭbĭcŏn, unless we have changed the quantity of the syllables.

Equally fallacious is the modern rule, that accented vowels, not ending a syllable, are short; Pēnthēūs, Pīndărŭs, Cōlchĭs, and Cūrtĭŭs, which are given as examples, have respectively their first syllables in Latin long. They may also be pronounced long by the English reader, without changing the kind of sound, which the vowels have received with us. On the other hand, unaccented syllables are not therefore short; examples of this, such as, ānxiety, cūriosity, ēxile, the adjective, and the like are very numerous.

It is partly to be attributed to inattention to Latin quantity, and partly to a habit derived from the pronunciation of English nouns, that we generally lengthen the first vowel of Latin dissyllables. But that we shorten the first where words have three syllables, in that language, merely because we accent them, is not so easily conceded. Fābula, Rēgulus, sēparo, dēligo, nōbilis, may be accented on the first syllable of each, without shortening those syllables. Rĕmŏră, and cŭcŭmĭs, have each, every syllable short, and when accented on the first syllable, this should not be forgotten. The antepenultimate accent, in words derived from the Latin, and Greek; and the penultimate, when the distinguishing termination is but a single syllable, greatly prevail in the English language.

A multitude of adjectives of two syllables are derived from Latin adjectives, and participles of three; and generally our accent in such instances is on the first syllable. But when tables of such derivatives are examined with care, it will be found, that however the places of the accents may have been changed, the vowels should retain, more frequently than is supposed, their original quantity.

CHAPTER IV.

OF ACCENTS.

WRITTEN words were distinguished, in some ancient languages, by final characters; in modern times, a discrimination is more happily effected by spaces. Words spoken cannot, without too much delay, be distinguished by pauses. These are better adapted to the division of sentences; some time being properly assigned between them for reflection. The Greeks, and Latins, as well as our Saxon ancestors, rendered their words distinct, in speaking, by laying on each its own accent, which was a stress of voice upon some one syllable, rarely on two. It was of small importance, which syllable received it, provided its claim was generally respected in conversation. Because the relations of words to each other, in Greek, and Latin, depended more upon terminational distinctions, than the collocation of the words, it was essential to perspicuity, that the stress should fall near the end of the word. This reason however did not extend to the Saxon language, which often substituted words for cases, tenses and persons; and retained a successive disposition of terms. The accent, therefore, rested upon some vowel in the former, as readily as upon the latter; and distinguished the radical meanings, rather than the relations, under which, terms stood to each other.

The Saxon accentuation has, in many instances, descended to us with their words; some relics also, of the ancient tones, may have been derived from the Greeks, and Latins; and necessity has introduced a third kind, to distinguish those words, which, in other respects are the same.

Accent, accentus quasi adcantus, was also termed τονος, for the reading of the ancients was musical; the tone, or accent, being a stress of voice elevating, depressing, or quavering a syllable, or rather its vowel. But, in the English language, it is sometimes said, but with doubtful propriety, to fall upon a consonant. The stress of voice, we denominate accent, is rather an ictus than accentus. The ancients could rise, and fall, upon the same vowel, if a long one; and upon the shortest, a rise was distinguishable from a fall.

Accent is still more strictly taken, but less frequently, to denote some mark, or character, adopted to give notice of the stress of voice. In a living language, no such character is necessary, except for the purpose of instruction.

Accents were added to the Hebrew language, it is believed, long after it had ceased to be spoken, chiefly with a view to render perpetual discriminations of sound, deemed to be important. But they are not credible evidences, if modern, of the original, or even of a very ancient manner of reading.

Hebrew accents, are either tonic, which serve both as pauses, and, as it is said, for musical purposes also; or euphonic, or rhetorical, to amend the sound. The former are distinguished by the analogical names of emperors, or kings, princes and servants, to point out their subordination to each other. If a king be present with other points, it is equivalent to a period, a prince to a colon, a servant to a comma. When their dominions are circumscribed in shorter sentences, their subordination, or relative proportion of time, is preserved. In the same manner, so far as regards time, the period, colon, semicolon, and comma, may have, with us, their relative effects, and be in just proportion, whilst the reading may be performed with very different degrees of rapidity.

But the Masoretic accents have their effect upon the voice as well as the time. The reading in the synagogues is denominated *cantilating*, an unharmonious singing; and the tonic accents serve to direct the undulation of the note, as well as to interpose the requisite pauses.

The ancient Greeks had no characters for their accents, as clearly appears from inscriptions, medals, &c. They are said to have been introduced by Aristophanes; but these were not such as are at present used. The precise time, of the introduction of those now seen, is uncertain. They were invented, say some, a little before the time of Cicero, for the convenience of strangers; but others affirm, not before the seventh century.

There have been adopted in teaching the Greek and Latin, three characters for accents; but the effect is often allowed, where the character is not superscribed. The Anglo-Saxons had but one accent, and that corresponded to the acutus. (*a*) Every accented syllable was spoken with an additional stress of voice; and somewhat louder than those which had no accent; but whether the syllable thus accented was actually sounded upon a higher, or lower note, has been a subject of much controversy. The more common, and it is presumed the better opinion is, that there was only an intentional elevation, or depression, however small, of the sound of such syllable.

When the acute raises the voice, the elevation of the syllable over which it stands, can be effected, without protracting the sound, or increasing the quantity. Thus in dóminus, all the syllables are short; and the first, which is elevated, is not lengthened. So neither does the accent lessen the quantity; for in Románus the middle syllable is long, and its accentuation ought by no means

(*a*) "Nullum præter acutum, in lingua Anglo-Saxonica observavi."—Hickes.

to abbreviate it. The grave denoted a depression of the voice, but was equally remote from a design to affect the quantity. This is rarely marked, except on the last syllable, and then to depress a little, that which might otherwise be an acute: or rather, because every syllable was grave, which was not elevated by an expressed acute or circumflex, and so the mark of the grave being unnecessary, that mark was used to express an acute, when it fell upon the last syllable; and, for this reason, it is, by some, termed an oxyton. The circumflex is a compound of both, and denotes a rising and falling on the same syllable; but, as it is said, never a falling and rising. The circumflex of the voice could only be effected, upon vowels naturally long. Such were sounded, as if containing, without division, two vowels, the former with the acute, the latter with the grave accent. (*b*)

Some elevation seems necessary to the expressing of any word; (*c*) and this is to give it an acute accent; the voice when elevated must sink again, which is the grave. If the penultima be acute, the last is grave; if the antepenultima, both the following are grave, but not marked. If the voice must sink upon the elevated syllable, it is termed a circumflex; but the true idea, distinctive of the circumflex, is probably not known, and the imitation of

(*b*) The acute was called ὀξυς. Words, which had it on the last syllable, were called ὀξυτονα; on the penultima παροξυτονα; on the antepenultima προπαροξυτονα; the grave was called βαρυς. The grave on the last syllable βαρυτονος, which, except to change, or denote an oxyton, is not written. The circumflex, περισπωμενος, when on the last syllable; on the penultima προπερισπωμενος.

(*c*) The monosyllables αι, ει, εις, εκ, εν, ἐξ, ες, η, ο, οι, ου, ουκ, ουχ, and ως, are said to have no accent; but more properly, their sound was connected with the next word, and their effect thus lost in it; which appears from their accentuation at the end of a period, or verse.

it in modern times, by rising and falling on the same syllable, may be a very faint resemblance of its former practical use.

In ancient Greek, (*d*) and Latin, the accent was never carried back, farther than the antepenultimate syllable; as in the words Aristóteles, Blasphémia, Ecclésia. This might happen when the two last syllables were short, or when one of them was long. But two long syllables never followed the accent; for neither the Greeks nor Latins admitted four measures, or times, after an accent. Yet each could admit of three times, or measures, with, nevertheless, this difference; that in Greek the two measures might be in the penultimate, as ἄνθρωπος; but the accent must be removed to the penultima when the final syllable becomes long, as ἀνθρώπου. In Latin it was otherwise, for the two measures, or the long syllable may be the ultima, and the antepenultima retain the accent; as Dŏmĭnōs.

Because the circumflex contains a grave after the acute, in the same syllable, it is never followed by two syllables in the Greek language, or found over the antepenultima, but must be changed into an acute; (*e*) as σῶμα, σώματος; whereby the voice is kept from sinking, until it arrives at the next to the last syllable. In Latin

(*d*) In the Romaïc, or modern Greek, it is asserted by travellers, who have visited the Ionian Islands in the present day, that there is an "invariable observance of accent, "and disregard of quantity." From which we infer that the ancient accentuation is lost in speaking, though marked in writing. Vide note A.

(*e*) There are instances, in which the circumflex will be thought to occur over the penultima, but such exceptions are rather of two words, than one; thus it is found in ᾗτινι, ὧντινων, but it is because ᾗ and ὧν are entitled to the circumflex, when uncompounded.

also, when the penultima is circumflexed, the last syllable is ever a short one. (*f*)

The ancient pronunciation of the Greek language is lost; and it is not venturing too far to pronounce, that it will never be recovered by the rules for quantity, and accent, which exist; and the imperfections, in the rules for the regulation of accents, will, it is probable, never be fully remedied, nor is it important that they should.

The nearest imitation of the ancient reading is unpleasant, in modern times. Also the instances, in which the signification of the words can be freed from ambiguity by recourse to accents, are too few, to render this subject very important. But if it be allowed, that the ancient mode of reading could be recovered, the practice

(*f*) The rules for Latin and Greek accents have been *asserted* to be these. "In dissyllabical words," in the Latin language, "the first syllable always bore the acute. In "polysyllables the place of the acute was determined by "the quantity of the penultimate: if this was long, the acute "rested on it, if short, then the antepenultimate, whether "long or short, bore the acute."—"In Grecian speech the "accent was frequently, where in Latin it never occurred, "on the last syllable; and, indifferently on a long, or short "last syllable. When not on the last, its place was generally "determined by quantity; not, however, as in Latin, by the "quantity of the penultimate, but generally by that of the "last syllable: if this was long, the penultimate, whatever "its quantity, had the acute; if short, then, with a few ex-"ceptions, the antepenultimate had the acute. Before the "antepenultimate, equally in Greek and in Latin, the acute "was denied a place."—The circumflex "containing the "acute, was always the principal accent of the word. For "place, it was confined, in Greek, to the last syllable, and "the penultimate; in Latin, equally with the simple acute, "it was denied to the last syllable." *Mitford, Esq.*

of reading Greek, according to the rules of Latin accent, modified by vernacular habits, has become too general to admit of easy correction. (*g*)

Whilst the Greeks wrote altogether in capitals, without spaces between their words, or sentences; and without either pauses, or characters denoting accents; we must suppose, that they could speak, not only distinctly, and intelligibly, but gracefully, and pathetically; and that in practice they adopted both emphases and accents. To deny them this, is to deny the most refined people in the world, what savages themselves might claim. They certainly knew how to give to each word its proper accent; they could also place the emphasis, according to the sense, on the proper word; and make it fall most heavily upon the accented syllable; or change it to any other syllable, when a contrast was designed. But la-

(*g*) —"False quantity may often be substituted for true, "not only without offence, but even with gratification to the "ear, and with offence only to the knowledge stored in the "scholar's mind."—"The truth, let it not offend, is, that the "harmony produced by Italian and English scholars in their "pronunciation of Latin verse, however pleasing, is not "harmony of quantity, but harmony of accent; the verse as "they speak it, is not metrical, but, like their vernacular "verse, accentual."—"A hexameter verse, to please us, "must have five strong accents: the three former, whether "on long or short syllables, matters not; the two last must "be on syllables long by rule. But the modern ear is care-"less about length of syllables in pronunciation: the sylla-"bles, on which the two last strong accents fall, may be "short in pronunciation, without offence to the modern ear; "which requires them on syllables long by rule, not through "any regard for length of syllables, but because the ancient "rule of verse requires long syllables, when the modern "ear requires the two last, strong accents." *Mitford, Esq.*

bour expended to recover, by the use of imperfect rules, that pronunciation, which did almost put imitation at defiance, whilst the language was living, can be productive of no other advantage to the world, than that of example. For if the object were attained, the fortunate proficient can understand the books, written in the Greek language, no better than he, who reads them as if in his native tongue.

Very little more can be alleged, though we use, with very few exceptions, the Latin alphabet, for spending months and years, in learning to read according to the quantity, and accents of the Romans. But because we derive laws, science, and religion, from the Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, and have adopted their words, as well as ideas; the meanings and derivations of them, and the construction of sentences, in each of those three dead languages, is well worthy of investigation with the most assiduous care. In the Latin language some rules of accent may easily be acquired, and must be, because it is expected of the scholar.

Monosyllables, if long by nature, containing two measures, are circumflexed, which is really an acute and grave; but when short, or only long by position, this is impracticable, they therefore receive only an acute. A penultima long by nature is circumflexed, in dissyllables, if the final syllable be short, as Rômă; in other instances, dissyllables have, in general, the acute on the penultima, as hómo. Polysyllables are circumflexed on every long penultima, if the last syllable be short; as Românus; if the two last be long, the penultima is accented as paréntes; but if the two last syllables be short, it is thrown back upon the antepenultima as dóminus.

But to these rules there are many exceptions; arising from the composition of words, particularly with indeclinable particles; from contracted syllables; and from

the effect of enclitics. Thus *ne*, *que*, and *ve*, draw towards them the accent, upon the last syllable of the word; as ámat, amátque.

In general, when we read Latin, we should elevate the voice on the first syllable in words of two; and, if it be rendered a trisyllable by the annexation of an enclitic, we should elevate the voice on the middle, or penultimate syllable. But útique, dénique, úndique, and such, which are denominated simple, are to be accented on the antepenultima.

The circumflex, on the final syllable of the ablative of the first declension, is justly accounted an errour, for the accent is no mark of quantity. The grave, on the last syllable of certain adverbs, is said to be also by mistake; such character of an accent, if it be a correct index of the stress of voice, ought not in every instance, to be printed over that syllable. But those characters are not usually esteemed signs of accents.

Emphasis is an additional stress of voice, and distinctness of articulation, laid on some important word, whereby it is distinguished from the other words in the sentence, and the attention of the hearer called to it. As accent is a stress laid on some particular syllable of a single word, to which it claims a prescriptive right, it must generally direct to the syllable, which is the seat of the emphasis; this, therefore, merely augments the stress. Errours in emphasis disgrace the orator, produce disgust, and destroy his usefulness; mistakes in accentuation expose the party's ignorance of grammar, condemn his education, and ensure contempt. Want of sensibility, of inventive powers, or of early association with the refined, prove often barriers insurmountable in the acquisition of the former, and furnish some apology; but accent, with a few provincial exceptions, may be acquired by proper

application to suitable helps; here, therefore, an excuse is rarely allowed.

Even market women, in Athens, could distinguish strangers, after all pains had been taken by them, to learn the Greek language correctly. The least errour in accent, or quantity, on the Roman stage, was perceived, and reprobated. Such nice distinctions became impracticable, and were deemed unnecessary, when those languages declined. These representations are the more credible, because the ears of our fellow citizens are, with almost equal delicacy, affected by errours in accent, which obtain in speaking our own language. So exquisite is their sensibility, that a few misplaced accents will often condemn the most laboured discourse. Emphasis, with some propriety, was denied a place in grammatical instruction, and was not usually, if in any instance, distinguished from its coincident accent, by the Greeks, and Romans. But unless we could hear them speak, we ought not to admit, that emphasis was not comprehended, in what is said by the grammarians of those languages about accents; especially, since quantity, and accent, with them, must have been very different from the modulations of the voice, which we now understand by those terms. (*h*)

As the Greek and Latin vowels, retained in the English language, have been almost wholly changed from

(*h*) The same may be affirmed of the quantity, accent, and emphasis of the Anglo-Saxons. Their poetry was sometimes rhyme, in other instances it resembled Greek and Latin verse, again it was free from all rule, and consisted of flights of imagination, and multiplied tropes.—" Versuum— " mensuram—plurimorum—metra nullâ unquam possimus " conjecturâ assequi: quantitas enim syllabarum, natura " longarum breviumque, hodie penitus ignoratur." Gram. Anglo-Sax. Oxon.

their ancient sounds; so that, which is denominated accent with us, must greatly differ from the ancient acute, grave, or circumflex. English accent, nevertheless, may possess a rising, or a falling inflexion, according to the situation of the word in the sentence; it may become the seat of the emphasis; or it may legitimately be so overruled by the emphasis of the speaker, as to be placed on a syllable, which has no title, except from such peculiarity of circumstances, to the accent.

Accent, with us, is said to be a mere stress of voice, which lengthens a vowel-sound not terminated by a consonant, or, in other instances, alights upon a consonant. When such syllable is short, we necessarily hasten to the next; and to discriminate, with which of them the intervening consonant, when there is but one, has been connected in pronouncing the word, is often too difficult to warrant a peremptory conclusion, that, in such instance, the stress has fallen on the consonant, and united it to the foregoing vowel. Thus, in the word *women*, the *o* is sounded like *e*, or *i*, and the accent is on the first syllable; but whether we say *wo-men*, or *wom-en*, is less clear than many teachers seem to imagine; so in the word *position;* do we pronounce *po-si-ti-on* or *po-sit-ion*, or, in some other manner? (*i*)

But this indecision, with respect to the place of the succeeding consonant, which the rapidity of the sound of the preceding short vowel occasions, makes it unnecessary to object to the rule, which appears in the general to be true; that the vowel is long, when the accent falls on it, and short, when the accent alights on the consonant, which follows it.

An accent, which points to the syllable most important to discover the original, or leading idea, is termed

(*i*) Vide ante p. 50, and 51.

radical; and is said to be most frequent in words originally Saxon. We certainly have not derived accents, on the first syllables of long words, from the Greeks, and Romans. We could have gained from them only those, which are denominated the *terminational* accents. Others, which we adopt emphatically to distinguish one compounded word from another, as *ínclude* from *éxclude;* or to distinguish nouns from verbs, have been termed *distinctive.*

Accents are also divided into principal, and secondary. A secondary accent is such, with respect to the degree of the stress of voice, which is to be given its syllable; for though it implies another accent on the same word, the secondary may be first in order. The existence of this has been denied, perhaps because two never obtained in the same Latin, or Greek word. But such words as *júxtaposítion*, *dísreputátion*, and the like, to many ears have two accents. Three accents have been attributed to some words; as to the word *váletúdinárian;* such pronunciation is practicable, but its necessity is questionable; and if unnecessary, it is improper, because of the delay. To adopt, and place an accent arbitrarily on a syllable, that had been a stranger to it, to avoid a secondary one, is also of doubtful propriety. Thus *centrifugal* was accented on the first and third syllables; this pointed us to κέντρον, and fŭga, of which it was compounded; but some modern lexicographers have reduced the two to one, and placed that, over the antepenultimate, probably because the *u* in *fuga* is short.

That every word has an accent, is almost proverbial among grammarians.(*k*) But if accent denote, with us, a stress of voice superadded to the natural sound of the syllable, this is incorrect. Many monosyllabic pronouns, and particles, though necessarily audible, when alone,

(*k*) Vide ante p. 52.

are sometimes scarcely heard. When put artificially, and occasionally otherwise, they become emphatic, and are said, we presume not improperly, to be accented.

A few dissyllables are thought, either to have no accent, or to receive on each syllable an equal stress; but, perhaps, this is a mistake. It is a very leading feature in dissyllables, that nouns have the accent on the first, and verbs on the last syllable. The necessity of discrimination has led the public, either insensibly, or with design, to establish this rule; to which, nevertheless, a contemptible pedantry, or pride of singularity, has created a considerable number of exceptions. But some are legitimate; for example, when nouns are used as verbs, or verbs as nouns, they often retain their accents. Also, dissyllables, formed from monosyllables, are generally accented on the first syllable.

No infallible rule can be laid down for the distinction of trisyllabic nouns, and verbs, by their accents; yet nouns seem generally to receive the accent on the first, and verbs on the second syllable. The accent is on that syllable, which expresses the original radix, in Saxon words; yet this may, nevertheless, be obscured from various causes. English terminations, added to derivative words, rarely remove the accent from the syllable, which antecedently possessed it. Whilst, on the other hand, some verbs of three syllables, compounded of a preposition, and some other word, retain the accent on the ultimate; but words ending in *ate*, *ise*, and *ize*, rarely admit the accent on the last syllable.

In polysyllables only, are found principal, and secondary accents; and the third, where it exists. More than one accent on a word may happily prevent the succession of several weak syllables; and such increase may be no less important in relief of the speaker, than to discover

the primitive words, which are included in the compound; or to direct the attention to the several ideas, which they express, might be to the hearer. In many instances, the primitives, nevertheless, drop their accents, and the compound word receives a new one; generally on the last vowel of the first radix, if it be an antepenultimate syllable.

In proper names, derived from the Latin, and Greek, dissyllables are accented on the first syllable, very rarely on the last. If the penultimate of a polysyllable was long, in those languages, it is usually accented in ours. But if it was short, the accent is on the antepenultimate. Where proper names, or appellatives, brought from the Greek, and Latin, are written in English, with fewer syllables, they have changed the place of their ancient accent, and the stress must be laid on some prior syllable; as Romăni, Rómans.

Accents, on the former part of long uncompounded words, in which accents were almost as permanent as the syllables, have been generally referred to the Saxon language; but if upon either the penultima or antepenultima, to the Latin, or Greek. Those which are accented on the last syllable, are sometimes from the French. The same word, consisting of the same letters, is not only differently accented, to distinguish the noun from the verb, or adjective; but sometimes, also, to denote different senses.

We have seen,(*l*) that the Romans accented, most frequently, the long penultimate vowel; but the Greeks, if the ultimate was short, accented the antepenultimate. Many words come to us from them, bearing their own respective accents; and some from the Greek language, with the Latin accent. In English the propensity seems to be, to accent, and shorten the antepenultimate.

(*l*) Vide p. 56.

Accent with us, differs materially from accents with the Greeks, and Romans, who chiefly regarded quantity. The oratorical, or emphatic accent, is of great importance to a speaker of the English language; which would otherwise be excessively tedious, from the frequent use of consonants. If the quantity of every vowel should have its full tale, and occupy the same time in sentences, as when alone, experience would soon discover, that the accent of our hardy ancestors, though very different from, is much more expeditious, than the musical tones of the refined Greeks. Precipitancy of utterance, nevertheless, is a dangerous evil, and a principal source of indistinctness. Where the articulation is clear, the sounds of the letters, and the quantity, as well as the places of the accents known, and the most natural seat of the emphasis well understood; there, many of the monosyllables, and the short unaccented sounds will be merely heard; each word of two, or more syllables, being chiefly distinguished by its accented syllable.

Rules, for ascertaining the places of the accents on English words, have been framed, and numerous exceptions collected with care. But to retain them in the memory, when we discover not their accordance with reason, is extremely difficult. Nevertheless, by unremitting attention to practice, and by care in removing our doubts, as they spring, we may arrive at so much correctness in accentuation, as to save our fellow citizens much of the trouble, which they would otherwise incur, by being laid under the necessity of censuring our defects.

NOTE A. TO CHAPTER IV. P. 53.

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΤΗΛΕΓΡΑΦΟΣ

περιοδικὴ ἐφημερὶς πολιτικὴ, φιλολογικὴ τε καὶ ἐμπορικη.

ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΑΙ ΕΙΔΗΣΕΙΣ.

16. Νοεμβριυ 1815.

ΙΣΠΑΝΙΚΗ ΑΜΕΡΙΚΗ.

Καὶα τὰς νεωτάτας ἐξ Ἀμερικῆς εἰδήσεις, ὁ βασιλικὸς στραληγὸς τῆς Ἱσπανιας Μορῖλλος ἐκυρίευσε τὴν πόλιν Καρθαγένην ἀπὸ τους ἀποστάτας δίχα τινος αἱματοχυσιας.

The Æneis of Virgil, in Russian Greek verse, by Eugenius de Bulgaris, printed at Petersburg, 1791, begins thus:

Ὅς ποτε λεπταλέῳ καλάμῳ ἔπος ἔπνεον ᾠδὸν,
Τλῶν δ' ἐκπροϊὼν τὰς ἄγχι ἄνωγα, ἀρούρας,
Ρ'ᾶστα γεπονίονθ' ὑποεικειν, κἀι τ'ἀκορέστῳ
Ἠ'δυτι ἀγροϊεροισι μέλος· νυν Α''ρεος ἀινὰ
Τεύχει ἀείδω, Ἄνδρα τε, ὅς πρῶτος δὴ Τροίης
Ἔξορος Ἰταλιηνδ' ὑπὸ Μοιρῶν ἦλθεν, ἰδ' ἀκτάς
Δαβινίους, ἀνὰ γῆν τ'ἀνά πόντον πολλ' ἐπαληθεὶς,
Δαιμονίη τε Οἰη, διὰ θ' Ἥρης μνήμονα μῆνιν
Νηλείος· πολέμῳ πολλὰ τλὰς κτιζεν τ'ὅτ' ἄσυ,
Ἐν δ' εἰσῆγε Θεοὺς Λατίῳ, γένος ἔνθα Λατίνων,
Ἀλβάνιοἰ τε πάτρες, καὶ γ'αἵπης Τείχια Ῥωμης
Μοῦσα, ἰφ' ὅις μοι μνῆσον· ὅτου δ'ἅρα Δάιμονος ἄτῃ,
Τίπλε δ' ἐπαχθομένη κρείουσα Θεῶν, τὸσ' ἐλίττειν,
Δεινὰ τον ἐυσεβιῃ περίσημον, τόσσα τ' ἀνατλᾶν
Θήκατο; ἦ τόσος ἔσι χόλος φρίσὶν ὑρανίοισιν; &c.

I'lle ego, qúi quondám gracilí modulátus avéna
Cármen; et égressús sylvís, vicína coëgi
U't quamvís avidó parérent árva colóno;
Grátum opus ágricolís: at núnc horrêntia Mártis
A'rma virúmque canó, Trojæ' qui prímus ab óris
I'taliám, fató profugús, Lavínaque vénit

Lítora; múltum ille ét terrís jactátus et álto,
Ví superû'm, sævæ' memorém Junónis ob íram.
Múlta quoque ét belló passús, dum cónderet úrbem,
Inferrétque Deós Latió: genus únde Latínum,
Albaníque patrés, atque áltæ mœ'nia Rómæ.
Músa, mihí causás memorá: quo númine læ'so
Quídve doléns regína Deû'm, tot vólvere cásus
Insigném pietáte virúm, tot adíre labóres
Impulerít. Tantæ'ne animís cœléstibus íræ?

Poetical accents have been here inserted in the Latin, to exemplify modern substitution of accent for quantity. The Greek is read in the same manner, but the above extracts bear the accents, which the modern Greeks had given them. Vide pp. 54, 55.

I

AN ESSAY ON GRAMMAR.

PART II.

OF WORDS.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF WORDS.

THE accurate knowledge of words, and of their changes, is indispensable to the clear discernment of their legitimate combinations in sentences, according to the usages of the language, to which they belong.

The purposes, for which words are introduced into sentences, are various; and, in correspondence to these, a distribution has been made of all words into classes, denominated parts of speech, to the intent, that as often as a word of a particular sort may be used, its effect may be distinguished, the sentence analyzed, and the legitimate meaning discovered with precision.

The names of the distributive parts should either express, distinctly, the influence, which each class produces on sentences; or some other characteristic trait, by which the respective species of words may be distinguished, without danger of confusion. It is at least probable, that no distribution, sufficiently minute, can ever be made, of the parts of speech, which shall be wholly free from all objection. Hasty innovations, therefore, and crude conjectures, should not be permitted to disturb that course of grammatical instruction, which has been advancing in

melioration, by the unremitting labours of thousands, through a series of ages.

The essentials of speech were anciently supposed to be sufficiently designated by the noun, or name of that, of which we speak; and verb, the word, or that, which we speak, or affirm; but to these was added the conjunction. In modern times, the component parts of speech have been by some denominated substantives, attributives, and connectives. The article was distinguished by the ancient Greeks; and this has occasioned the name definitives, a fourth part of speech. Abbreviations have been also suggested, as a distinct kind of words; but this term regards their origin, not their nature or effects, and may therefore comprehend other parts, and produce confusion.

Grammarians have very naturally distinguished between the noun, and its pronoun; the preposition, and the conjunction; the verb, and the adverb. But they have sometimes left the substantive, and the adjective, parts wholly distinct, to bear the common appellation of noun, whilst they have rent asunder the participle from its parent verb. In English it scarcely deserves the name participle, since it has neither number, nor gender; case, nor declension.

The later Greek grammarians made eight parts of speech; ἄρθρον, *article;* ὄνομα, *noun;* ἀντωνυμία, *pronoun;* ῥῆμα, *verb;* μετοχὴ *participle;* ἐπίῤῥημα, *adverb;* πρόθεσις, *preposition;* σύνδεσμος, *conjunction.* The Romans had no article, but retained the same number, by distinguishing, between adverbs, and interjections.

English grammarians have generally followed the parts of speech, adopted in the Latin language; with the addition of articles, making the number, in the whole, nine; but the adjective should be distinguished from the noun, and the participle restored to the verb.

Nouns stand for persons, things, or qualities. Articles limit appellative nouns, to denote species, or individuals; or designate known individuals. Adjectives express the concrete qualities of persons, or things. Pronouns are substitutes for names, qualities, or propositions. Verbs predicate, connect attributes, or denote actions. Participles are parts of verbs, expressing their attributes, or action, with time; but without assertion, yet assuming what the verb asserts. Adverbs express circumstances, or modifications of actions, or qualities. Interjections are natural sounds, or intercalary words, or sentences. Prepositions express relations, and connect words with sentences. Lastly, conjunctions, whilst they also express various relations, do connect sentences; or introduce words, under the same circumstances, into one sentence, producing the effects of different propositions.

The number of the parts of speech may be reduced, or enlarged, at pleasure;(*a*) and the rules of syntax may be accommodated to such new arrangement. The best grammarians find it difficult, in practice, to distinguish, in some instances, adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions; yet their effects are generally distinct. This inconvenience should be submitted to, since a less comprehensive distribution would be very unfavourable, to a rational investigation of the meaning of English sentences.

In the Hebrew language, the greater portion of the roots are verbs, which are used as substantives, adjectives, or other parts of speech, often without any change. And as the regular radices consist each of three letters, they may have been all monosyllables; except, when more than one of those three are vowels; a case which is often

(*a*) —" In quibus, scil. *partibus orationis*, tanta est inconstantia grammaticorum, ut nihil certi nobis adhuc potuerint constituere." *Sanctius*.

remedied by dropping a vowel; as aleph, he, jod, or oin. In this, there exists a similarity with the colloquial medium of the Chinese, which, is, perhaps, altogether monosyllabic.

Professor Carey, in his Burman, and Bengalee grammars, says, that in those languages the most useful distribution of words is into, "discriminating words, and—words to be discriminated; the first are adjectives, adverbs, &c. which express the quality, or circumstances of any thing or action, and the last the thing or action itself." He also mentions, that the Burmans, by means of participles of every mode and time, exclude the use of antecedent and relative pronouns; and "are enabled to carry on a subject, by interweaving one sentence with another, to any extent they please without coming to a conclusion."

CHAPTER II.

OF NOUNS.

THE term substantive, without an unwarrantable extension of its natural meaning, is too limited for the purposes of grammarians, and to rack ingenuity, by imagining abstract, and artificial substances for its support, is unnecessary. The old term, noun, is sufficiently expressive of the sort of words here intended, if we exclude adjectives from its comprehension.

Nouns, from ὀνομα, nomen, *name*, are the names or signs of ideas; or they are the names of persons, things, abstract qualities, or their respective negatives. When they are the names of individuals, they are denominated proper, and are so much their own, that they ought not to be changed, in translations from one language to another. When they belong to all of a species, or genus, they are termed common. When a number of individuals, in some respects, resemble each other, and we, by omitting the distinguishing peculiarities, and abstracting the common properties, denominate every individual, that possesses them, by the same term, this is an appellative noun. As often as the generic name is used, even though the attention be fixed on an individual, specific differences are presumed to be excluded. The species being to the genus, what individuals are to the species, they are formed by the same kind of generalization, and their respective names are alike termed, by grammarians, nouns-common.

These render language more permanent; for whilst individuals are successively falling and rising, common names remain. Yet this advantage is, perhaps, balanced

by the ambiguity they occasion; for different minds are perpetually liable to embrace more or fewer of the common properties, and thus to understand different things by the same name. (*a*) But sometimes a single quality is separated, and receives a name, which is then called an abstract term; as whiteness, thought, &c.

As common names cannot, in ordinary cases, express all the attributes, included in the complex ideas denoted by them, they often, at least in their origin, point to some principal property. Yet this, when investigated, may afford a very inadequate conception of the meaning intended. Sometimes the etymological investigation terminates in the discovery of a mere analogy; thus nouns expressive of moral virtues, intellectual faculties, mental exercises, and abstract ideas, for the most part, radically signify sensible objects.

As proper names may become common, and be used in the plural, so common names, by the addition of terms of particularity, and from various other circumstances, may become nouns-proper.

Nouns-common may be used in a collective sense, thus, the word man, comprehends the race. If this had been their natural and usual signification, individuals must have been always designated by some term of specification. To obviate this inconvenience, a common name, may stand for one, or for more, of a species or genus; and it accordingly admits, in the most instances, of a singular, and of a plural form.

(*a*) In the same manner it has often happened, that the same thing, has received numerous names, in different languages, according as its various causes, appearances, or effects were noticed by those who gave them. "Sic Græci ἄνεμον, Latini *ventum* appellavere; illi ab spirando, hi a *veniendo*." Sanctii Minerva.

Neither the Greek, nor the Hebrew language, had originally a dual number; the latter, read without points, still knows no dual, but the Greek has its ἑνικος, δυϊκος, and πληθυντικὸς. The dual, however, is rarely used, being chiefly confined to natural pairs, or to express union in authority, or duty. In other circumstances the plural is generally substituted.

Nouns-proper, when the names of individuals, exclude the idea of plurality; abstract terms, as the virtues, and vices; also herbs, and things weighed, and measured, with few exceptions, follow the same rule. But when they imply plurality, the singular is, in some instances, as in the names of cities, not used. Also proper names, by frequency, publicity, and other means, often become appellatives, and admit a plural.

Greek, and Latin nouns had various final syllables, to denote plurality. In these, the latter will be found to have followed, generally, the former. About one third of the varieties, in the declensions of the Greeks, terminated the nominative plural in iota; and these nominatives were probably taken from the Hebrew, and Chaldaic plurals in jod, in construction. (*b*)

(*b*) Reason would seem to dictate, that the characteristic of plurality, affixed to the singular, should be taken in every language from some word signifying many, or multitude. Accordingly the plurals of Indian nouns, in Elliot's Bible, almost without exception, have one of two terminations, according to their gender; and these are the final syllables of two words which signify *many*. In like manner masculine nouns, in Hebrew, chiefly end in ים, *im*, some feminines in ות, *tim*, but more usually by contraction in ת. These are evidently from המה, *multitude*, the final ה of which is omissible. The Hebrew language has also ין, *in*, as the Chaldees had ין, a masculine, and ן, *n*, a feminine plural termination. It is probable, these were from המון, *multitude*.

The ordinary plural in English nouns was, perhaps mediately, borrowed from the Latins. It is made by adding s, or, for distinctness of sound, es, as book, books; box, boxes; church, churches. O final, in some words, takes s, and, in others, es; as folios, cargoes. (*c*)

Y, following a consonant, is changed into ies, for the old termination was ie, in the singular; as vanity, vanities. Final f, and fe, are generally substituted by ves; as leaf, leaves; life, lives; but grief makes griefs, and ruff, ruffs; proof, reproof, relief, &c. also add an s.

Foreign words often bring their own plurals with them into our language; as cherubim, data, ellipses, radii, hiatus, species, beaux, &c.

The names of sciences, as ethics, and many other nouns, as billiards, measles, and especially such as are used collectively for a whole kind or species, as cattle; and those which naturally or artificially include plurality, as lungs, bellows, either have no singular, or it is made by prefixing an article, or other definitive word; as an alms, a youth, a sheep, this deer; amends, victuals, odds, and some other words are probably singular; (*d*) but news and means are singular, or plural, according to the sense.

As a different inflexion to mark the plural produces a great saving of words, in conversation; and convenience, or necessity, has rendered this distinction almost univer-

(*c*) In the Saxon, boc, *a book*, was in the plural bec; so fot, *a foot*, plural, fet, *feet;* wif-man, *a woman*, plural, wif-men, *women;* lus, *a louse*, made lys, *lice;* mus, *a mouse*, plural, mys, *mice;* cu, *a cow*, plural, cy, *kine;* toth, *a tooth*, plural, teth and tothas, *teeth;* gos, *a goose*, plural, ges, *geese.*

(*d*) We can say an amends, an odds, but not a victuals; such words bear a close affinity unto Greek and Latin neuter adjectives in the plural, such as cibaria, imparia, ἤθικα, and the like: which, in Greek, accord with singular verbs.

sal; so there is another discrimination to be made, dictated by nature herself, in the diversity of sex.

Things without life, and consequently of neither sex, and termed accordingly neuters in the English language, are mostly masculine in the Hebrew. (*e*) Also the masculine and neuter terminations were ever the same in the genitives, datives and ablatives, of both numbers with the Latins, in their adjectives, participles and pronouns; and in the genitives and datives, singular and plural, and in all cases of the dual among the Greeks. The same similarity obtained also, with a few exceptions, between masculine and neuter nouns, of the same declension, in the oblique cases in both those languages.

In the Greek and Latin languages, although the α, and the η, or e, are usually feminine terminations, any final letter may terminate a masculine or feminine noun, and its gender will be, according as the word may denote a male, or a female. But the Greeks had nouns which they termed ουδέτερα, of neither gender, and the Latins in like manner had a similar kind which they termed neuters. To this class all inanimate things ought to have been referred; but they generally were, in each of these languages, as they had universally been in the Hebrew, deemed of different genders, without regard to the truth of the fact: unless feminines, only, denoted a sex.

In the Greek and Roman languages, there are also many nouns, which signify females as well as males;

(*e*) In the Hebrew language, there are but two genders, as in the French, the masculine and feminine; and to one of these belong every noun, and every third person of every verb. In nouns, the feminine is designated by a final ה or ת with very few exceptions; in verbs the ה postfixed makes the third person singular, feminine, of the perfect tense, in all the conjugations, and the ת prefixed, the future.

which must never be used in any, except the masculine gender. These are termed common in signification. There are others, perhaps as numerous, that are used either in the masculine, or feminine gender. These are common in construction, κοινα, *communia.*

The appellative names of many living creatures are uniformly of one gender, but include under it both the sexes; this is denominated the epicene, επικοινον, *supercommune, more than common.* When the sex is to be distinguished, this is to be effected by some other word or words. As Passer, qui est fœmina. Felis, quæ est mas. Eliphas gravida implies fœmina, because Eliphas is masculine. Daughters are liberi. So timidi damæ, and talpæ oculis capti imply masculi. The Greeks used ὁ λεων for a *lioness;* τον αιγα for a *she-goat*, and the like. The επικοινον differs from the κοινον in this, that whilst the former remains of one gender, as when Pliny says, " Mus marinus parit ova," the latter may be of either gender, as hic canis, *a dog*, hæc canis, *a bitch.* The epicene and the common in signification appear to differ only in this respect, that the former is applied to beasts, birds, reptiles, fishes and insects; whilst the latter denotes human beings; as homo, advena, agricola, assecla, accola, exul, latro, fur, opifex, which are masculines; operæ, vigiliæ, and excubiæ, feminines; and scortum, mancipium, and servitium, neuters.

Nouns are said to be of the doubtful gender, when they are used promiscuously; which sometimes happens in the same sentence; thus, dies in the singular is masculine, or feminine, and vulgus masculine, or neuter.

In the English language nouns are denominated masculines or feminines, according to the sex which they denote. There are many nouns common to those classes, and may signify either males or females, or even include both. Such are friend, enemy, parent, cousin, and the

like. Nouns signifying inanimate things, which are without sex, are called neuter. This is a happy improvement, begun in the Greek, carried on in the Roman, and perfected in our language.

The difference of the sexes is designated by distinct names. Words, which stand for both sexes, are freed from ambiguity, by prefixing the words man, male, he, &c. maid, female, she, &c., or by the annexation of some other word discriminative of gender. Or, and er, are generally masculine terminations; ess, ine, and ix are usually feminine.

Gender may be figuratively attributed to things of no sex; but poetical, and rhetorical fancy must, in the exercise of this privilege, conform to custom. The sun, the ocean, time, death, sleep, &c. must never, in English, be deemed feminines; nor the moon, the earth, cities, ships, virtues, vices, fortune, &c. be accounted males, at the hazard of grammatical reputation.

The state, or the situation of the noun with respect to the proposition, or sentence, was denominated its case, *casus*, πτωσις. When a noun occupied in a sentence the condition of subject or attribute, agent or object, cause or effect, its case was termed right or direct, πτωσις ορθη, *casus rectus*. When nouns were introduced into the sentence in any other manner; for example, as the origin of the agent, the instrument of the action, or the end designed, their cases or positions were said to be indirect, or oblique. These, in languages, which admit variety in the collocation of the words, have been, for the sake of perspicuity, denoted by terminations, which distinguish them from the direct cases, and also, in some instances, from each other.

There is some discordancy in the opinions of the ancients with respect to cases. The Stoics denominated the first case πτωσις ορθη, *casus rectus*, because the word

fell thus directly from the mind; the others were πτωσις πλαγιαι *casus obliqui*, because they fell from the mind under some variation. The Peripatetics imagined the first was not a case, and that the others were πτωσις, *casus* because they fell or varied from the natural state of the word. The Latin names have been thus explained; nominat, gignit, dat, accusat, vocat, aufert.

The vocative, or addressing case in the Greek, was ever among the Attics, whose language was deemed the most refined, the same as the πτωσις ορθη, or nominative. (*f*) The other dialects, for the sake of euphony, or distinction, often cast away a final ς from the nominative, in all the declensions; or change a long vowel in the final syllable, into a short one. The infrequency of the use of vocatives in the dual, and plural, it may be presumed, was the reason, that they never varied from the nominatives.

Among the Romans, the vocative never varied from the nominative; except when they followed the Greeks, by casting away s; and this was chiefly confined to the second declension, where us final, which is the Greek ος, is changed into e; or if us followed i in the nominative of proper names, it was merely omitted to avoid the effect of two vowels in the end of the word. The rare occurrence of the vocatives of appellatives of this description, has left, perhaps all, but filius and genius, exceptions to the rule.

The genitive case was probably so denominated, because the word, in that form, denoted the thing signified, under the relation of producing something; or it imported some kind of origination of motion.

(*f*) Hence we read; Ἡ παῖς, ἐγείρου; Luke viii. Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς. Heb. i.

The dative case was used, when any thing was given; and exhibited the thing signified by the noun, under the relation of receiving; or as an object, towards which there was a tendency. It was therefore precisely opposed to the genitive, a fact perhaps without exception in syntactical government. In Greek every dative except Ἰησοῦ, and such, once terminated in iota, but in time, it was placed under α, η, and ω.

The ablative, or casus Latinus, expressed the means and instrument; but, because these were connected with the beginning, the ablative was often put for the genitive; and as it is also frequently connected with the end, it is then put for the dative. The Latins, in their second declension, and often in their third, in the singular, and always in the plural, made their ablatives like their datives; or rather, in fact, they were the same. Among the Greeks, the dative form, preceded by a preposition, was anciently called casus præpositionis. Sanctius thought, that as the dative expressed the end, or term, to which any thing or action tended, the same termination following a preposition, in a sense entirely different, should be distinguished by a different name.(*g*) In Cicero

(*g*) His Aristarchus severely reprobates this opinion, in his notes; and alleges, that the argument would prove too much, because many prepositions are put with the genitive, which neither denote origin, nor possession. Perizonius himself inclines to the sentiment, which, though plausible in some respects, has never been supported fully; that every ablative in the Latin was once written as the dative; thus a, in the ablative singular of the first declension, he says, was long, because anciently written, as the dative, in ai, which afterwards became æ. And he attempts to show a probability, that like changes obtained in the ablatives singular of the third, fourth, and fifth declensions.

we read, " Nunquam in majore ἀπορίᾳ," which either makes ἀπορίᾳ an ablative, or is a violation of concord.

The Latins never connected simple prepositions with the genitive, or dative; because, although the same relations might have been expressed by prepositions, they were unnecessary.

The Greek language, which is exuberant in various respects, added prepositions to enforce the expressiveness of their genitives and datives; and also because these two cases were not sufficient, without such aid, to express discriminately the various relations of origin and end, motion and rest, time and place. (*h*)

The object of an action is distinguished, regularly, in the Greek and Latin languages, by the accusative termination. In both, it is the same with that of the subject in neuters, for no discrimination between the nominative

(*h*) Doctor Carey, in his grammar of the Burman language, p. 42. says, " Nouns have seven cases; the nomina-
" tive, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, possessive
" and locative. Also the vocative, which is accounted a
" particular form of the nominative.

" According to Mag*u*dh*a* grammarians the cases are
" also denominated—the first;—the second;—the third;—
" the fourth;—the fifth;—the sixth; and—the seventh.

" When in construction with verbs, the cases are deno-
" minated—the agent;—the object;—the instrument;—the
" giving;—the taking away;—the connecting; and—the
" possessing form.

" The vocative is called—the case of familiarity. It is
" divided into—friendly,—respectful, and—disrespectful."

The cases are formed by affixing terminations, which he thus translates; Nom. *a man*; Acc. *man;* Instr. *by*, *with*, or *for a man;* Dat. *to*, or *for a man;* Abl. *from*, *because of*, less *than*, more *than a man;* Poss. *man's;* Loc. *in*, or *respecting a man.* The plural is in the same manner.

and accusative is necessary, where the thing is incapable of becoming an agent.

It is not worth disputing, whether cases mean changes of terminations, or various conditions of the nouns, in which they may stand related to sentences. It is a fact nevertheless, that the different terminations of nouns in the Greek, and Latin languages, do denote the distinct relations, which such nouns bear, in the logical arrangement of the sentences, to which they belong.

If it could be conceded, that the various terminations, which constitute the oblique cases, were originally prepositions, which have by long use coalesced with the nouns; yet in the Greek and Latin languages, no other prepositions, with the nouns which they govern, constitute cases. If grammarians mean by cases of nouns, their different terminations, yet the design of these was manifestly to denote such relations, or connexions as have been mentioned, for when different cases of the same noun have the same termination, we distinguish the case by the position, or sense.

Each case, considered as a genus, contained several species, which have been classed together into declensions, κλισεις; but these classifications are obviously imperfect, both in the Latin, and Greek languages. It is an unhappy variety, producing not the least advantage, and in no instance introducing the expression of a single new relation, in addition to those provided for by the cases: unless it be said, that the Latin fourth declension admits only verbal nouns. Latin grammarians agree to make five declensions; the Greek formerly made ten, five of the simples, and five of the contracts; but now usually three of the former, and two of the latter. Provincial preferences of α, or η, and other letters, contributed to the number of the declensions; particularly the refinements of the Athenians changed ο of the second declen-

sion of the simples into ω, and added all the contracts. (s)

In the Latin, the declension is usually distinguished by the final syllable of the genitive. This is not always a

(s) Besides the changes made in the terminations of nouns to produce cases, there were many alterations in Greek words, either effected for the purpose of better sound, or of expedition. Instead of a short vowel repeated at the end of a word, the one was dropped, and the other lengthened. A short vowel thus preceding a long one, or ι, or υ, was also omitted, whereby a contraction was made. But of two different short ones, the first predominated, and was lengthened. A vowel in the same manner preceding a diphthong, was in some instances omitted, and in others it excluded one of the vowels of the diphthong.

The Athenians delighted in such contractions, and often joined words together; the Attic dialect is esteemed as the most elegant, pure, and energetic. The Ionians on the contrary extended, and resolved words. The Ionic dialect was spoken in Asia Minor, and the adjacent islands. Besides the peculiarities of the various dialects, it is primarily important to a knowledge of Greek, to be able to recognise both the common, and contracted forms of words. This may be gained by attention to the following rules.

In the first declension, which ended in ας, ης, α, or η, contractions were made by omitting a preceding short vowel, except in εα not preceded by a vowel, or the letter rho. These contractions therefore occur, αα into ᾶ; αη into ῆ; εα into ῆ; but εα pure, or after rho into ᾶ; εη into ῆ; οα into ᾶ; οη into ῆ; εου into οῦ. The contracted nominative was declined parisyllabically through the cases.

In the second declension, which terminated in ος, or ον, no contraction took place, except when a vowel, or diphthong was preceded by ε or ο. If in such event, the following vowel was short, the contraction was into the diphthong ου; but if the following vowel was long, or if a diphthong suc-

criterion in the Greek. The two first declensions are parisyllabic, and distinguished by the last syllable of the nominative; ας, ης, α, and η belonging to the first; ος, and ον, or the Attic ως, and ων, indicating the second. A geni-

ceeded, the prior vowel was dropped. To one or the other of these two rules, the following are examples; εον, and εου into ουν; εος, εους, and εους into ους; εου, εου and ε into ου; εω, and εῳ, into ῳ; εω, and εω into ω; εοιν, and εοιν into οιν; εοι, and εοι into οι; εα, and εα into α; εων, and εων into ων; εοις, and εοις into οις. But the vocative ευ was not contracted, and was therefore an exception.

It has been alleged in another place, that the negative particle ου was anciently ο; the same may be said of the genitive in ου; also the dative ῳ was formerly written οι. When the three sounds of ο were distinctly characterized by ο, α, and ου, the genitive obtained the ου, the dative ω, with the iota, which was excluded by the long vowel, subscribed. Thus, in every instance, the quantity was preserved. The Athenians also preserved the two measures in each, when they used ω, and ῳ for the genitive, and dative, in this declension; and they were not afraid of confusion of cases, when they rejected the final ν from the accusative, and retained the ς in the vocative.

In the third declension, and in the contractions of verbs it is believed the rules were the same. The Greeks changed α before ο, or ω, together with the final letter, into ω; otherwise α was retained only, with ι of diphthongs subscribed; as τιμαε, τιμᾶ; and τιμαη, τιμᾶ; ες, or εα, before ς was contracted into the diphthong ει, otherwise into η; but εα pure, and sometimes after rho, into α; and ε before υ or οι was dropped: also a short vowel before an iota, became with it a diphthong, as λητοϊ, λητοῖ; οου, and εο were contracted into the diphthong ου, as χρυσοου, χρυσοῦ; φιλεον, φιλουν; and so also was any other short vowel after a short vowel changed into υ; as Βοες, Βοῦς; ναες, ναῦς. When ο came before α, or a long vowel, they were contracted into ω, as λητοα, λητῶ, χρυσόω, χρυσῶ; but if ο preceded a diphthong, it excluded

tive in ος, ους, or ως determines an imparisyllabic noun; if the ος be impure, it denotes the third of the simples; but when the genitive is in ος pure, ους, or ως, the noun is a contract. The contracts are distinguished by the termination of their nominatives; the first declension ends in ης of the masculine or feminine, and in ες, or ος, of the neuter; and all other contract nouns belong to the second. This distinction is important, because of the different extent of their contractions. The division is confessedly imperfect, there are nouns of mixed forms; and others variant, deficient, or redundant, in cases, genders, or numbers; but they are not so numerous as to confound the learner, whose convenience is the sole object of the distribution of nouns into declensions.

That the various relations of English nouns to sentences, expressed by their accompanying prepositions, are important, and to be carefully distinguished, is undeniable; but that these relations must be reduced to just six kinds, denominated cases, because in some languages, three or four prepositions have been affixed, or so many different terminations otherwise given, to all their nouns, which serve to denote such relations, it is probable neither necessity, nor propriety will justify.

The English language, the slowly conceived, and tardily matured offspring of other languages, is unintentionally perhaps, but fortunately free from the per-

the first vowel of the diphthong, and coalescing with the following, formed a new diphthong, as χρυσόει χρυσοῖ, χρυσόοι χρυσοῖ, χρυσόῃ χρυσῇ; except that οειν became οῦν. If any vowel followed a long one, or ι, or υ, it was omitted, if a contraction was made. Neuters of the same declension in ρας, and ας pure, which have τος in the genitive, and which, by rejecting τ in the oblique cases, produce a concurrence of vowels, are afterwards contracted, according to the above rules.

plexity of cases and declensions of nouns. It would appear to have been highly inconvenient, to have continued the numerous terminations for cases, which the Saxon language contained, if we should consider, how much our speech abounds with consonants. We have no oblique case, unless that, which is denominated the possessive, forms an exception, and which is supposed by some to be the Saxon genitive. (*t*)

The connexion in sense, between the adjective and noun, is as clear, as if their concord had been designated by similar terminations, expressive of gender and case. The object of an action, or effect of a cause, may be as easily discriminated in an English sentence, as if characterized by the final syllable of an accusative case. Since no such distinct terminations are recognised, and no occasion for them exists, in English nouns, it is plainly unnecessary to make them.

Nouns in the English language have, like the French and the Hebrew, unless the casus constructus be such, no change of termination to denote a diversity of relations, nor any thing corresponding to case, except, as before mentioned, the possessive termination. The pro-

(*t*) In the Anglo-Saxon language, there are seven principal modes of declining nouns, in four of which, the genitives terminate in s; those of the others do not. If we have borrowed this case from them, why did not our ancestors adopt others, singular, and plural? It is believed every noun in that language had its dative, and ablative plural, ending in um; how can it be accounted for, if we have inherited their genitive singular, that we should have no vestige in our language of a rule so general in theirs? And how came this termination to be used also for a possessive case in the plural, whilst every genitive plural, it is presumed, in the Anglo-Saxon language, terminated in a?

nouns his, her, and their, which formerly followed nouns, must now be omitted; and, in writing, an apostrophe be substituted, and sometimes an s, which must be sounded in speaking; as, John's book, instead of John his book.

When the s follows another s in the singular; or is otherwise prevented from becoming audible, the i, a part of that, which the apostrophe denotes to be absent in writing, must be restored in speaking, and become an additional syllable; as, James's, or Wallace's book; which must be read James'is or Wallace'is book. But nouns singular in ss, and plurals in es admit only the apostrophe in writing, in speaking there is no change.

Some imagine, and it may be correctly, this is but the genitive case of the third declension of the Latins, but it is of much less extent in use. It is called the possessive case with some propriety, as it is to be used only, where a possessive pronoun may be substituted. The preposition of, sufficiently expresses the relation denoted by the possessive case; but it is offensive, when too frequently repeated, and generally yields to the apostrophe and s. When several words are used as one noun, the last word must bear the badge. This is usually the course preferred, when several nouns succeed each other, all under the relation of possession.

If the word case be used to signify the relation, which is denoted by a preposition, or by the juxtaposition of a verb; then it is used in a novel sense; for, in ancient languages, it only signified the particular change, in the word itself; which denoted a relation. If it must now import relations, however constituted, there are hundreds of cases, as well as an objective one. But the effect, of such position of the noun with respect to the verb, may be taught, and remembered, without incurring the errour of denominating a mere relation, a case; or incumbering our language with a useless apparatus, to which it is evidently a stranger.

CHAPTER III.

OF ARTICLES.

WHEN, by generalizing, we abstract prominent qualities from individuals, and, combining them together, express the complex idea by a common name, it is, in the first instance, indefinite. Such term may very naturally denote the whole class, whether genus, or species; thus man signifies the race. The purposes of language make it necessary, to be able to limit the sense of such appellatives, either to stand for one; as, a man; or still more definitely, to designate an individual, without using his name, if he may have been already known; as, the conqueror of the world; the murderer of Julius Cæsar.

Almost all languages have definitive words; as, ὁ, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος; hic, iste, ille, is; a, the, this, and that; all of which belong to the third person, because that is generally the subject of discourse; or because the others are present.

Articles have been defined to be, "words which fix, "or limit the signification of nouns;" but when such limitation is effected by a word, that expresses a quality, it is classed with adjectives. Articles are generally adjectives, but sometimes participles, verbs, and even nouns, by apposition, are used for this purpose. If the defining term be one, that is most commonly used as a substitute for a noun, it is called a pronoun; thus although articles are excluded from the Latin language, the substitutes hic, ille, and iste, are often plainly articles. In Greek ὁ, ἡ, τὸ, and in English, a, and the, are deemed articles; but ὁ, often stands alone, in the attitude of a

substitute, and should be then termed, and treated as a pronoun. (*a*)

The Greek name ἄρθρον was given to ὁ, it is said διὰ τὸ συναρτᾶσθαι τοῖς ὀνόμασι, *because it was joined with nouns;* but some of the Latins thought, it was denominated from the joints of the fingers, which agree in number with its changes. Hence the words articulus, and article, the meaning of which has little connexion with the things, which they are intended to denote.

Articles are used to limit general terms, that they may denote particular objects; and sometimes to render the nouns, with which they stand, substitutes for proper names; but since this may be effected by other parts of speech, the article may be distinguished by this circumstance, that it neither expresses an action, or quality, as a verb, noun, or adjective may do, nor is itself a substitute for a noun.

A, or an signifies one,(*b*) and therefore only separates an individual from a general class, without shewing which, or whom; and cannot be joined with a plural. But *the*, still more strictly defines the object, and particularizes an individual, or certain individuals already known; and thus may limit plurals, as well as singulars.

(*a*) The Hebrew ה has sometimes the force of an article, and when prefixed to proper names, it is thought, that they should be understood appellatively. It is deemed in different circumstances, demonstrative, relative, interrogative, vocative, local, and emphatic; and it is also probable, that if it has not been prefixed for the sake of better sound, it is in many instances merely pleonastic; "sæpe pleonasticum," says Castell, vide Lexicon Heptaglotton ad lit. ה.

(*b*) An, or a is also a corruption of the Anglo-Saxon on, which means in. This is therefore the meaning of the a, or an, in the beginning of many compound English words: alive is *in life*, asleep is *in sleep*, aboard is *on board*, afire, *in fire*.

An retains its n, before a vowel, or a silent h; but drops it before a consonant, or either of the vowels, o, u, or y, when sounded as, or with a consonant; as, an apple, an hour, a house, a ship, such a one, a union, a youth.

Because articles are, in our language, designed to render words definite, they ought not to be used with terms, which are sufficiently restricted. They do not therefore accompany proper names, except when used appellatively; as, a Newton: or adjectively, a noun being understood; as, the Delaware. Nor are they put with pronouns, except to prevent ambiguity; as, I am the he; or when they are taken artificially; as, decline the thou. The interrogatives who, what, which, &c. receive not the articles; because, being unknown, they cannot be rendered definite. Numerals in every instance except one, imply plurality, and therefore are not preceded by a; but inasmuch as they are undefined, with relation to the individuals of the class from which they may be taken, they admit the more definite article the. Both, is sufficiently definite; many, few, more, less, better, worse, most, least, and many other adjectives may have the articles. Articles as naturally associate with the common appellatives of a genus, or species, as with individuals.

Articles, in our language, standing with their adjuncts always limit the sense although the adjunct may remain capable of still closer restriction; whence they are more fitly denominated definitives. An indefinite definitive would be a contradiction; our articles are definite in different degrees; and neither of them are properly termed indefinite, unless comparatively.

The Latins distinguished individuals by pronouns, or particularizing descriptions. The Greeks, perhaps, at the first did the same. That which was afterwards deemed by them an article, is thought by some to have been, in

the days of Homer generally equivalent to ἀυτὸς or ἐκεῖνος; at least when it stood alone. It has been too hastily admitted, that, in Homer's writings, ὁ is always a pronoun; for it is evidently sometimes an article in the Ilias. The argument which has been drawn from the concession, that ὁ is ever a pronoun in Homer, by shewing it to be as much an article in some passages of the Ilias and Odyssey, as among later writers, is merely an advantage taken of an indiscreet concession, and does not affect those, who renounce the admission.

It is an ancient discrimination between ὁ when an article, and when a pronoun, that the former requires a noun, and the latter stands alone. The former supposes some previous knowledge or notoriety of its adjunct, without which it would be improperly introduced; the latter must ever refer to that, for which it is a substitute, and which is either antecedent, or consequent. It is probable, that its more ancient use was that of a substitute; and the transition from the sense of a demonstrative pronoun, to that of a defining article, must have been easy. The absence or presence of its noun, seems to have been the criterion; for Eustathius says; "When articles "throw away their nouns, they become pronouns:" and Plutarch, that "Homer prefixes articles to a few of his "nouns."

When it disagrees in gender, or case, with its nearest noun, it accords with some other; and is then a substitute. Thus τὸ Ἀ᾽ριστάρχου, and ἡ σήμερον imply ὄνομα, and ἡμέρα.

Because "there is no conceivable instance, in which, "to the article, used confessedly as a pronoun, we may "not subjoin the noun;" it is said "to be evident, that "there is no ground whatever for making a distinction, "between the nature of the article ὁ, and that of the "pronoun ὁ." But it has been long known and often acknowledged, that by subjoining the noun, the office of ὁ is

changed. While alone, it was the representative of its noun, and clothed with its powers; but as soon as its principal arrives, its representative authority is superseded, and it becomes the menial of its noun. As it stood pro, *for*, in the place of the noun, in its absence; so when the noun is present, it still partakes of the pronominal nature, intimates its noun to be the same, that was previously known, and thus circumscribing its generality, points to the individual.

To suppose the Greek article to be a subject, and its adjunct a predicate, is to give it greater consequence, than it often claims. To make it a mere anticipation of its noun, is to err in the opposite extreme, and render it worse than useless. The old opinion is much to be preferred, which is; that it restricts, or defines its adjunct, by referring the reader, or hearer, to that species, or individual, which has, or may have been, previously known. If it merely anticipates, and yet is a subject, the proposition is ever identical, and useless. These strange hypotheses are insufficient to convince the mind, that it has the precise force of a pronoun, in the presence of its noun.

To suppose the participle of existence to be always implied, between the article and noun, is necessary neither to the meaning, nor the syntactical construction. The old grammarians have indeed noticed ὁ, with a participle, as a nominative to a verb; and termed it, in such instances, indefinite. This is not inconsistent, with what they have said of its definitive effect, as an article; because in the former case, it is strictly a relative pronoun, answering to qui; in the latter it is not a substitute, but designates more specially, and thus renders definite that, which is expressed by its noun. This indefinite sense has been lately alleged as a proof, that its nature is not to define; and in ὁ περιπατων κινεῖται, ὁ has been considered a universal

term, limited by περιπατῶν. The reverse seems to be the truth; for remove περιπατῶν, and ὁ will lead the mind back to some individual. It must therefore be περιπατῶν, which changes ὁ, *ille*, or *he*, into *qui*, or *whosoever;* and renders the expression equivalent unto πας περιπατῶν, or *omnis circumambulans*. The office of the ὁ is to particularize the individual, who walks about; and though it may be applied severally, it means but one, as is evident from the singular number of κινεῖται.

The Greek article originally referred to something already known; and thus, if its adjunct were a common appellative, it was restricted to mean an individual; and by thus particularizing the thing, or person, it usually added emphasis to its noun. Hence it is a rule, that only the noun denoting a person, thing, or idea, distinctly known, should have the article, and no other. It is used with proper names of deities, persons, and places, though sufficiently definite, merely to mark them as already spoken of, or known; it is never addressed without its noun; and has but rarely the vocative, except in the Attic dialect. (*c*)

As the Greek ὁ, when alone, is a pronoun; it seems probable, that proper names may have been subjoined to it exegetically, but even then definitely; to prevent the ambiguity, which might have arisen from the use of a pronoun in the third person. In some instances, words, or even lines, especially in poetry, intervene between the article and its noun, which may create a pleasing suspense; it then much resembles the pronoun, and may fairly be said to anticipate. If this were the only reason for its use, in such instance, it would be of small utility; and its infrequency in the Attic dialect, which was the

(*c*) Exceptions may be found in Psalms, v. 11. xxii. 1. civ. 1, &c.

most refined, is some argument, that it might have been more often omitted without impairing perspicuity.

When ὁ is used with adjectives, pronouns, and infinitives, it is for the most part strictly an article; but when put with participles, prepositions, adverbs, or alone, it is chiefly a substitute, or pronoun. With a neuter adjective without a substantive, as τὸ ἀγαθὸν, τὸ καλὸν, it restricts the sense to that of an abstract term. When an adjective follows its substantive, it often has an article, as well as its preceding substantive, and in such instance, it may be rendered as a pronoun with the participle of existence. (*d*) Such participle is its usual concomitant when a pronoun; as οἱ ἐν πολεσιν *those who are in cities;* οἱ ἐν οπλοις *those who are in arms;* οἱ ἀπειλα *those who shall be hereafter;* οἱ προσθεν *those who were formerly.* When another noun, and its article, both in the genitive, are elegantly introduced between an article, and its noun, this separation seems neither to warrant the denominating ὁ in such case, a pronoun, nor the introduction of a participle.

The Greeks omitted the article, when they expressed the genus, or species, without exception; and often before an individual, when we should insert *a* or *an;* and if, in such instance, the appellative term mean not the whole class, or species, but one, though indefinitely, the same purpose is effected. Frequently the article ὁ should be rendered by *the*, rather than *a*. Ὁ προφητης ει συ; is not, *art thou a prophet?* but *the prophet*, whom Moses promised. Thus Ῥιζα γαρ παντων των κακων εστιν ἡ φιλαργυρια is not, "*For the love of money is the root of all evil;*" but, *for the love of money is a root of all the evils*, which were before mentioned.

(*d*) Such repetition of the article sometimes happily expresses emphasis, or distinction; as, ἐγω ειμι ὁ ποιμην ὁ καλος.

The Greeks prefixed the article to the governing, and governed noun, or omitted it before both; and would either say υἱος Βασιλεος, or ὁ υἱος του Βασιλεος. The Latins would have rendered either by *filius regis*. We have greater variety; a son of a king, a son of the king, the son of a king, and the son of the king, all in different senses. Yet the Latins could have said, filius ipsius regis, filius ille regis, and ille filius ipsius regis.

The Greeks sometimes used the article, to distinguish the subject of a proposition from its predicate. (*e*) When εἰμι expresses merely existence, the nominative rarely has the article; for it may be rendered as if following the verb. And not only are the nouns, which follow the substantive verb, but those, which follow verbs, and participles, generally anarthrous; because they are introduced thus in the first instance, and without previous mention. When the subject, and the predicate, each, have the article, the proposition is usually convertible. So the omission of the article before both, shews, that each may be a predicate.

When two or more nouns, adjectives, or participles are connected by και, and refer to the same person, the article will be prefixed to the first noun, adjective, or

(*e*) Thus we read, ὁ Θεος ἀγαπη ἐστι; ὁ Θεος φως ἐστι; ὁ λογος σαρξ ἐγενετο; but the article is often found with the predicate only, where the subject is a pronoun; as in Mat. v. 13, 14; xxi. 38; John vi. 50; x. 7; Acts ix. 22. It is more probable, that the true reason, that the predicate is found often without the article is, that it is introduced as a new idea, or at least as a word not mentioned before on that occasion. And when it is introduced with an article, but without having occurred before, the article may be used demonstratively, or as it is termed emphatically. Yet the rule in the text is generally received; and very safe, except where a pronoun is the subject.

participle, and the other, or others should be anarthrous; because the person is sufficiently particularized by the article of the first. But if different persons be spoken of, the article should be repeated, provided the second, and following persons have been previously spoken of, or known.

This rule affords ground to conclude, that when several words appear thus connected, the first with the article, and the rest anarthrous, they relate to the same person, or subject. This has been noticed by Beza, Doctor Guyse, G. Sharp, and others. But it is no more than presumptive evidence. Also the article, especially in poetry, is often omitted, when it should have been inserted. To insert the article improperly betrays ignorance, to omit it, no more than carelessness; and sometimes also the insertion would be unnecessary; as, ὁ Αλεξανδρος και Φιλιππος; where every one would understand, Alexander and his father. So in τον Πετρον, και Ιωαννην και Ιακωβον, the two last are rendered certain by the first.

When ὁ follows a proper name, and is succeeded by the name of the parent of the party mentioned; in like manner, when it precedes adjectives, and appellatives characteristic of men; as, ὁ φιλοσοφος, it has much of the force of a pronoun. So also where it comes between πας and its noun. Frequently the article is used, when παις or υἱος is understood, and the other noun is put in the genitive. If a participle intervene, ὁ is a pronoun; as που εστιν ὁ τεχθεις Βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων; *ubi est ille natus rex Judæorum.*

Adjectives and nouns preceded by ὁυλω, or ὁυλος, admit not the article. Nor is it prefixed to partitives or pronouns; except to αὐλος, *idem.* Παυλων, followed by ὁυλος, and a superlative, is preceded by the article. Αλλος, and πολυς admit the article, only when they refer to something known, or a number determinate.

When ὁ is used in contrast, as ὁ μεν, and ὁ δε, *the former*

and *the latter*, it has the pronominal sense. When τῃ μεν, and τῃ δε are used as *hic*, and *illic*, μερίδι is often to be understood. There are similar forms of expression; as, ὁ εἷς, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος, *unus* et *alter;* εἷς μεν, ἕτερος δε *alter quidem, alter vero.*— The ὁ μεν, and ὁ δε is most used; and frequently the ὁ μεν, of the former member is merely understood.

The neuter article precedes the infinitive mode, when it is to be used as a noun; and before a noun of any gender, when it is put artificially, and is then the ἄρθρον ἐνίσχυον.

When a noun follows a negative particle, and is intended to exclude every individual of the genus, or species, which it expresses, it can have no article; because subject to no restriction; thus οὐ νᾶυς, οὐ τειχῆ τῆς πολεῶς, &c. *no ships, no walls of the city.*

Generally when previous knowledge is excluded, the article is omitted; as before nouns, which follow verbs of existence, creating, naming, choosing, and appointing: and where the attention has been called, by the article prefixed, to the first of several names, of the same person, it should not be repeated with the rest; for a subsequent insertion of the article is unnecessary, and therefore must denote a change of the person.

CHAPTER IV.

OF ADJECTIVES.

ADJECTIVES have been denominated attributes, and adnouns; and classed among verbs, because they are predicated of subjects.

They are more usually accounted a species of noun, but they are not names of the qualities, which they signify; except as every word may be deemed a sign.

Much diversity of sentiment exists, with respect to the nature of an adjective, as contradistinguished from that of a substantive. Dr. Blair has asserted that adjectives, "have not, by their nature, the least resemblance to sub-"stantive nouns, as they never express any thing, which "can possibly subsist by itself, which is the very essence "of a substantive noun." Writers on universal grammar, both of ancient and modern times, it is believed, generally agree with him.

Mr. Tooke, with much zeal has espoused the opposite opinion, and thinks, he has shown "that adjectives are "indifferently the signs both of substances, and accidents; "and substantives are indifferently the signs both of "accidents, and substances:"—"That an adjective, there-"fore cannot stand by itself, but must be joined to some "other noun, does not proceed from any difference in "the nature of the idea; or of the thing, of which "the adjective is the sign; but from hence; that hav-"ing, added to the sign of an idea, that change of "termination, which by agreement or common accep-"tance, signifies that it is to be joined to some other

" sign, the hearer, or reader expects that other sign, " which the adjective termination announces." But this expectation of a noun, or suspense of mind, upon expressing an adjective, without our being able to divine its subject, does not always arise from a change of termination in the word; because the same letters, or sound, may stand for a substantive, or for an adjective. In such case prefix the article; as, a gold, it is an adjective, the mind is in suspense. Take it away; as gold, it is a noun, the doubt is removed. And articles also, partaking much of the nature of adjectives, leave the mind, when they stand alone, in the same suspense.

Adjectives denoting the matter of which any thing is made, have been adduced as a refutation of the positions, that adjectives never denote substances, are not the names of things, and are therefore improperly classed with nouns. But the argument weighs nothing, because the same word as a noun, and as an adjective, has quite different meanings.

To say that; " An adjective is the name of a thing, " which is directed to be joined to some other name of " a thing;" is no improvement in grammar, for an adjective is not the name of a thing, and may be, where no such direction has been given.

When the same term may be either a substantive, or an adjective, it is necessarily equivocal, while alone; but there is no confusion of the different senses, in which it can be taken; each is clear; the only doubt is, which of the two sorts of words is intended by the writer, or speaker. The same ambiguity occurs, when the letters or syllables of the adjective, or noun, may be also any other part of speech; but there is rarely any difficulty in a complete sentence. If we ask a school-boy of what part of speech the word understanding is, in this member of a sentence; understanding, that an understanding man is a

man of good understanding; he will, without fear of mistake, decide, that it is first a participle, then an adjective, and lastly a noun.

Substantives were much used, in the ancient languages, for adjectives; this not only appears in the translations of the Hebrew scriptures, but in the New Testament, where the same idiom is continued. We also use the substantive for an adjective, prefixing it, with a hyphen, whereby it coalesces with the following noun. An argument has been hence derived against the necessity of adjectives; their utility is however undeniable, and the existence of the class perfectly natural.

The term adjective (*a*) imports that, which may be added. It has been defined, "A word which expresses "a quality, or property of a thing, or something which "is ascribed to it:" "An epithet, which denotes a qua- "lity, and nothing more." Neither of these definitions will distinguish an adjective from a substantive. It has been also defined; "A word which expresses the quali- "ties, manners, of a noun substantive;" "A word added "to a substantive to express its quality." An adjective always supposes a noun,(*b*) as that, of which it expresses

(*a*) It has been said that this class of words "may with "much more propriety, be denominated attributes, or attri- "butives; as expressing whatever belongs to, or is attributed "to things." And that, "attributes in grammar are words, "which denote the qualities inherent in, or ascribed to "things." But if only qualities are attributed, and adjectives comprehend them, it is not easily discerned how it could be said, that this class of words "may, with much more "propriety, be denominated attributes."

(*b*) There are few discriminations more important, than those which regard the connecting of adjectives with nouns, and adverbs with verbs: yet adjectives expressing qualities are more nearly allied to verbs, than adverbs are, which

a quality, and this is noticed in the two last definitions. There is a difference between a quality in the abstract, as goodness, and the same quality existing in a being; as a good man. This difference is also slightly provided for in the first, and in each of the two last definitions. The last seems preferable to the rest, and yet whether some participles might not thus impose themselves, as adjectives, their time, action, or suffering not being provided against, in it, is questionable.

It has usually come into the definitions of an adjective, that it cannot stand alone. To this it is answered, that the oblique case of a noun cannot stand alone. If we admit that such a noun, in the possessive case may signify a quality; yet it must be a quality in the abstract, of which the idea may be determinate: but the quality expressed by the adjective is adherent to a subject, which is not discovered by the adjective, when alone; and the mind is consequently left wholly in doubt. Such is the mutual dependence of words in sentences, that several others, as well as the adjective, are not to be used alone;

denote qualities of qualities: accordingly in many instances our language supplies the defect of verbs, by substituting participial derivative adjectives, and the verb of existence. And great attention to style is necessary to enable the speaker, or writer to choose correctly the respective prepositions, which custom has designated to express the relations required by such adjectives. Thus we use *of* after abhorrent, impatient, independent; *on*, after dependant, intent; *to*, after averse, conformable, repugnant, submissive, suitable; and *with*, after compliant, conversant. The adoption of a different preposition has frequently the effect, not only of expressing a different relation, but of directing to another sense of the adjective: thus conversant with, implies familiarity or acquaintance with, conversant about, is the same as occupied in.

nevertheless, its need of the support of a noun is so palpable a criterion, that no part of speech is with more facility discriminated.

Upon the whole, an adjective, in our language, is a sort of word, which expresses a concrete, or adhering quality of a noun, without other circumstance.

In the Greek and Latin languages, adjectives not only denote qualities of the nouns, to which they belong, but also their genders and numbers; the latter are distinctly expressed by their terminations. They are also declined through the same cases, which mark the relations of nouns. This agreement seems chiefly necessary, to prevent an ambiguity, which would otherwise, frequently arise from an irregular collocation of words in sentences. (*c*)

Our adjectives, besides the ideas, which they radically denote, do also often borrow from other languages terminations, expressive of relations, or other circumstances. Thus many of them end in able, or ible; which seem to have been derived mediately, or immediately from

(*c*) In Hebrew, adjectives have terminations, which denote numbers and genders; but a singular adjective often accompanies a plural noun, in a distributive sense, or the adjective may be plural, when the noun is singular, if it denote multitude. These principles are just, and imitated in Greek, and Latin. When a Hebrew masculine adjective is put with a feminine noun, it is said to import dignity. When an adjective, with a plural feminine termination, follows a noun in ם for adjectives in Hebrew usually follow their substantives, the noun is supposed to be feminine, though the termination is that of the other gender. The Hebrew language has no neuter gender: "etiam Chaldæi, Samaritani, Syri, et Arabes, omnes neutro carent, pro quo fere utuntur fœminino, interdum et masculino." Harmonia &c. à Castello.

the Gothic word able, *strength.* Adjectives in ile, and ive, have probably taken their terminations from the Latin *ilis*, and *ivus;* the former bearing a passive, the latter an active signification.

But our language has affixed to its adjectives no sign of gender, number, case, or declension; and thus accords more perfectly with nature, than those languages, which allow them the characteristics of sex, number, and other relations. But by assimilating them to such circumstances of the nouns, to which they belong, in other languages, that ambiguity, to which the changeable, and frequently capricious collocation of their words ever exposed the reader, or hearer, was prevented.

In the Latin, those adjectives, which express a quality capable of increase or diminution, except they terminate in icus, short, imus, inus, ivus, orus, or us pure, for the most part receive, but in various manners, or, and mus, to denote the comparative, and superlative degrees. Yet many adjectives in us pure are compared. The Greeks made the same degrees, by adding τερος, and τατος; and sometimes by ιων and ιστος; but also in ways very different. The Hebrew language effected comparisons by prefixing מן or מ *as;* or ב *among;* or by repeating the word expressing the quality, whether substantive, or adjective.

Adjectives, in English, also frequently admit of changes of termination, to express a difference in the degrees of the qualities, which they denote. These have been differently accounted two, three, and four, degrees of comparison.

Adjectives, chiefly monosyllables, which express a quality as faintly, and imperfectly existing in their subject, receive the termination ish. This has been called the imperfect degree, and is mostly confined to such as express taste, or colour.

Those, which in their natural state, simply denote a

quality of a noun, without increase, or diminution, are said to be in the positive degree, or state.

These have been denied, perhaps correctly, to be degrees of comparison; they, nevertheless, unquestionably express different degrees, in which the things, denoted by the nouns, possess the qualities attributed.

Some adjectives may express the quality of the noun, to be possessed in a greater or less degree, by receiving the termination er, or r, if they end in e. This is the comparative degree.

When an adjective indicates a quality of its subject to be in its highest measure, it is said to be in the superlative degree. And, with somewhat less propriety, the same term is used, where the degree of the quality is the least. Either of them is made by affixing est; or st, if the simple adjective terminates in e.

These comparative, and superlative terminations, are applied chiefly to monosyllables, and dissyllables accented on the ultimate, or ending in y, or le after a mute; to other adjectives, rarely. (*d*)

(*d*) The following are anomalous comparisons.

Bad	worse	worst.
Far	farther	farthest.
Fore		foremost, or first.
Good	better	best.
Late	later	latest, or last.
Little	less, or lesser	least.
Much, many	more	most.
Near	nearer	nearest, or next.
Nether		nethermost.
Old	older, elder	oldest, or eldest.
Under		undermost.
Upper		uppermost.
Utter		uttermost, or utmost.

Nouns used adjectively, and numerals, (*e*) whether cardinal or ordinal, admit not of comparison. There are also many other particular exceptions; as all, any, each, every, some, &c.

Many adjectives, the most of dissyllables, and polysyllables generally, although they admit not the comparative, and superlative terminations, may be accompanied by the adverbs less and least, more and most, (*f*) with equal advantage of variety. Rather, may supply the place of the imperfect; and very, that of the superlative degree. Such adverbs, for so they should be denominated, after all that has been said, may, at any time, supply the place of regular comparatives, or superlatives; but must not be used with them.

Much, by far, a great deal, incomparably, extremely, superlatively, infinitely, and the like, also all names of measures, and numbers, are expressions, more or less definite, of the different degrees, in which qualities may be possessed; but the diversity of degrees is literally infinite.

It ought not to be imagined, that all of these comparatives, and superlatives originated from adjectives in the positive degree. Comparatives and superlatives may spring from other parts of speech; thus Pœnior *more of a Carthaginian*, means more crafty, and is an adjective, though formed from a substantive; but if Pœnus be an adjective, Nero is not, and Neronior, is *more cruel:* junior, sinisterior, beneficentior, and the like, furnish other examples.

(*e*) The Anglo-Saxon names of numbers are aen, twegen or twa, threo or thry, feother or feower, fif, six, seofon, eahta, nigone, tyn. This *tyn*, is the probable origin of *teen;* and the Moeso-Gothic *tig*, δικα, that of *ty* in twenty, thirty, &c.

(*f*) Lytel, leas, læst; micel, maere, maest are the Anglo-Saxon words.

Er signifies ante *before*, this comparative termination is Anglo-Saxon; the Greek ερος, and the Latin *or*, have probably the same origin, also our superlative *est*, is Anglo-Saxon, and corresponds to the Greek ιστος. The Latin *mus* of the superlative is thought to be the Gothic *mist*, which answers to the Anglo-Saxon *mest* and to our *most*.(*g*)

(*g*) *Foremost* is from the Anglo-Saxon *for*, *former*, *formest*, which is like the Latin præ, anciently pri, says Dr. Jamieson, prior, primus. So *hind*, *hindmost*, and *hinder*, *hindermost*, follow the Moeso-Gothic *hindar*, post, *hindumists* postremus. It is supposed by that writer, that from the Moeso-Gothic *mists*, were derived the Greek superlatives in ιστος, the Latin *imus* and eventually the Anglo-Saxon *ast*, *est*, *mest*, &c. and the English *est*, and *most*.

CHAPTER V.

OF PRONOUNS OR SUBSTITUTES.

THE words of this class are secondary, or representative; they were formerly supposed to be used only instead of names, to prevent repetition, or to supply the place of an appellative noun. Hence they were denominated pronouns. (*a*) But as they stand, not merely for nouns, but in the room of adjectives, parts of sentences, and sometimes for whole sentences, this name may mislead. They have been, in different ages, called also substitutes, a term which is liable to fewer objections. It is probable, no description of this part of speech can be given, free from exception; for nouns, which are never arranged with this class, are often used in place of nouns.

In the Latin language, nineteen pronouns, with their various compounds, are usually recognised; to which the most learned grammarians have added, alius, ambo,

(*a*) Ἀντωνυμία. Pronouns, being abbreviations for other parts of speech, chiefly nouns and adjectives, might be respectively referred to that class, which they in each instance represent. "Nam quum dicis, nomen declinari per "casus, nec significare cum tempore, cur non apponas," says Sanctius, "pro exemplo, *Ego*, *Tu?*" In like manner, hic, ille, meus, &c. it is thought, might be termed adjectives.

In Greek and Latin, pronouns are too irregular to admit of a distinction of declensions. In English, even those, which are used subjectively, and objectively, are generally of different origins.

duo, omnis, qualis,(*b*) quantus, talis, tantus, totus and uter.

In the Greek, twenty-three primitives, and compounds, have been enumerated, to which some have added the relatives of quality, and quantity, ὅιος, and ποῖος, ὅσος, and τοσοῦλος. In like manner, in the English, there have been rescued from the adjectives, and classed with the pronouns, any, aught,(*c*) each, every, many, none, one, other, some, such, that, those, this, these; and by other writers, all, another, both, either, few, first, last, neither, and several. When these words, standing alone, represent others, or sentences, they are fairly substitutes; but when used definitely, or to express qualities, they are confessedly within the usual definitions of articles, or adjectives.

When the speaker, or writer is the subject of his own discourse, or represents himself as speaking or writing, the substitute for his name has been called, in European languages, (*d*) the first person. As often as the party addressed is the subject, and a substitute for his name is given, this is the second person. The substitutes of all other subjects of discourse, whether animate or inanimate real or imaginary, are with some share of impropriety termed third persons.

As there are supposed to be present, only the parties addressing, and addressed, the terms person and perso-

(*b*) Qualis, and talis, πηλίκος, and τηλίκος have been supposed to come from the Moeso-Gothic *leiks*, and immediately from *guheleiks* and *thalik;* whence came also the Anglo-Saxon *thylic; lic* is similis, *like*. But similis more nearly follows כמל *similitudo;* whilst the Greek ἴκω, *similis sum* resembles the Scythian word *leiks*.

(*c*) Awiht, Saxon, *aliquid;* nawiht, *non-aliquid*.

(*d*) In Hebrew, the person which answers to our third, stands first in the verbs, and is supposed in every root.

nal have been denied to be proper, when used for those, who are spoken of. This seems however an unnecessary refinement, perhaps unjust; for, when persona is used for a *mask*, it supposes the party absent. As nouns have numbers, so have their substitutes. Many present may speak by one, or be thus addressed; they may be speakers, or hearers collectively.

I and me (*e*) singular, and we and us plural, are the first persons; thou, thee, perhaps you singular, ye and you plural are the second. He, him; she, her and it singular, they and them plural, are the third. Their compounds, and relatives, may be accounted of their respective persons.

There are no distinctions of gender in the first, and second persons; the sex of the speaker, and hearer being presumed to be known, or unnecessary to be noticed. So also there is no diversity of gender, in the first person, of the personal pronouns, of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages. There are different genders of Hebrew personal pronouns of the second person; but in Greek and Latin, the same words respectively, are of all genders, in the pronoun substantives of this person. In the third person, each of those languages have pronouns of different genders, and these in different numbers.

The substitutes of the third person are distinct words in the English language, for the masculine, and feminine genders, and for the neuter. This provision extends not to the plural of this person in English, as it does in many languages. If when the plural is used, different genders are more frequently intended, we are saved the trouble of expressing them, and also the uncertainty attending

(*e*) Greek ἐγὼ, ἐμοὶ, μὲ; Latin ego, me; Anglo-Saxon ic, meo, me; Moeso-Gothic ik, mik; Francic ik, mi, me; Icelandic eg, mig; German ich, mich; Swedish jag, mig.

the embracing the less worthy, under words of the more worthy gender.

The first and second persons cannot be used, without making them, in some degree, the subjects of discourse; and they become more conspicuously such, when the third person is predicated of either of them; as, I am he; thou art he.

To this distinction of persons, verbs are, in different respects, originally accommodated. I, thou, he, she; we, ye, they, who, and whosoever, may be the subjects of verbs, but cannot follow them as objects. Me, thee, him, her; us, them, whom, and whomsoever, are said to be objective cases; and together with himself, herself, and themselves can only follow prepositions, verbs, and participles, expressed or understood. All, another, any, both, each, either, first, it, last, many, neither, none, one, other, some, such, that, those, this, these, you, and what, (*f*) together with ours, yours, hers, theirs, mine, thine, few, and several, may be either the subjects, or objects of verbs, and follow participles and prepositions.

If nouns had had originally a possessive case, it might also have been expected in their substitutes. *It* seems to have such case; and the resemblance is strong in *his*, and *whose*. But, in all languages, there is found a species of words, denominated possessive pronouns, which fully answer every purpose, that the possessive case, in English, could effect; yet not all the ends of a genitive, in other languages. *John's eye* is *his eye*, his possession, or

(*f*) Hwæt, Saxon, *quid, quod;* from hwa, *quis, qui.* Quis has been thought to come from τίς, or from κὶ ἵς and qui from κὶ ἵ; but as it is probable, that both Greeks and Latins obtained many words from the ancient Goths; the Latin quis, quoius, or cujus, quoi, or cui, may have come from the Gothic quhas, quhis, and quhe.

property; and this is *suus oculus*, not *oculus sui*, (*g*) for that is *the eye of him*, namely *of John*. My, our, thy, your, his, her, its, their, whose, and whosesoever, are regular possessive pronominal adjectives, and denote, both, the persons, for which they are substituted, and the right of possession, or property. They are as obviously derived from personal, or primitive pronouns, as are the derivatives, ἐμὸς, σὸς, ἡμέτερος, σφωίτερος, ὑμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, and σφέτερος in Greek; or meus, tuus, noster, vester, and suus in Latin. The possessive cases, of the English substitute nouns would be by analogy to modern nouns, I's, we's, thou's, ye's, he's, &c. but none such exist. The pronominal possessive adjectives, which are used in their stead, like all other English adjectives, are unincumbered by various terminations, for numbers or genders.

Ours, yours, hers, and theirs, are most usually considered possessive cases of personal pronouns; but they are, more probably, possessive substitutes, not adjectives, but nouns. They are substitutes not only of the person, but of that which is possessed. They may be either subjects, or objects, to verbs. It is said, that they are then mere possessive cases, and that there is a noun understood, which is the real subject, or object; but this is assertion without proof. If a noun were understood, it might be supplied. If it be asked, whose book? And the answer be, ours, yours, hers, or theirs; the word book is included in such answer; for if book were ex-

(*g*) The genitives of the Latin personal pronouns, may denote possession; but the possessive adjectives are chiefly used for that purpose to prevent ambiguity. Though amor meus is *my love for another*, and amor mei *the love of another for me*, yet sometimes the possessives meus, tuus, and suus, are used, where the genitives mei, tui, and sui would be most proper; as, Invidiæ meæ levandæ causâ. Cic.

pressed, as ours book, yours book, &c. the answers would be double. But suppose the answer to be, John's, or James's. The idea book is not included, but implied, and may be expressed. The English possessive case is strictly, what its name imports; possessive substitutes are completely equivalent to it, and have therefore no need of such a case for themselves, and supply its place, fully, to all those substitutes, of which they are derivatives.

Mine and thine are under similar circumstances, they are not possessive cases, but pronoun substantives, designed also, chiefly, for answering the question, whose is it?

For this reason, as in the former case, to the question, whose book? we may answer, mine, or thine;(*h*) but not mine book, or thine book. Nor can mine, or thine, with any more propriety, than ours, yours, &c. be joined to any noun, as possessive adjectives, and possessive cases may, yet this is often done. When the preposition *of* precedes mine, ours, yours, &c. the errour lies, not in this, that there are double possessive cases, but in forming an implication of a noun, which the substitute already denotes, together with the persons.

In Greek ἑ in the singular, ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, and ἑαυτοῦ, which last may be of any person, and in Latin, *sui* are

(*h*) Min, and thin are given by grammarians, of the Anglo-Saxon language, as the genitives of ic, *ego*, and thu, *tu*. But they also give min, for *meus*, *meum*, genitive mines, *mei;* and thin, *tuus*, *tuum*, genitive thines, *tui*. There are therefore the same grounds to conclude, that the Saxons borrowed the idea of such genitive case, from the Romans, and that their errour was followed by their posterity. In like manner, our, and ours follow the Saxon ure, *noster*, *nostrum*, and ures, *nostri;* also, your, and yours, have the force, respectively, of their eower, *vester*, *vestrum*, and eoweres, *vestri*.

reciprocals; they have no nominative cases, because the action can only recoil upon the other cases. In like manner, himself, and themselves are reciprocals,(*i*) and have no other, than the objective case.

Myself, ourself, ourselves, thyself, yourself, yourselves, herself, and itself, are compounded of pronominal adjectives, and the noun self.(*k*) They are substitute nouns, and may precede the verb, or follow it, its participle, or prepositions. *Himself* and *themselves* are objectively used.

The substantive own cannot stand with I, thou, he, me, him, &c. but with their derivatives, the possessive substitute adjectives, my, thy, his. These words seem highly important for the prevention of ambiguity. This may be seen in translating, jugulavit se illius gladio; suo *illum* gladio jugulavit. Own, agen, Saxon, *proprius*, and perhaps self, may, in some instances, be taken adjectively.

I, thou, or you, he, she, and it, in the singular; we, ye, you, and they, plurals, are substitute nouns, usually denominated the personal pronouns. My, thy, his, her, our, your, and their are called possessives. That, who, which, and what are relatives.(*l*) The four last, and whether, not the adverb, when they ask a question, are styled interrogatives.(*m*) Whose is assigned according

(*i*) The man came himself; they went themselves, are frequent forms, and held to be proper. In these instances, himself and themselves are said to be nominatives; but it is probable, I mean, or I speak of, or some such terms are implied, which govern those words in the objective case.

(*k*) Sylf, Anglo-Saxon, is *ipse*, and was either used alone, or compounded with pronouns; and in some instances with nouns also.

(*l*) Who, relates to persons, and which, usually to things, animate, and inanimate. That, has been by some deemed a pronominal, and, by others, a definite article.

(*m*) What, is very nearly equivalent to, that which, and is therefore said to include the force of a definitive, and of a

to circumstances to either of the three last classes. This, and that, in the singular, with these, and those, plurals, to which some add the adjectives former, and latter, are termed demonstratives. (*n*) Each, every, either, and neither are accounted distributives. All, another, any, one, other; and perhaps other, the noun, which has other's, others, and others'; some, and such are indefinites. Both, first, last, none, few, and several, may be accounted also substitutes in some instances.(*o*) But all those classes of pronominal adjectives are more concerned with the sense of the words, than the grammar of the language. Also the classification is perhaps imperfect, as well as unimportant.

Who, which, and that are said to be conjunctives, and virtually to include an *and.*(*p*) It has been long since

relative pronoun. Who, and which, are also, by some, said to be always mere relatives; and the interrogative sentences, in which they occur, are always relative clauses, uttered in such circumstances, as to enable the hearer to supply the antecedents, necessary to complete the meaning. Thus, "*who* is this that cometh from Edom?" is, Tell me who is this, &c.

(*n*) This, points to the nearer antecedent; that, to the more remote. In the same manner οὗτος *hic*, from ὀν, *ubi*, ὅς, *hic*, stands for the proximate, and ἐκεῖνος, *ille*, from ἐκεῖ, *ibi*, and ὅς, for the more distant noun; or for that, which is supposed to be in the mind of the reader; vide 1 John iii. 16. Ἄυλος is *ipse*, from ἀν, *rursum*. That they are compounds of ὅς, is evident from their mode of declension.

(*o*) Thæs, *this*, hevilc, *which*, hwa, and hua, *who*, and the neuter hwat, *what*, ænig, *any*, sum, *aliquis*, an, *some one*, or *one*, agen, *own*, *frofrius*, eal, *all* or *every*. hwæther, *uterque*, owther, *alter*, auht, *aliquid*, and naught, *nequid*, have been ranked among Anglo-Saxon pronouns.

(*p*) Vir sapit, qui pauca loquitur; Vir sapit, ille pauca loquitur; Vir sapit, et pauca loquitur; are expressions dif-

observed, that qui, quæ, or quod, would connect an incidental proposition, so as to make it a part of another principal one.(*q*) ὅτι is affirmed to be always a pronoun, and never a conjunction; and ut, formerly written uti, to be really ὅτι. Quod, anciently written quodde, is supposed to have been καὶ ὅτι, written qu' otti, quoddi, quodde, and quod. And the English word, *that*, is likewise denied to be a conjunction in any case, but affirmed to be always a pronominal adjective, agreeing with fact, maxim, assertion, purpose, or some other word under-

ferent in their meanings, as well as forms. Paucity of words, according to the first expressions, is the index of wisdom; in the second, the effect; in the third, a distinct circumstance. Qui pauca loquitur is in the first instance really an attribute of a wise man; in the second, ille &c. a distinct proposition. In the third et &c. produces a compounded proposition, wherein something is affirmed, either of man in general, or of some man in particular, but not of a wise man as such. If in the last, *is* should follow *et*, the *et is* would make a distinct proposition.

(*q*) Qui is sometimes interrogative; quis of all genders. Their genitives were quoius, and datives quoi; hence by apocope quo is sometimes a dative. The accusative was written quum, for all genders; then cum was read, by a change like those for cujus, and cui, and was originally a relative. Qui regularly made queis, in the dative, and ablative plural; but ques was also a nominative plural, from whence came quibus. Quo was anciently an accusative plural, like ambo and duo; as, usque quo.

The Anglo-Saxon hwa, *who*, hwæt, *what*, and the Latin quæ and quod; and also hwæs *whose*, quoius or cujus; hwam *whom*, and quam seem fairly to point to a common origin; whilst the Anglo-Saxon hwæne, and hwone have been observed more nearly to resemble the Greek ὅν, and ἥν. The Greek aspirate, the guttural hw, and the Latin qu, had possibly similar sounds, if not the same effect.

stood. But the Goths used *at*, and the Anglo-Saxons *aet*, as conjunctions, and in such manner as we use *that*.

As and so have been also deemed substitutes, and resolved into other words. But if all abbreviations are to be restored to their primitive parts of speech, there will be a general revolution in the present systems of grammar; and the various improvements, which have sprung from convenience, or necessity, and been sanctioned by the usage of ancient times, must be retrenched, and anarchy in letters universally prevail.

CHAPTER VI.

OF VERBS.

IT has been ingeniously imagined, that actions were at first expressed by words, compounded of the names of the agent, and object. Thus οἶνος and ἐγὼ joined, and abbreviated are οἰνόω, that is *wine I*, and might express, *I drink wine*. If this were established, verbs would appear to have been originally the names of things. In the Hebrew language, pronouns, or parts of them, prefixed to themes, or roots, constitute the futures; and postfixed, form the preterit tenses of verbs. But no imagination has proved sufficiently fertile as yet, to convince the world, that the terminations of Greek and Latin verbs are the skeletons of pronouns. They were, more probably, derived from the Scythians. To concede that the themes of verbs, which were anciently the third persons singular masculine of the perfect tenses, were the names of things, prior to their becoming the signs of affirmation, or action, is to oppose the matter of fact, appearing in perhaps the oldest language in the world.(*a*)

(*a*) Verbs do indeed necessarily contain the names of ideas, and are so far identified with nouns. This was affirmed by Aristotle—τὰ ῥήματα ὀνόματα ἐστὶ, καὶ σημαίνει τί. But the same thing may be said of every class of words. There is also something, whatever it may be, in which every verb differs from a noun. The radical idea may exist in various parts of speech: thus, " *Docere docilem* facile est, ut *docilitatis* suæ " edat *documentum*, celeri apprehensione *doctrinæ*, fiatque " vir *doctus*, et sentiat *docte*." *Comenii Lex. januale.*

Our knowledge consists of our ideas, and the judgments we form of them. Terms represent our ideas; propositions communicate our judgments. To the formation of every proposition, whether in the pursuit of truth, or in the communication of it, a verb expressed, or implied, seems to be necessary. That, of which any thing is asserted, is the subject; the thing affirmed is the object, or predicate; that which connects them, or affirms, is the verb, which may include the attribute, with the affirmation. (*b*)

The chief characteristics of this important part of speech, appearing in the numerous definitions of it, have been, its necessity to every sentence, affirmation, energy, action, suffering, being, time, number, and person. Every verb, whilst it implies time, predicates, or connects an attribute, or expresses an action. If this description shall appear defective, or erroneous, it will afford some consolation, that the sort of word is ever distinguished by the meanest capacities.

It had been said by an eminent grammarian, that "Every complete verb is expressive of an attribute, of "time, and of an assertion." This has been abruptly denied; "The verb does not denote any time; nor does "it imply any assertion." But though a verb, in every of its variations, may not express, or imply, an attribute, time, and an assertion; yet the position is certainly in the general correct. (*c*)

(*b*) "Non modo affirmationes strictius sic dictæ, sed ne-"gationes etiam, interrogationesque includuntur." Rudd.

(*c*) A modern writer on grammar has defined a verb to be, "A word which signifies to be," &c. and nevertheless tells us that; "The English verb is mostly composed of principal "and auxiliary, and these several parts constitute one verb." But each of those parts will be made a distinct verb, by his

When a verb connects the predicate with its subject, like the sign of equality in an equation, it is merely affirmative, or a copula. When an attribute is implied in, and is a part of the verb, it is not of its essence, for it might be expressed by some other sort of word. Even when no predicate follows the substantive verb, we have more than a mere copula; for it then implies existence. But it is a different proposition, when this kind of verb is followed by an attribute. Every verb, which affirms, may be resolved into the verb *be*, and some other word, expressive of that, which such verb predicates. And since the substantive verb may supply every thing, which such verb would import, except the quality, and that can be expressed by some other part of speech, it has been fairly inferred, that the essentials of every verb of assertion, may be found in the verb *be;* which under such circumstances is not existence, for such is its effect when alone, but mere assertion. This therefore is at least some part of the specific difference, which distinguishes a verb from every other part of speech.

Verbs, in their indefinite, imperative, and hypothetical forms, can scarcely be said strictly to affirm, or assert; yet indicatively they do, and in every form they import some radical idea, which is to be sought in the theme, from whence they have sprung, or to which they belong respectively.

The various characteristic prefixes, suffixes, and changes adopted to designate the modes, or manners, of expressing action, affirmation, or being; and also the tenses, or times, when such events took place, are chiefly arbitrary. If in Greek, and Latin, the terminations have

definition; besides that different words should be written, pronounced, and understood as distinct verbs, and yet at the same time form together only one verb, is evidently repugnant.

been supposed to have been formed from pronouns, not borrowed from the Scythians, they designated originally numbers, and persons; but they also denote the mode and time. (*d*)

When a word follows a subject; and occupies the place of a predicate, or connects the subject with an object, we are led by custom, to understand such word to express the thing it signifies, as in action; and to give it the character of a verb; thus in kings reign; reign is shown by its collocation to be not the noun, but the verb.(*e*)

(*d*) In Hebrew, the numbers and persons are undeniably so constructed, and though the past and present tenses, have been thought liable to be changed, in certain events; yet, perhaps always, the theme placed before the parts of the pronouns denoted the action to be past with respect either to the time of speaking, or the time last referred to; and when placed after, it signified that the event was future, with respect to such time.

(*e*) The different persons are supposed to have been formed in Greek, and Latin, from the pronouns, in the following manner. The first person singular in ω, from ἐγὼ; in μι, from ιμε; the first person plural in μεν, from ημεις. The second has been thought, both singular, and plural, to have sprung from ת a fragment of אתה *thou;* the t being changed to s, in the singular, and preceded by a short vowel which is sometimes lengthened by addition or change. The plural retained the t which was followed by a vowel. The third persons are supposed from הוא *he*, and ουτοι *they;* but the mutations are extremely fanciful. Thus Βασιλεύω is Βάσιλεὺς ἐγὼ, that is *I king*, or as in Latin, regno, *I reign.* But this mode of accounting for the persons, to which the Hebrew leads us, is not credible with respect to the Greek and Latin verbs, which bear in their persons, numbers, and tenses, a very striking affinity unto the more ancient language of Northern Europe. Vide Dr. Jamieson's Hermes Scythicus.

As it is the principal characteristic of a verb, to express an affirmation, or predicate something of a subject; verbs have been differently denominated; according as they follow, or precede their respective subjects, or objects. When a verb follows the agent, and is followed by an object, it is termed active; when this order is inverted, it is said to be passive.(*f*) If the verb denotes neither action, nor suffering, it has received the appellation of neuter.(*g*)

Neuter verbs, that is, which are supposed to signify, neither action, nor passion, constitute a class which comprehends not only such as denote, or imply being, or situation; but even those, which confessedly signify action, provided the action terminate on the agent, or an object approximating their own signification; but these are distinguished by the name intransitive, in contradistinction unto transitive, the action denoted by them, passing from the agent to an object.

The Latin language has generally distinguished between the active, and passive forms; but the division is imperfect, as some verbs in o, have a passive, and others in or, an active sense. The latter are called deponent; and such also as have the neuter signification, under the passive termination. But the active termination with the passive, neuter, or intransitive sense, procures the appellation of neuter or intransitive verbs; which, if personal, are rarely found in the passive voice. Transitive verbs are distinguished only by their meanings, or effects.

(*f*) A few Latin verbs are denominated common, because they may with the same terminations be used either actively, or passively; thus, we find osculor te, and osculor a te; hortor te, and hortor a te.

(*g*) This name has been deemed improper, for neuter verbs really often imply the one or the other: as, curro, ægroto, glorior.

They terminate indifferently in o and or; and, in either shape, govern the accusative of their object, expressed, or implied; but in few cases does the sense require such object to be mentioned.

Neuter passives are, in form, neither wholly actives nor passives; as fio, audeo, &c. but in sense either, for some are active, and others passive. Derivatives in *to* are called frequentatives; in *sco*, inceptives; in *io*, desideratives, terms which express their significations respectively.

Greek verbs assume the various forms of active, passive, (*h*) and middle. The middle voice is of an intermediate form, some of its tenses being passive, and others active in termination. It differs not from the passive, in the present, and imperfect tenses, except in sense. Its reflex effect, or its requiring a pronoun to follow it in meaning, when no object is expressed, is its peculiarity. Sometimes each pronoun is expressed. From the frequent use of its aorists, in a sense merely active, and before expressed objective cases, it seems inferrible, that they appeared to the Greeks to denote an action more energetically, than those of the active voice. The first aorist of the middle is very frequently used, both in the active, and at other times, in the passive sense; but the second aorist of the middle is much more often taken actively, than passively. Also, those passive verbs, which have both aorists, are most frequently used in the second.

(*h*) The Greek passive terminations μαι, σαι, ται, have been supposed to be really μοι, σοι, and τοι, for οι. Also the ν of the second person singular passive, to have been anciently σαι. Thus τιμάομαι, τιμάσσαι, τιμάεται are exactly equivalent to τιμῶ, or τιμά, μοι, σοι, τοι; *honour to me, thee, him;* or *I am, thou art, he is honoured.* This hypothesis may be extended to several tenses, in the passive, and middle voices, and is at least ingenious.

Sometimes, when such verbs are rendered, as if in the passive voice, the sense requires in English the expression of the pronoun; thus, ἐπορευοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι is not *all went to be enrolled*, but *all went to cause themselves to be enrolled.* Such verbs generally partake of an active, and passive sense. For example, whilst φυλάξαι is *to watch* another, φυλάξασθαι is *to take care of himself*, σπεύγειν is to *impel* another, σπευγέσθαι is to *hasten*, that is, *to push one's self forward.*

In Hebrew the variety is still greater, for they have not only the active, passive, and reciprocal; but they have two others, which import the causing an action, and its being caused.

As the Greeks used not the causative forms of the Hebrews; and the Latins also relinquished the reciprocal forms of both the former; so the English language has no other, than the active voice. There would therefore be the same propriety, in giving to English verbs the middle voice of the Greeks, and the hiphal of the Hebrews, as the passive of the Latins.

Active verbs in Greek, and Latin, have the agent preceding them as a nominative; in the passive voice, they are followed by the agent in the dative in the former, and ablative in the latter; in each instance an action is expressed. The distinction of voices, into active and passive is therefore radically incorrect. It may nevertheless be convenient in Latin, in English it has no apology. It would not have been known to the English scholar, had it not, like many other useless discriminations, been borrowed from foreign languages.

A division into active, passive, and neuter, if the last be distinct from the others, might comprehend all Latin verbs. This is a division according to the sense, and not fully warranted by any characteristic features of the

verbs. Because the active verbs generally terminate in o, and passives in or, the two other classes, called deponents and neuter-passives, have been adopted, that the logical might become, also, a grammatical division.

C. Scaliger says—" manifestum est, verba neutra non " esse ab activis sejuncta." And Sanctius contends, that every cause has an effect, every effect a cause, and that in every action there are an agent and patient; " Quid " igitur agent verba neutra, si nec activa nec passiva " sunt: itaque verba neutra neque ulla sunt, neque na- " tura esse possunt, quoniam illorum nulla potest de- " monstrari definitio." But Perizonius disagrees with them, and shows the difference. He exemplifies in the neuter verbs sedere, placere, rigere, fugere, cavere, clarere, albere, pendere, *à pendeo*, jacere, *à jaceo*, calere, stupere, patere; and gives the correspondent active verbs sedare, placare, rigare, fugare, cavare, clarare, albare, pendere, *à pendo*, jacere, *à jacio*, calefacere, stupefacere, and patefacere.

Other classifications have been adopted, as into transitive and intransitive; a distinction existing only in the sense of the words, without change of their letters. Some have added to it, verbs auxiliary, and passive; and others, instead of these, have proposed connexive verbs; but all these divisions are destitute of opposition, and therefore illogical.

In English, there being no passive verbs, it is improper to denominate any, neuter; but a division of them into transitive and intransitive is just; and according to their meaning. The distinction also between regular and irregular is real; and there are verbs in our language, which are defective.

Besides the attribute, and affirmation, usually expressed by a verb, it may in different forms show the will of the speaker, the liberty, or power of the agent, or some

other circumstance of the action. A mode is that form of a verb, which indicates the manner of the being, action, or passion, which is represented by the verb.(*i*) In English grammar, mode is a form of the verb, indicating the manner of assertion, action, or being.

Ancient philosophers divided sentences into various species, which were reduced to five; the vocative, imperative, interrogative, precative, and declarative. (*k*) But since many other distinct sorts of sentences may be discriminated, and there are no particular forms, or correspondent changes in the verbs, which may have the effect to denote them to the hearer, or reader; they have no just claim to a conspicuous standing in grammar.

Language has been said to require four modes of verbs; the indicative, potential, interrogative, and requisitive, which last includes the imperative, and precative. Propriety might equally dictate vocative, hortative, and dissuasive modes; but the inquiry is not, in how many ways, actions may be differently, or most conveniently expressed; but what are the actual forms, adopted in the respective languages, whereby their verbs denote different manners of expressing action, being, or suffering.

When verbs adopt certain forms, simply to declare, or affirm; they may be said to be in the indicative mode; when they receive other appearances, to denote, that they assert conditionally, or under a possibility, these may be denominated the potential mode. Or because in some languages, this mode generally follows an indicative expressed, or implied; and denotes the end, or de-

(*i*) "Modus est diversa verbi inflectendi ratio, diversis "animi affectionibus indicandis inserviens." Ruddiman.

(*k*) Κλητικὸν, or προσαγορευτικὸν, προσηκτικὸν, ἐφηπτικὸν εὐκτικὸν, and ἀποφαντικὸν.

sign of the former action, it may be, in such instances, named the subjunctive. These last are different names, grounded on different reasons; yet they denote the same mode, because verbs bear the very same aspects in each of those conditions, and have the same characteristics for them.

The Greek language has, what grammarians denominate, the optative mode. It rarely expresses wishing; and when it does, there is usually some particle, of such import, preceding it. It is sometimes used indicatively, but chiefly as a subjunctive, and has been denied to be a distinct mode. It expresses possibility, or liberty; and is often to the subjunctive, precisely what the subjunctive is to the indicative. (*l*)

When a verb expresses a command or request, it is said to be in the imperative mode.(*m*) The opposite uses of this mode frequently produce uncertainty, which is sometimes relieved by the tone of the voice. In English, it is ever the same with the infinitive, and may be sometimes resolved into it. (*n*) The same may be said of Hebrew, but not of Greek, and Latin imperatives. In Latin, and English, it is supposed to have only a present tense;

(*l*) The learned Busbey uniformly terms this, the potential mode.

(*m*) Such effect is sometimes produced by the present of the subjunctive mode in Latin; but there may be in such instances an ellipsis of an imperative; thus, bono animo sis, has been thought to require fac ut, to be supplied. Yet the the imperative may always be otherwise expressed, but more circuitously, by expressing the command or request indicatively, and following it by an infinitive, or subjunctive mode, in languages where the latter is found.

(*n*) By supposing "I entreat, or I command" to go before it.

but it necessarily partakes of the future, since a compliance is regarded in the demand. It has been, by ancient grammarians, termed a third future, and is often supplied by the future of the indicative, or some tense of the potential, which has also generally a future import. It frequently has the sense of an aorist of the future. In the Greek language, there is an imperative of the perfect. If that tense expressed a time perfectly passed, such an imperative would be inconceivable; but viewing it as it is more correctly, a present of a finished action, the imperative of the perfect in Greek is really a present tense in command, though future in accomplishment.(*o*) It is probable that the imperative aorists as τυψον, and τυπε, as well as the subjunctives, belong to the first and second futures.

Verbs in Greek, and Latin, in certain forms which express action, being, or suffering, indefinitely with respect to number, impersonally, and without predicating any thing, are said to be in the infinitive mode.(*p*) But the propriety of classing this among the modes, has been often, and perhaps correctly denied. It has been denominated a noun, expressing the energy of the verb.(*q*) At least it declares its name; for in English, and Hebrew, it is the ονομα ρημαΤος; in Greek and Latin, it is rather ονομα ρημαΤικον, since in these it expresses also time, which is the property of a verb, not a noun. This has however

(*o*) " Apud Græcos, etiam præteriti temporis sunt impe-
" rativa, quamvis ipsa quoque ad futuri temporis sensum
" pertineant, ut ἀνεωχθήτω πύλη, *aperta sit porta.*" *Priscianus.*

(*p*) This form serves, in the Hebrew language, for any mode, or tense. So, in the New Testament, it is sometimes used imperatively, as ἐχειν *have*, χαίρειν *rejoice ye*, περιπατεῖν *let us walk*.

(*q*) " Significat rem ipsam, quam continet verbum."

been thought exceptionable, as in; scire tuum nihil est; non est vivere, sed valere vita. But these are scarcely exceptions, or if they be, the position is nevertheless generally, if not universally true.

The infinitive in Latin, besides time, exhibits an action, &c. as finished, or incomplete, preserving the same characteristics of imperfect, and perfect actions, which obtain in the indicative, and potential modes. Whether the tense expressing an unfinished action be a past, as well as a present has been questioned. Thus it is said, gaudeo quòd amas, may be changed into gaudeo te amare; but gaudeo quòd jam tum amabas cannot be given by, te jam tum amare, but amavisse. Yet, "Vidi "enim, dum tu aberas, nostros inimicos cupere bellum," has been quoted from Cicero, to shew, that cupere means quod tum cupiebant; and this seems to justify amare; but whether or not, amavisse is certainly no equivalent to quod amabas, because the former expresses a complete, the latter an imperfect action.

Latin infinitives have no futures, unless fore be an exception; but the better opinion is, that fore is for fure, and this, by syncope, for fuere, the infinitive present of the old verb fuo, from which the perfect fui comes. Fore is often used for esse, and signifies a future, only by its being connected with the future participle of the active voice, which it frequently accompanies. In the artificial futures of the infinitives active, and passive, in Latin, esse, and iri are both present tenses; and their future sense is the effect of the participles in rus and dus; or a supine with iri, a verb of motion, expresses an action beyond an action, which is thus necessarily future. Infinitive futures thus constructed, when fairly analysed, will be found to have the sense of a present, or past, as well as of a future time; which would be more easily discovered, if the natural import of the words were not

obscured by the meaning, which art has imposed on the compound; and this is some argument of the inutility of the contrivance. If, nevertheless, such infinitive futures can be clearly shown to have been used anciently, without regard to gender, and number, they ought not to be deprived of their standing in grammar. But the instances of this, hitherto discovered, have been said to be so few, as to make it most probable, that they are mere errours in transcribing, and printing.

A gerund, from gero to execute or perform, if placed as a nominative to the verb est, and followed by a dative of the person, is a verbal noun expressing, with the action of the verb, whatever it be, the necessity or obligation to do it. But such construction should be confined chiefly to neuter verbs. This kind of substantive is formed from the neuter of the future passive participle, with which it is sometimes confounded. Like other verbal nouns, it often governs the case of its verb; as, legendum est libros; or may have a genitive of another noun, as cupidus videndi sororis. It is better to use the participle, and to say legendi sunt libri, than legendum est libros; because gerunds should rather stand as nouns, than govern as verbs.

The gerund, expressing only the action of the verb, never has a plural sense, and is only found in the singular. But the future in dus, sometimes imports duty; is often rather present than future; and active, than passive; and is elegantly in the plural; excitanda est memoria ediscendis quam plurimis. In all the cases of the singular, they stand, and are governed as nouns; and generally are resolvable by the infinitive or subjunctive modes of their verbs, but more elegantly by the participle in dus, when the participle, and the substantive must take the case of the gerund.

Sometimes, in the Greek, the infinitive mode used as

a noun supplies the sense of the Latin gerund, as, τοῦ ποιεῖν *faciendi*, εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν *ad faciendum*, ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν *faciendo*. The Latins frequently used the infinitive as a nominative, and, for other cases substituted the gerund in its place; but the Greeks used the infinitive for other cases, and had no gerunds.

If infinitives have been deemed verbal nouns, much more are supines entitled to the appellation. The Latins had a supine in an active, and another in a passive sense. But their name seems to intimate their being designed to express the quality, without the action denoted by the verb. We cannot say eo cubare, but eo cubitum. If in such case ad, or some other preposition is understood, the supine is unquestionably a noun; but there is a difference in sense between eo visum, and eo ad visum, and it chiefly consists in the implication of action in the former.

There is a near affinity between many nouns in us of the fourth declension, and supines. Perhaps, they are accusatives and ablatives governed of ad and in. The supine in u agrees well in sense with the ablative of a verbal noun; and there are many examples of it in ui, the dative, in old writers. There have been enumerated many nouns in us, that once had a nominative in um; and supines have been thought to be so called, because, "They have waxed old." Whilst some derive them from the neuter of the perfect participle, others think the participle has been formed from the supine, and that they are so called; "Quia à verbo transeunt in participium, "iterum à participio *resupinantur* in verbum." As they are not found in the Hebrew, and Greek, so we have not yet adopted them, in the English language. The Greeks used in their stead the infinitive mood, as, οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην: "Non veni missum pacem." Καλὸς ἰδεῖν pulcher videre, for visu. These are followed by the English, for we say; *to send peace; beautiful to be seen.*

In our language, a verb assumes no particular form, when following another in a double sentence; we have therefore no subjunctive; and to denominate the indicative such, as often as it is preceded by a conjunction, can answer no valuable purpose. Every subjunctive mode in Latin and Greek, may be substituted by the infinitive, by a change of phraseology; a clear proof, that a subjunctive mode is unnecessary. Although the Hebrew and English languages have none, yet they have words, which express possibility; and these may be used to even greater advantage; or the purpose may be answered by omitting such word, and subjoining an infinitive. If thou wouldst, wert, mightest, are confessedly correct, and why not also, if thou hast, hadst, dost, and didst? Since English verbs have no change, expressive of power, liberty, or possibility, and this is supplied amply by verbs in the indicative; to denominate these potential modes; or to term the infinitives, or past participles, which follow them, or the compounds made of regular indicatives, and infinitives, or participles, potential modes, is precisely the same absurdity as to denominate an infinitive, which follows a verb of motion or adjective, in Greek, or English, a supine, because in Latin a supine would in such case be used; or to term a subjunctive in Latin an optative mode; because it follows a subjunctive, or utinam, or might have been in the Greek language expressed by an optative mode.

We have an indicative, an imperative, and an infinitive; or rather an indicative, and another mode, which has sometimes the force of an imperative, and at other times that of an infinitive; but if the appellation of mode be denied it, it is then a verbal noun. This is indeed its truest character, because its idea ever represents an object of approach. *To* supplies the defect of a termination characteristic of the infinitive, precedes it, and marks it

either as that, towards which the preceding verb is directed; or it signifies act, and shows the word to import an action. When the infinitive is the expression of an immediate action, which it must be, after the verbs, bid, can, dare, do, feel, hear, let, make, may, must, need, see, shall, and will, the preposition *to* is omitted.

In Latin the present infinitive active, standing alone is imperative, but passive, thus docere is *be thou taught;* in English the simple form, which is infinitive, standing alone becomes imperative, but is active. This is also according to the genius of Hebrew verbs, where the infinitive, in each active voice of every of the three conjugations, is the second person singular masculine imperative of the same voice.

Verbs, by certain peculiar forms, can show, not only the particular intention of the speaker, or writer, together with their principal signification, but the time, to which the assertion relates, or when the action took place, and also the person. (*r*) Time is naturally divided into the present, the past, and the future. These may be expressed definitely or indefinitely; and an action, or event, so represented, may be denoted, as advancing, or completed. (*s*) Thus γραφω, scribo, *I am writing*, express a present advancing, or imperfect action; εγραφον, scribebam, *I was writing*, a past imperfect action: γραψω, scribam, *I shall be writing*, a future imperfect action. Scripsi, εγραψα, (definitely γεγραφα) and *I have written*, are ex-

(*r*) A change of persons in the same sentence is unusual; yet there are some instances; as παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς – ἦν ἠκούσατέ μου, Acts i. 4. εἰσῆλθε πρὸς ἀὐτοὺς – ὃν ἐγὼ καλαγγέλλω ὑμιν, Acts xvii. 2. 3. Καὶ ἀὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν ἀὐτῷ, μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν ἀλλ' ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαὐτὸν, Luc. v. 14.

(*s*) "Infecta sunt, *discebam*, *disco*, *discam;* perfecta, *didi*-"*ceram*, *didici*, *didicero.*" *Varro.*

pressions of a present complete action. (*t*) Scripseram, and ἐγεγράφειν, which we render *I had written*, are past tenses, denoting a complete action. Scripsero, which is really indicative,(*u*) γεγράφω,(*v*) and *I shall have written*, all express a future action, which will, after some event, be finished. In the Latin, the characteristics differ according as the action is perfect, or imperfect; but in the Greek language, there is also respect had in the tenses, to actions, which are aorist, and definite. The English language can express, circuitously as above, but not otherwise, these different tenses, of present, past or future, and each as perfect, or imperfect, definite, or indefinite.

To affirm that the verbs be, can, do, have, may, shall, and will, "imply different modifications of simple ex-"istence, considered alone, and without reference to any "particular thing," seems to be incorrect, except as to the word be. It is to be attributed to their meanings as principal verbs, that they are allowed to be joined with each other, and with the participles of other verbs, so as to form compounds, approximating in sense the varieties

(*t*) Thus; fuit, *is no more;* vixerunt, *are dead;* dixerunt, *have closed.*

(*u*) "Videtur ergo ex sententia Ursini illud *didicero* ejus-"dem esse modi," scilicet, indicativi, says Perizonius. But he was of a different opinion; how correctly may be inferred from his judgment on the words; "*Ego cras, postquam* "*prandium sumpseris, veniam.*" Of which, he says; "In his "tota res, quæ dicitur, est quidem futura etiamdum, at "verbum nullum est futuri temporis, nisi *veniam:*" thus he denies what every person will admit, that *sumpseris* is a future.

(*v*) It must be admitted, that the first and second Greek futures are often used promiscuously; this Sanctius admits, but denominates the second, futurum remotius.

in the verbs of other languages.(*w*) They may be translations of voices, modes, tenses, numbers, and persons, and equivalent to them, but not the things themselves. Ingenuity might, in this manner, far exceed the variety in the verbs of any known language, if it has not already done it. In arriving at the true sense of any such combination, we are not bound to receive the artificial interpretations of our own grammarians, for these differ; but ought to take every verb as a principal verb, in its own natural, or original meaning, modified by such variations, as exist in fact, and are proper to our language. Thus *I will go* is not strictly a future tense. *I will, woll* anciently, is the present tense, expressing *I incline, I choose. Go* is the infinitive: *I incline to go. I will* expresses a present inclination, and no more; *go* expresses indefinitely the action, which is intended to be accomplished, and therefore as yet necessarily unaccomplished, that is to say

(*w*) Dr. Beattie cautions against the doctrine, that there are but two tenses in English verbs, as likely to "introduce "confusion into the grammatical art." But his thirty-six tenses contained no more variations, than may be easily reduced to two, the present and the past. Greek grammars have optative, and subjunctive passive perfect tenses, formed of the perfect participle and a substantive verb; and the Latin in the same manner supply all the passive tenses, when the action or passion is of the perfect, or finished kind. But teachers and learners, always distinguish the words in the resolution of the sentences, wherein such constructive tenses occur. It is only when words have fairly coalesced, as in the Hebrew, where the personal affixes become part of the same word with the principal root, that they are to be read and treated as one word. In that language the pronominal suffixes also are joined unto nouns, and verbs, in writing, and reading; yet in parsing they are ever separated, and accounted for distinctly.

future. In this manner we supply the defect of a future tense, for no such thing is given by any form or variation of verbs in our language. If such substitution, or compound of words be a future tense; μέλλω γενέσθαι, *I shall be*, μέλλω δεδόσεν, *I will serve*, and μέλλει ζήλειν, *he will seek*, are futures in the Greek language, to assert which would justly expose any grammarian to contempt. In like manner *I have gone*, though it expresses a past action, is not strictly a past tense. *I have* is present, *I possess*, *I am in the state of*. *Gone* is the past participle. *I have gone*, *I am in possession of this*, *namely to be removed*, or *I am in the condition of one passed away*. As the removal, expressed by *gone*, must be past, before it could be said, *I have it*, or *am possessed of it;* the whole compound *I have gone* expresses that, which is past; and with the same indefiniteness, that belongs to the participle *gone*, for *I have* is not a past tense, but expresses a present condition.

If, by auxiliary verbs, be meant such as have been invented, merely for the purpose of combination with others, which were ever to remain principal verbs; that all the variety in the tenses of other languages might be effected in the English; there are no such verbs in our language. The verbs, denominated auxiliary, have their respective meanings, without which they would be a useless incumbrance. To conceal those meanings, by declaring such verbs to be signs, or indices of tenses is to render language unmeaning, or obscure, and to yield an authority, or to attribute an importance to rules, officiously made, to which they are by no means entitled.

It is one thing to understand, correctly to render in English the tenses of Greek, and Latin verbs; or for the grammarian in our language to be so well conversant, in the composition of English sentences, as to be able to make, and rationally explain, the numerous combina-

tions of verbs with each other, and with nouns and conjunctions; and another to repeat the technical compounds, usually denominated tenses in our grammar, and, instead of being instructed accurately to resolve them, to refer all to the magical word auxiliary, and the authority of the grammar, which he learned in his childhood.

Our language has a present, and a past tense, and no more. Writers of English grammars have no other tenses until they coin them. And unless this be kept in our minds, though it be not taught in our grammars, we shall make a very limited proficiency in the resolution of the tenses of other languages. The knowledge of those combinations, which are denominated compound tenses, in various modes, may be usefully taught, so far as they are correct, in the department of logic, or after etymology, and syntax; but they belong not to the grammar of the English language.

It has been correctly observed; "That the position is "not tenable, that equivalence in sense implies similarity "in grammatical nature. It proves too much and there-"fore nothing. This mode of reasoning would confound "the acknowledged grammatical distinction of words." A philosophical grammar, adapted to all languages, is a chimera. Logic is the nearest approximation of this. If English verbs must be assorted into various combinations, and then marshalled, without respect to their real variations, into a vast variety of voices, modes and tenses; shall we adopt those of the Hebrew, the Greek, or the Latin language? Or choose out of them all, the variety which best pleases every one's own fancy? Or shall we invent new ones? Truth, and utility, seem to require a strict adherence to the varieties, peculiar to the several languages.

The Greek and Latin verbs, it has been shown, may express actions as imperfect, or accomplished; and in

some instances their times appear to be definite, whilst other tenses are aorists. A present action, if advancing, may be termed definite, when the reference is to absolute time, or that which is capable of being precisely ascertained. Scribo and γραφω are accurately rendered *I am writing*, when this refers to the time of the discoursing, and are no aorists. If *I write* did of itself always refer to the time of the discourse, it would be also definite, but it may be understood of any present time. Thus; *Addison writes well*, refers to the age in which he lived.

The present is strictly an indivisible point, which when arrived is past; but grammatically taken, it means a portion of duration, which is begun, and advancing; or it may be spoken of as indefinitely present. The Greek, and Latin present tenses, which are really also imperfect, and the Hebrew and English participles, used with substantive verbs, all express the former, and the English present tense the latter kind of time. (*x*)

This present, which is naturally an aorist, may be rendered definite by any word, or words, which shall connect it with absolute time. When the verb in the infinitive mode follows do, the sentence is rendered more emphatical, and may be, under circumstances, sometimes definite. But do is naturally indefinite, thus; Virtuous men do many things reprehensible, yet all do love virtuous men. The infinitive is of itself also indefinite. The same things are true of did.

When the present participle follows the substantive verb of the present tense, the action is represented as

(*x*) It is strange that Dr. Beattie should deem, I write, a definite present, and yet acknowledge is, are, and makes, aorists. Dr. Priestley pronounced, that in no language there was more than one present tense; yet the perfect in Greek, and Latin, often expresses the completion of an action, as a present fact.

advancing, but the time is thereby rendered definite, no farther, than such expressed present is connected with the time of the discourse. Bolingbroke is ever aiming at christianity. Is aiming, cannot be a present tense definite; it is an action advancing through all the author's works, and present, but not connected with absolute time.

The interpretation of the imperfect tenses, of the indicative, in Greek, and Latin, by the past tense *did*, followed by the corresponding English verb in the infinitive, is very usual, but most unhappy. Scribebam, and ἔγραφον are not *I did write*. They resemble *did* in this, that they are past tenses; nevertheless *did* is not only expressive of a perfect action, as the English past tense ever is, but the word itself also signifies accomplished or performed; whilst scribebam invariably, and ἔγραφον, generally,(*y*) not only express the action of writing, but that it was imperfect, or unaccomplished. Greek and Latin, imperfect tenses, though not of themselves strictly definite, are generally connected with some fact or circumstance, by which the actions expressed by them may be connected with absolute time; but, *I did write* is wholly indefinite. *I was writing* is a closer translation. *Was* is the past tense, *writing* is present, and expresses the action to be going on, or imperfect. Its sense of the present is counteracted, or removed to the past, by *was*. The compound therefore expresses a past action, then imperfect. And although it be not of itself definite, yet it will usually be found in discourse to be concurrent with some other action, which, if by any circumstance, or expression, it be connected with absolute time, will also render

(*y*) "Designat sæpissime apud Græcos retardationem "aliquam, repetitionem, vel continuationem cujusdam fac-"ti." Verwey.

the compound itself capable of being ascertained; thus in *I was writing, when the sun rose*, the first proposition is rendered definite by the second. The principal use of this tense in Latin is, to connect one action with another. "Dum loquebaris, dormiebat."

The preter-perfect tenses in Greek, and Latin alike denote their actions to be past, and are called præterita; and also complete or finished, and therefore perfecta. But they widely differ in another respect, for whilst the Greek perfect tense expresses a definite time, being a present-perfect, with more propriety than a preter-perfect, that is, now complete, not formerly perfect; the Latin perfect is indefinite in point of time; yet it partakes of the present, for it denotes that the action, whensoever effected, was complete at the time of speaking. The Greek first aorist of the active answers to the Latin perfect. Scripsi is ἔγραψα, yet it might be taken in the other sense also. If Pilate uttered, quod scripsi, scripsi; he did not mean ὃ ἔγραψα, ἔγραψα; but ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα, expressing the accomplishment of the act, rather than an indefinite relation of it, for it was his refusal.

Dr. Macknight says of the Greek preter-perfect; "It "denotes an action completed some time ago," this is a better description of the Greek aorists; and yet he agrees, that the perfect may be rendered by the present, in ἑστήκατε *ye stand;* Rom. v. 2. ἠλπικαμεν *we trust;* 1 Cor. i. 10. ἀπελήλυθε *goeth away;* Jam. i. 20. οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα *for I do not yet ascend;* John xx. 17. and quotes Beza, as saying; "multa enim verba sunt apud Græcos, quæ "in præteritis habent presentis significationem." This is not so much a Hebrew idiom, as the natural effect of the Greek perfect. Yet there has been much diversity, and sometimes change of sentiment upon this subject. Sanctius called the first aorist παρελήλυθώς, *leviter præteritum, just now past*, in which he agrees with Casaubon, Vos-

sius, and Budæus. Τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος, says Casaubon, denotes a much later time, than if it had been γεγεννημένου. This is an inaccurate discrimination, the former occurs in Matt. ii. 1. and expresses indefinitely his birth in the days of Herod. The perfect is used to denote the certain accomplishment, though it were but an hour ago. Both words are used in 1 John v. 18. Οἴδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· ἀλλα ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, τηρεῖ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς, &c. Here the perfect participle expresses accomplishment, or certainty of the fact of being born of God, whether an hour, or years ago; the indefinite participle designates the person, who is kept from apostacy, without saying when he was the subject of the change.

The English past tense is like the Latin perfect, an aorist. *I wrote* is equally indefinite as scripsi, or ἔγραψα. *I did write* is both more emphatic and has been thought more definite. But *did* is the past tense of *do*, and is an aorist, and *write* is an infinitive. Connected indeed with proper names, particular circumstances, definitive attributives, or substitutes, such a combination may be understood in a definite sense. Nevertheless *did* is sometimes resorted to by grammarians to make an aorist.

Have is the verb generally adopted in combinations formed to express a definite perfect tense. Accordingly our translators have made Pilate say; "What I have "written, I have written." Have is the present tense, and signifies, among other meanings, to possess, or to attain unto; had is its past. Like all other words, it must be used with reference to its proper meaning. It is not the word have, which in any connexion expresses a past action, definitely, or indefinitely; for it is present. If a definite perfect be denoted by the compound, I have written, it must be the past participle, which effects these ends. No other kind of participle than that, which de-

notes an accomplished event, can be joined unto, or make sense with have, because it signifies to possess or attain to a state. Past participles generally signify finished actions; thus whilst have, which is present, refers to the time of speaking, the past participle expresses the complete action, and both together very nearly equalise the Greek perfect, by denoting the action to be perfect at the time of speaking. It is for this reason, that it is improper to say *I have read a book yesterday;* when any other period or point in time is taken, instead of the present, with which to connect an accomplished action, in English, the past tense should be adopted; because being indefinite, no conflict will be produced, thus it is more proper to say, *I read a book yesterday.*

There is a present, which is supposed in every discourse, and which is necessarily definite, being a known part of absolute time. But the present tenses of English verbs, unless by some other means than the verbs themselves restricted to this, are nevertheless aorists, as has been shown. I have written, though less indefinite than I wrote, is deemed not to be strictly definite, and therefore falls short in this respect of a definite perfect.

Those who imagine, that the present participle expresses an action definitely, can easily fabricate definite tenses, whether present, past, or future, in all voices, and almost in every mode. I have been writing, would by such be here substituted. I have is present; been is past, and signifies a state; writing is present, and signifies an action advancing. The compound expresses the act of writing, as that which is past, with respect to the present have. If it indeed expresses the act to be "just finished," it approaches definite time. But unless it is because there are two present tenses for one past, this sense is not discernible in it. *Writing* expresses an advancing action. *Been* united with *writing* removes the

idea from the present to the past. *Been writing* shews a state of action, which is over or passed. *Have* is present, and expresses the state of inaction, or rest from writing, to be the present condition of the speaker, but how long he has been idle is not shown.

The first aorist with the Greeks expressed an action to be perfect, or accomplished, but indeterminately in point of time; their second aorist expressed an action also indefinitely, whether present, past, or future; and is an aorist in a larger sense, than the first is; but it has been asserted to be used as a present tense more rarely in the passive, than in the active, and middle voices. Both aorists denote the future in the subjunctive, and optative; and in the imperative occasionally. According to others they are perfect in the indicative, present in the imperative, future in the optative, which is termed also potential, and in the subjunctive; and their participles are said to assume the tense of the verb in the sentence.(z)

It is possible that the variety of the inflexions of Greek verbs derived from the Scythians, and Phenicians, may have been increased, by different modes of speaking, adopted by different tribes, or, in distinct provinces. If this was the fact, a diversity of sense did not originally exist for every change of termination. Their number, after all discriminations, perhaps exceeds the demands of nature.

The plusquam perfect tense, in Greek, and Latin expressing an action, which was prior to another, which is also complete, is merely the past tense of a finished ac-

(z) " Vult indefinitum omni pro tempore sumi.
" Perfectum est monstrante modo, presensque jubente;
" Possibilique modo,* vel subjungente futurum.
" Participium, tempus verbi cui jungitur, optat."
Gram. Busbeiana.

* So he denominated the optative mode.

tion; and is to the perfect, what the imperfect is to the present tense. English verbs have no tense analogous to this. But we usually combine the past tense of the word have, with the past participle of the translating verb, as the nearest representation; thus scripseram, γεγραφειν is *I had written*. *Written* denotes a completed action, *had* is in the past tense, and also signifies possessed, or attained unto, and thus necessarily supposes its object or condition determinate; the whole compound denotes, that the action was done before some other time, or event alluded to in the discourse. If that time were ascertained to a moment, yet the more remote time implied in the compound, is indefinite. This has been denominated the prior-past-tense-indefinite, but it is a compound of words, and no part of a verb, and consequently not a tense of a verb. I had been writing is after the same manner, called the prior-past-tense-definite; but it is not definite, for no one knows by it, how long the time was, which elapsed between the event referred to, and the antecedent act of writing; when the writing began, its duration, and the time of its termination are all unascertained. The two compounds differ chiefly in this respect, that the expression, I had written, expresses the accomplishment of the act before the second act or time referred to; whilst the phrase I had been writing, only mentions the prior act of writing, without expressing the accomplishment of it.

The Greeks have three futures as ϑύψω, (*a*) ϑυ-

(*a*) The first future was originally formed, by assuming ς before ω, as τίω, τίσω. In time π, β, φ, πϝ severally, with ς, were changed into ψ; κ, γ, χ, with ς, into ξ; and τ, δ, and θ, were omitted before ς. But the liquids λ, μ, ν, and ϱ, were retained in the future. At length it is presumed, the ς was dropped after these, except by the Æoles, who retained it, and for ψαλῶ used ψαλσω. Terminations of the present in ζω,

πῶ(*b*) and τετύψομαι. The first is in greater use, expresses a future unfinished action indefinitely, and is therefore termed an imperfect future, and an aorist; τυψω is verberabo. The second is rarely used, except in the passive, as τυπήσομαι. This denotes a more remote(*c*) but complete action, and is denominated a perfect future. The subjunctive future in Latin, as scripsero, is of this kind, and is justly said to be indicative as much as scribam, the imperfect future, for every future, humanly speaking, implies something potential. It is rendered *I shall have written.* The third, or paulo-post-future, is denominated imminent, or immediately to take place. It is found only in the passive, and is rarely used.(*d*) But some gram-

σσω, and ΠΙω are believed to have been introduced instead of γω, when their futures are in ξω, as they often are; or instead of ∂ω when their futures are in σω. Thus ὀρυγω made ὀρύγσω, that is ὀρύξω; and κραγω made κράγσω, that is κράξω. The second aorists, second futures active, and perfects middle bear characteristics accordant with this hypothesis.

(*b*) The second future was made in general by shortening, when long, the penultimate of the present, and circumflexing the ω. To distinguish it from the present, or first future, the penultima ε, especially in dissyllables, is changed into α in most instances.

(*c*) Sanctius called it, futurum remotum; and his opinion is strengthened by the Septuagint ἐλεήσω, ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρῶ. Paul has used the same words, Rom. ix. 15. *I will have mercy upon whomsoever I shall in future have mercy; I will have compassion,* &c. that is, " miserabor " cujus voluero, et clemens ero in quem mihi placuerit." His favours flowing from his sovereignty are to have no other reason assigned for them, than the mere facts of future mercy. Ἐλεῶ and οἰκτίρῶ are unquestionably futures, because the correspondent Hebrew words are futures without vaus.

(*d*) This tense having a passive meaning, and being in-

marians doubt the reality of these distinctions of Greek futures. The difference between the Latin futures, of actions advancing and complete, is strictly observed. The future participle of the active voice, with the substantive verb, is often used for a future tense and is thought to be somewhat more definite. Thus scripturus sum may be rendered, *I am about, or presently, to write.*(*e*)

In English no verb bears the least trace of a character, or form to denote the future; but we express it by the meanings of various words, single and combined. If we had not learned this name, and others, such as passive and middle voices, potential, subjunctive, and optative modes; perfect, imperfect, pluperfect, and indefinite tenses; from other languages, our grammars would not have been burdened, nor our children perplexed with them.

Among the various means in the English language of

capable of a formation in every instance from the first future active, seems to have been originally taken out of the perfect passive, by putting ομ before αι of the second person. This circumstance would naturally lead to an inference, which seems to be supported by fact, that the paulo-post-future expresses not an imperfect, but an action immediately to be accomplished. It is probable, that it was constructed with the characteristic of the first future active, to express futurity; that it received the same reduplication, or augment, which the perfect in each of the voices has, to show that like them it partakes of the sense of a present perfect, that is, of an action immediately to be perfected; and that it terminates in ομαι, instead of ω, because it is confined to the passive sense.

(*e*) Future tenses in each of the three languages are sometimes used to express a wish, duty, or even a command; as, " Sed valebis, meaque negotia videbis, meque " expectabis." Cic.

signifying the future, the verbs shall, and will, are the most usual. Shall, which imports compulsion,(*f*) in the first persons, foretells; in the others, it threatens, or engages. But will, which expresses originally the inclination of the mind,(*g*) in the first person may promise, or threaten; and in the rest foretell. These opposite senses, so far as they are in fact observed, result from the difference, which is implied between force, and choice. We never force ourselves, I or we shall, is therefore not compulsion; but choice, promise or prophecy; yet we may express our choice with authority. But others may be compelled, and some conjecture may be expressed of what they will do. From hence it follows that ibo, ibis, &c. are not *I shall*, or *will go; thou shalt*, or *wilt go;* &c. but, *I shall go*, *thou wilt go*, *he will go*, *we shall go*, *you will go*, *they will go*,(*h*) and yet even thus, if a very strong emphasis be laid upon the middle word, the sense should be otherwise expressed in the Latin.

Shall, and will, are in the present tense; and it is their meaning with respect to an action, or event, which is necessarily future, and not by reason of rules of grammar, that they supply the place of a future tense. Like all other English present tenses they are aorists. If they be followed by any infinitive, except be with a participle, the compound is indefinite; if by be and the present participle, the action expressed is imperfect. If a perfect participle

(*f*) Perhaps originally from שׁאל *to demand*, or *require*.

(*g*) From volo, which is Βουλω, and this, it is probable, was from בל Chald. the *heart*, *desire*, or *thought;* or from *wil-jan* Moeso-Gothic, *velle*.

(*h*) Custom has distinguished between *thou willest*, *he wills*, and *thou wilt*, *he will;* the two former are used with nouns, and pronouns, and are somewhat more emphatic; the latter with verbs, and participles, when futurity rather than choice is intended; but they all spring from the same root.

follow *shall be*, or *will be*, the action is perfect. If *shall* or *will*, be followed by *have been*, and a present, or past participle, the action will be imperfect, or perfect, as before. The past condition, or state, implied in the past participle *been*, having been attained unto, which is expressed by the infinitive *have*, there is a reference to some other event, without which the compound will be unintelligible; but which, if expressed, must be future, or to be accomplished, in ordinary cases, after the action described in the compound; as, I shall have been waiting, when you will be ready to dine.

Other words, which denote present, or past tenses, can also signify the future. Thus, when he comes, may signify, when he shall come; so, when he is, or has come, may mean, when he shall have come. Constructive futures almost innumerable may be made. Those who have limited them to a first future indefinite, and definite, and a second future indefinite, and definite; which they exemplify in, I will go, will be going, will have gone, and will have been going, might have found many other examples, of other futures: and if they had borrowed the help of other parts of speech, and amalgamated them into their English tenses, in the same manner as they have acted with conjunctions, and certain verbs, which they have degraded from their standing as a part of speech, and denominated auxiliaries, they might have made the definiteness of some of their constructive tenses much less controvertible.(*i*)

(*i*) One grammarian denominates, I shall or will love, a first future; I shall have loved, a second future. Another terms them the future indefinite, and the prior-future indefinite. The phrase prior-future well expresses that this future is to precede another. It is the future of an action to be perfect, or completed before another. That it denotes a

It has been shown before, that English verbs adopt no particular forms to denote subjunctive, or potential modes. Yet there are verbs, which express potentiality; and the idea of possibility, liberty, or power may be easily connected with that of any action, by placing the infinitive of the verb expressing such action after a verb, which imports any of these. *May* as a distinct verb predicates liberty, or right, and *can* power, and are the usual means to effect such purposes in various combinations. No one would render eam by *I go*, for this is indicative, but by *I may* or *can go*, or *be going*, that is, I have liberty, or power to go; or by *let me go*. May, and can are present tenses, used in their proper meanings, and if they were potential modes, potentiality would be once expressed and once implied; there would be a bis petitum.(*k*) Let, in let us go, is obviously imperative. Go is

time indefinite must be admitted. I shall or will be loving, is with the latter also a future tense definite; and I shall have been loving, a prior-future tense definite. The former expresses a time no otherwise definite, than that it shall coincide with the implied future action, or event. It is not connected determinately with the time of speaking, or writing. The latter, as well as the former, describes an unfinished, or imperfect action, but wholly undefined as to its beginning, progress, or termination; it is to precede some other future which it supposes, but it is entirely indefinite, if even the ulterior future to which it refers is precisely known.

(*k*) If may, be the potential mode, and this mode signifies possibility; then as may signifies this also of itself, I may, is equivalent unto, it is possible that it is possible for me; and so, I may go, is equivalent to, it is possible, that it is possible for me to go. If it be alleged that, I may go, is the potential mode of the verb go; the very same meaning must be assigned, unless we suppose that the word may, has no

the infinitive or undefined theme. Here are all the requisites to a potential mode. The verb in the present tense, of the imperative, requests permission to do that, which is expressed by go, and partakes of a future, as every potential verb does; the possibility is also supposed, and the action expressed. Eam is much more compendious; but *let me go*, or *I may go*, are compounds containing words of distinct meanings, and more intelligible. All the fabricated tenses of a supposed English potential mode, partake so much of the future tense, that some have judiciously waved the discrimination.(*l*) The phrase he may come, will suffer little alteration, if we substitute any of the words might, can, could, shall, should, will, or would, in the place of may, for the purpose of connecting the idea of contingency with that of coming, and of making the action future. Yet when analyzed, the expressions differ in sense, and such difference will generally guide to the preferring of one to another, according to the views of the speaker, or writer.

When such words as, if, though, provided, and the like, are used, verbs of conditionality seem to be superfluous; or because their import being nearly the same, there can be no ambiguity, they are usually omitted; as, if he be, that is if he may be; though he come, though he may come.(*m*) But instead of the infinitive it is usual

meaning whatever of its own, which none can admit. The truth is, that may is in the indicative mode, and go in the infinitive; and that the sense of the verb may, when put before an infinitive answers to the force of a potential mode in some other languages, and supplies its defect in the English.

(*l*) Vide Dr. Lowth's Grammar.

(*m*) The supposed potential *were* and *wert* are usually objected as incapable of such resolution. Our language contains no other semblance of such mode. But if *were* comes from the Saxon wære, *eras*, it is then the second

to insert the indicative, as, if he is, though he comes, which excludes the implication of the verb of possibility. Sometimes the past participle takes the place of such infinitive; and then the infinitive, have, with a verb of conditionality, is understood. Yet in these instances, it may be, that the peculiar terminations of the second, and third persons have been disregarded; or the past participle may have been confounded with the past tense.

Possibility is often also elegantly expressed in English by placing the subject after its verb; as, had I gone. But artificial and arbitrary rules, arising out of grammatical refinements, should never be allowed to take the place of that simplicity in our language, by which cases, voices, modes, and numerous tenses are happily supplied by words, which all may understand. The labour, time, and expense which have been wasted in learning declensions, and conjugations, in the Greek, and Latin languages, can never be computed; and though essentially necessary to the knowledge of those languages, the whole was without the least profit, or the gain of a single idea in itself useful.

person singular of the past tense indicative of beom, or am, *sum;* and in the Danish Saxon it is used for wæs, *eram*, *erat*, the first and third persons. Or it may be resolved into the infinitive, were, *esse*, of the Anglo-Saxon. Wære is said by the grammarians of the latter language to have stood for any person, singular, or plural, of the imperfect, perfect, or pluperfect tenses, of the potential mode.

The Greeks and Latins borrowed their substantive verbs respectively, from different verbs. Εἰμὶ and ἔσομαι have little resemblance, sum, es, eram, and fui, speak different origins. They perhaps imitated the ancient Scythians; for the Moeso-Goths had two substantive verbs, wisan *esse*, and wairthan *fieri*. Fui was probably from fuo, φυω, *nascor*, *fio*. Sum, anciently esum, and ἐσομαι were possibly from the Moeso-Gothic first person plural *wesum*.

The Greeks had no imperfect of the subjunctive.(*n*) Also it is agreed by the best grammarians, that the first aorist of the subjunctive is really in signification,(*o*) a first future, and their second aorist of the subjunctive a second future. They have been denominated "futures perfect," as partaking of the past and of the future. The perfect participle of the active, as well as of the passive, with a subjunctive, or optative of the substantive verb, are often substituted for subjunctive tenses, and are denominated "futures by circumlocution."

In the Latin every tense of the subjunctive has a future signification. Si scribas is scarcely distinguishable from si scribes. The imperfect of the potential, by means of different combinations, may also signify the present, or past, as well as the future. Cum multum amaret, is present; cum magis amaret, quam nunc, is past; "Ope-"ram dedisses quam debebas, magis te amarem post "hac," is future. If amarem were a past tense, expressing an imperfect action, and merely equivalent to amabam, it would have been repugnant to have connected

(*n*) This ὑποτακτικη scil. ἐγκλίσις, or subjunctive mode contained the ἐνεστῶς scil. χρονος, or present tense; παρεληλυθώς, first indefinite; ἀόριστος, or second aorist; and the παρακειμενος, or preterperfect. In addition to these tenses their ὁριστικη, or indicative, contained the παρατατικῶς, or imperfect; μέλλων, first future; ἐσόμενος, second future; and the ὑπερσυντελικὸς, or plusquam perfect tense.

(*o*) It is not derived of the future of the indicative, for then ψηλω, the first aorist of the subjunctive would be ψαλω, as the future; and νειμω would be νεμω, as the future. Yet we have θησω, δωσω, and εσωμαι subjunctive futures, and no such aorists as θηκω or δωκω in the subjunctive. Also in the passive voice a first future of the subjunctive occurs; βληθήσῃ *thou shalt be cast*, Mat. v. 25. καυθήσωμαι, *I may be burned*, 1 Cor. xiii. 3. κερδηθήσωνται, *they may gain*, 1 Pet. iii. 1.

posthac with it. It is not only subjunctive to debebas, and must be in the past tense to denote a time correspondent to the preceding verb; but it expresses a possibility of an action, or affection, which possibility not only existed at the time denoted by debebas, but it was then continuing, or imperfect; and, as the posthac shows, was to continue after the time of speaking the words.

The Latin potential imperfect is usually rendered by could, might, should, or would; which are all indicative modes, and express times past, but signify power, liberty, possibility, or inclination; and thus have a respect to the future, whilst they express the existence of the liberty, possibility, &c. at a former time. They are not subjunctive modes, for they stand as well first, as last in a sentence, and need not another verb to precede them. They are not potential modes, for it must be attributed to their obvious meanings, and not to any particular mode, or form assumed by them, that they have this influence in a sentence. And it must be assigned to the same cause, that they supply to the English language a variety of expression, which is even more extensive, and convenient, than all the modes, and tenses of the learned languages.

As the perfect of the indicative expressed, in Latin, a finished action indefinitely, and in Greek, somewhat definitely; so the perfect of the subjunctive in those languages expressed a perfect action under a condition, or possibility. In English we render it thus, iverim *I may have gone. May* is the indicative present, and expresses right, or possibility; *I may* is therefore nearly equivalent unto, *it is lawful*, or *possible to me. Gone* is the past participle, and expresses that which iverim predicates, but as past, and complete. These two words contain all that is requisite to express the perfect tense of the potential mode. But *may* is intransitive, and the participle *gone*

cannot immediately follow it; the word *have*, or some such infinitive, expressive of possession or the attainment of a condition, must therefore intervene. Iverim has been otherwise rendered, *I might have gone;* but although the verbs of potentiality, in their present and past tenses, are often promiscuously used with little disadvantage, there is in this instance, some diversity of meaning. *May* and *might* not only differ by expressing, the one a present, and the other a past possibility; but, as often happens in many verbs of other languages, this verb assumes diverse meanings in different tenses. Thus if *I may have gone* means I am at present uncertain whether I went or not; and *I might have gone*, signifies, it was, at some antecedent period, in my power to have gone; *may* here expresses doubt, and *might* signifies power, or liberty.

Might have, with the past participle, is the nearest translation of the Latin plusquam perfect of the potential, when it stands alone, that perhaps can be given. *I might have gone* is ivissem, rather than iverim; for this tense expresses not merely the past time of a finished action, but it does so under some possibility, or conditionality. The past participle *gone* expresses a complete action, the infinitive *have* imports that this is attained; and *might*, being in the past tense, implies that the party had at some antecedent period possessed liberty, or power to have accomplished the action. The effect of the Latin plusquam perfect in the potential mode is often also happily approximated, by prefixing some word of conditionality before the past tense *had.* But such word must not be a verb. *I might had gone* is not English, for *had* is either the past tense, which ought not to follow a past tense; or it is the past participle, which cannot follow an intransitive verb. Long usage is nevertheless admitted, if this be a justification.

The Latin plusquam perfect of the potential mode

must be supposed to represent an action, as possible to have been accomplished before another, which is past, at the time of the discourse; the possibility implied in it is past, and consequently the future has expired with it.

The Latin subjunctive future has been already said to be really indicative, and to differ from the future of the indicative mode just as the perfect differs from the present, and the plusquam-perfect from the imperfect, that is by expressing a complete action. Every future is potential in this respect, that we know not, but that it may be defeated; yet the former of these futures usually expresses an action somewhat more imperatively than the latter; and this less forcibly than the former; nevertheless the distinction between an advancing, and a finished action, is that which they chiefly express. Ivero is well rendered *I shall have gone;* each of these expressions equally refers to some other time, which is yet to come, but when come, it will find the action accomplished. *Shall* is present, and foretells; *have* is the infinitive, and signifies to possess or attain to. *Gone* is the past participle, and that which it denotes must be past and complete before it can be possessed. But though the going must be past, or over, in order to be had, or attained unto; yet the *have gone* wholly relates to a time future at the juncture of the discourse, because it is foretold or promised by *shall. Shall* though in the present tense, nevertheless by the force of the word, declares an event, which is, with respect to the moment of its occurrence, indefinite. Ivero expresses a future action, which is then to be complete, but does not show when, and is therefore also indefinite. *I shall have been going*, differs from *I shall have gone*, by expressing the future action, which is to follow a future action as imperfect. *I shall be going*, ibo, simply foretells or promises, that a future action

shall have been begun, or be advancing at some period expressed in the discourse, or presumed to be known. If *going*, or such like present participle, may be deemed definite under such circumstances, yet after *shall have been*, it is indeterminate, as the participle *gone* is after the verbs *shall have*.

The imperative mode admits strictly only of a present tense, yet it partakes of the future; as has been already shown. Also because for a man, by words, to command himself would be folly, this mode has no first person. In English, there is neither a first nor a third person; for *let him* and *let them go*, are equivalent to *permit him*, and *permit them to go;* and *permit* and *let* are each the second person, whilst *go* is the infinitive.

In the Latin indicative and potential modes there are three persons singular, and three plural; in the Greek, three persons singular, and three plural in the indicative, optative, and subjunctive. Also the dual number has in these modes, the three persons, except that in the active voice, there is no first person dual. The ancient Greeks, it is said, did not use a dual in their verbs, the Æolians therefore did not adopt the Attic innovation. And these were followed by the Latins. The Moeso-Goths used a dual.

In English, both in the present tense, and past, of the indicative, the second and third persons, in the singular, differ from the first; but the plural of every person is the same with the first person singular.

If we be bound to admit a participle to be "Vox va-"riabilis per casus, significans rem cum tempore;" then none exist in Hebrew, or English. But if a participle be a part of a verb, expressing its attribute with time, but without person, or assertion, there may be Hebrew, and English participles, as well as Greek and Latin. The defect of a parent verb deprives of the character such words as, fretus, galeatus, insciens, inspirans, indoctus,

piliatus, præditus, &c. Defect of time deprives such as, iratus, mœstus, sapiens, serpens, solens, sponsa, &c.

In English, adjectives, and participles, are equally, and properly destitute of number, gender, case, and person, for these changes have no place in concrete attributes. Their use in the learned languages, seems to have been to relieve the embarrassment, which an inverted structure of sentences might produce. Yet qualities may belong to substances, and be predicated of them at one time, and not at another. If time be not implied; the word, which in origin, and form, might be deemed a participle, receives the denomination of an adjective.

There are but two kinds of participles in the English language, the present and the past. The former always ends in *ing*, the latter ordinarily in *d*. Such as are termed irregular verbs, have their past participles usually in *t* or *n*, and a few in *e*, *k*, *g*, and *m*. The past participle is most commonly the same with the past tense; and therefore when it is not, it is too frequently confounded with it.

The English participle in *ing*, corresponding in some respects to the Latin in *ns*, and Greek present participle in *ων*, and perhaps derived from them, differs very little from a verbal noun; when standing alone, or only preceded by the article the. But it differs from the infinitive when substantively taken, in this, that the infinitive, when an abstract noun, denotes an affection, action, or effect; while this participle expresses an incomplete action, and without the agent. When it follows the substantive verb, it expresses an unfinished action, whether connected with language that denotes time present, past, or future. But with each it signifies a present time; for it can with certain combinations mark the past time as then present, or the future as hereafter to be present.

The present participle is generally active, but some-

times passive; as, *the book is printing*, *the house is building*. At least such participles, and especially of intransitive verbs, bear a sense approximating a passive; but the action, or suffering, is represented as continuing, or advancing.

The past participle usually denotes an action, which is past. When followed by an object, or preceded by the verb *have*, it has ordinarily an active signification. In some grammars, it is said to be the past tense, which follows, *have*, or *had;* and the past participle, which is preceded by *am*, *was*, or *be*. Thus in *I have bound*, and *I am bound*, the former *bound* is sometimes deemed the past tense, and the latter the past participle; also it is said that before intransitives, the verbs, *am*, *was*, and *be* often take the places of *have*, or *had*, and are followed by the past tense; as *I am come*, is equivalent to *I have come*. But the public voice is in the present age correctly opposed to this opinion; and *I have wrote*, *ran*, or *rode*, and the like expressions, common in authors of the last century, are generally and properly now avoided by the best writers, and speakers.

The past participles, of active verbs, after *have, had*, or *having;* and those of intransitive verbs, where they follow *am*, *was*, or *be;* may have an active signification. So in Latin secutus, ultus, ausus and many other perfect participles of deponent verbs may have an active signification.

The Latin perfect participle has been, it is presumed justly, said to have been formed from the third person singular of the perfect indicative active, by adding *us;* which corresponds to the Greek termination ος; as amavit, amavitus, amatus; docuit, docuitus, doctus. *Uit* was *aida*, in Moeso-Gothic, and *ai* sounded as *e* in Latin. When agreeing with a noun, it generally denotes, that the thing, of which it has been predicated, has been the subject of that action, which it expresses to have been

finished, and is therefore said to have a passive sense; but not always, if stratus membra may signify *having strewed his limbs*, as has been supposed. But it is more usual in such instances to understand stratus passively, and membra to be governed by some word not expressed; *prostrated as to his limbs.* Strictly the English word, prostrated, expresses a complete action considered with relation to the agent, whilst its sense is passive with respect to that of which it is affirmed; in Latin stratus membra is passive, as well as strata membra, provided stratus does not agree with the agent.

The perfect participle of the Latin passive voice is materially different from the English past participle, in its meaning, in some circumstances. Amatus and *loved*, may both be passive, and are each expressive of the time past. When they follow the substantive verb, they are alike; but very different after the verb of possession, for in such case amatus retains its passive sense, but *loved* becomes active. Thus habet amatum, *he possesses the beloved object*, has no resemblance to *has loved.*

The Greeks frequently, and happily used their numerous participles for infinitive modes. This is occasionally imitated in our language; as, Μέμνημαι ἰδὼν *I remember seeing;* οἴχεται ἀπιων *he is going away.* If the verb, which such participle accompanies, should be of a different tense from that of the participle, the time of the participle will bear a relation to it, and not to the time of the discourse. Thus in Ἐτυγχανομεν περιπατοῦντες ἐν τῷ Χρονου ἱερῷ *we were walking in the temple of Saturn; walking* was a present action, when we were in the temple, and not when Cebes wrote the sentence; and to say that *walking* in this case expresses no time is a mistake.

The Greek present participle active in ων, *being*, the Latin in ns, that is *ens*, *being;* the Benoni of kal in Hebrew, and the English present participles; all when

of transitive verbs express present, advancing, or imperfect actions.

The participles of the first, and second futures, active, and middle, in the Greek, are deemed sufficiently near in sense to be rendered by the Latin future in *rus.* (*p*)

The participles of the first, and second aorists, and of the perfects in the active, and middle voices, have no nearer approximation in Latin, than the perfect tense of the indicative active; except when they can be rendered by Latin deponent verbs; the past participles of which are in many, if not the most instances, not only the past tense, but of an active signification. Thus εἰπας is *locutus*, which is not *addressed*, but *having said.* The perfect participle in the Greek is sometimes to be made by the pluperfect tense of the Latin.

It is an ancient opinion that Greek participles, and especially the aorists, are frequently to be taken as of the tense of the verb, with which they are most nearly connected in the sentence. But it would be better to say, their times relate to the time of such verb, not to that of the discourse. Thus ὁ πιστεύσας σωθήσεται, is not *he who has believed*, at the time of the promise, but he whose faith shall have preceded the accomplishment of the promise of salvation, shall have the advantage of it. But if the correct rule be, "Participium," scil. indefiniti, "tempus "verbi, cui jungitur optat"' then πιστεύσας must be taken

(*p*) The Greeks often use the infinitive, when the Latins would introduce their participle in *rus*, termed, under such circumstances, also an infinitive; as, ἐκηρυξα δωσειν, *edixi daturum esse*, that is, *me;* but, if another person is intended, the accusative must be inserted; as, ἐπηγγειλάμην ἐκεινον δωσειν, *Pollicitus sum illum daturum.* The participle of the present tense expressing an unfinished action, was also used for the future; thus, Διὸ εἰσέρχομενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον means, *wherefore, about to come into the world.*

to signify, in this case, the future tense. But it appears more eligible to consider it an indefinite past tense, with respect to the time expressed by the verb, with which the participle is associated.

In English, and Latin, the participles of the present, and past, retain their own time; but it is with respect to the time expressed by the verb, with which they are most closely connected in the sentence.

Hebrew, and English verbs have a past participle, generally of a passive sense, and thus nearly correspondent to the perfect participle of the Latins, and the participles of the aorists, and perfect, of the passive voice, of the Greek language. But to render the perfect participle active of the Greeks, we place before our past participle the word *having* as, γέγραφως *having written*, and for the present passive participle of the Greeks, we prefix to our past participle, the term *being*, as, τυπτόμενος *being beaten*. The Latins beside their perfect participle, sometimes used for it, their present participle active, the reciprocal pronoun being implied; as "genibusque volu- "tans hærebam;" "præcipitans traxi mecum."

But the present participle passive of the Greek has no correspondent participle in Latin, or English. Τυπτόμενος is not *verberatus*, or *beaten;* qui verberatur, or *who is now under the lash*, more nearly expresses the meaning. When present participles admit the passive sense they resemble this Greek participle; as *I am consuming*. The passive sense is sometimes improperly given to present participles of English active verbs, as if we should render πνευμάτα ἀποστελλόμενα *spirits sending forth*, that is in the present condition of being sent forth.(*q*)

(*q*) Some participles have a passive termination, but an active signification; as, argutus, cautus, circumspectus, consideratus, contentus, discretus, disertus, falsus, notus,

The participle, which we denominate past, often means an action whilst performing. Thus, *I saw the battle fought, and the standard lowered. Fought* and *lowered* imply actions seen in their continuance, as well as their termination.

In English the past participle in various combinations serves, as has been shown, for the tenses of the perfect kind in the passive voice. *I am loved* expresses a perfect action in a present time and passive sense, as fully, in each respect, as amatus sum can do. When used for those of the imperfect sort, the past participle somewhat counteracts the verb of existence, which it accompanies. *I am loved* is far from being a correct translation of amor, because whilst *am* is present and expresses a continued state, *loved* is passive, or rather represents the time of the action to be past. Amor is *I am a present object of love.* Instead of the passive present tense, we can use the active, and change the subject into an object. With respect to the present and past tenses *of the perfect kind,* in the passive voice, the Latin language is equally de-

profusus, scitus, tacitus, tutus, which have the force of adjectives. Others chiefly coming from neuter verbs, have the effect of participles of deponents; as, adventus, cessatus, complacitus, conflagratus, conjuratus, decessus, decretus, defectus, emersus, excretus, exitus, fluxus, juratus, penetratus, præteritus. A third class, which spring from deponent verbs, have a passive signification; as, abominatus, adeptus, adortus, aggressus, amplexus, architectatus, arbitratus, auxiliatus, bacchatus, cohortatus, comitatus, commentus, conatus, confessus, consolatus, dignatus, enixus, exorsus, executus, largitus, mensus, mentitus, mercatus, meritus, modulatus, oblitus, opinatus, professus, perpessus, pollicitus, populatus, præfatus, professus, testatus, vadatus, veneratus, ultus.

fective as the English; and the Greek has rarely such in the optative and subjunctive.

The participle in *dus*, it has been said before, often takes the place of a gerund, and besides the predicate, which its verb expresses, also implies necessity, or duty, and must be rendered as a present participle. This last circumstance, and the fact that it rarely admits the sense of a future, has procured for it the name of an adjective, as indeed it very nearly agrees with the Greek verbal in τεος, the neuter of which, like the neuter of this participle in the Latin is the gerund of the Greek language.(*r*) But the participle in *dus* is plainly a part of a verb, and the verbal in τεος, is not, and this circumstance must fix their characters.(*s*)

The Benoni niphal of Hebrew verbs, and the participles of the first and second futures of Greek passives, are also rendered by the Latin participles in *dus*, and by the English past participle, preceded by the words *to be*. The same translations, preceded by mox, or *presently*, are made of the paulo-post-future of the Greeks.

(*r*) The infinitive in the Greek is also used in the circumstances of a gerund in the Latin language; as, ἀναγκης ἐπελθουσης τρεχειν *quum incidisset necessitudo currendi*. Often also such infinitive for a gerund is preceded by the article; as ὀν τοῦ ζην-ερῶ εγωγε, *non amore vivendi ego teneor*.

(*s*) The Latins rarely used the gerundive, as this participle has been called, where the verb did not govern the accusative. But instead of the gerunds of verbs governing the accusative, and of fungor, fruor, and potior, the gerundives were preferred. Thus scribenda est epistola is better than scribendum est epistolam. The Latins were fond of verbals and participles. Est mihi oblectamento was better than me oblectat; and redempturus filiam preferable to, ut redimeret filiam.

The participle in *rus* is active, and does not lose under any circumstances, its signification of the future.

Participles in the Greek language may assume the article and stand as nouns, and become the subjects or objects of verbs, or be governed by prepositions. But though they may express persons or things, they have nevertheless the requisites of participles. Thus ὁ δουλευων is *a servant*, but he must be in actual service at the time; ὁ εχων may signify *a rich man*, but he must be actually possessing at that time; ὁ πιστευων is *a believer*, but the expression regards the then present *assent* or *confidence* of his mind. The participle of the present time in English may assume an article, and the condition, and meaning of a noun, but it signifies the act, not the agent; it retains often the property of its verb, in being followed by a noun as its object. However, it has been thought, that a preposition ought to intervene, as often as an article has gone before; because the article determines it a participial noun, rather than a participle. It may be a noun without the article, and then generally a preposition should come before the following noun; yet not always, for a noun, with, or without the article, may have its object; as lectio librum.

In the Greek and Latin languages, verbs, which want modes or tenses, are termed defective, but not if the deficiency be of voices or persons. Any of these may be equally excluded by the meanings of different verbs, as well as by other causes. When verbs signify imperfect actions, as, glisco, labo, and the like, they admit not the perfect, and pluperfect tenses. If on the contrary they express only complete actions, as odi, memini and others; odio, and meno, with their imperfect tenses and indicative futures, must remain forever useless. If it be alleged that odi and memini are in fact present tenses; it may be answered, so is every Latin perfect; but they are not equi-

valent to Latin and Greek present tenses, which ever express imperfect actions.

The numerous classes of verbs in those languages, consisting respectively of tenses drawn from different roots, now in many instances obsolete, may be deemed defective verbs. Ease in discrimination frequently dictated, when two verbs accorded in meaning, the adoption of those tenses, which denoted imperfect actions, from one root, and the tenses expressive of perfect ones, from another; as λαμβάνω, λήψομαι; reminiscor, recordatus sum.

In English those verbs are accounted defective, which want either, or both of the participles; as, can, could; may, might; shall, should; will, would; wis, wist; wit, wot.

Others are thought, but perhaps erroneously, to be defective also of the past tense; as, must, ought, and quoth.

Our grammarians seem to have consented to denominate all verbs irregular, the past participles of which do not terminate in *ed*. The number of them, including those which are defective, do not exceed two hundred.(*s*)

(*s*) Vide the Syllabus appending to this essay.

CHAPTER VII.

OF ADVERBS.

VERBUM, and ῥῆμα, from whence adverbium, and ἐπιῤῥῆμα have been formed, did not originally signify, what grammarians now intend by the verb; but rather the predicate of a proposition. An adverb therefore did not, when the word was first coined, signify an appendage to that sort of words, which we at present denominate verbs; nor ought it now to be so understood. As substantives may themselves be predicated, so may they also admit adverbs as associates; but in such cases the substantives express qualities; as nimium philosophus; admodum puella. An adverb nevertheless is not a name of an immediate attribute, nor does it denote a quality of a substantive, but it expresses some modification or circumstance of an action or quality, and has been termed an attribute of an attribute. Hence an adverb should never in discourse take the place of an adjective, nor vice versâ. It may also be inferred, that such secondary qualities may be expressed otherwise, though it be circuitously; and that adverbs may be rather convenient abbreviations, than a necessary part of speech.

If we describe adverbs as words used with other(*a*) words to modify their significations, many verbs and

(*a*) By *other words* is not meant other sorts of words, for adverbs may modify the meaning of adverbs; yet all other sorts of words may be thus modified, unless interjections are to be excepted. It is generally a safe characteristic of an adverb, that it will not make sense with a substantive; yet substantives must not be excluded from the description, because

adjectives will be included; but if we add, that they express some circumstance, or relation of an attribute or action; they will be distinguished from the parts of speech hitherto treated of, but not from prepositions. Interjections will be excluded, and yet in the Greek grammars they belong to the same class of words.

Adverbs are often abbreviations of words, or parts of sentences, and are in every predicament. Though as primitives they be few, as derivatives they are very numerous; and as various as are the circumstances of actions. Substantives, articles, adjectives, pronouns, verbs and their participles, prepositions and conjunctions, can all occasionally fall into their ranks, and be used adverbially.

Conjunctions become adverbs, when, not being used to connect sentences, they serve only to modify the sense of a word; thus in *nescio an amet*, *an* is a conjunction; but in, *an amat? an* is an adverb. Yet there is a numerous class of conjunctions, which stand first in a sentence; but the subject has been begun antecedently. Also adverbs of likeness have in construction the effect of conjunctions; and must be deemed adverbs in sense, whilst they are conjunctions with respect to the structure of sentences.

In Latin, adverbs rarely govern any other than the genitive case, and these partake somewhat of the nature of substantives, and follow in government their primitives. Prepositions uncompounded govern either the accusative, or ablative; and if they have no case, they are converted into adverbs, and have generally their effect with the verb in the sentence. But if the sense require a case to be supplied, they are to be deemed prepositions. Ad-

it has been before seen, that adverbs may be used with them, under some circumstances. This is especially true of adverbs of place, time, and quantity; as, ἡ ἄνω βασιλεία *cœleste regnum*; οἱ παλαι ἀνθρωποι *antiqui*.

versus, clam, juxta, secundum, and some other words, which are esteemed prepositions, have been thought to be merely adverbs, and when followed by cases, other prepositions are supposed to be understood, which really govern them.

Although adverbs, in the Greek, and Latin languages, sometimes govern cases; as, ἀνλίκα νυκτὸς; δὶς τοῦ σάββατου; τηλόθι πάτρης; θεοις ὁμοῦ; clanculum patres, clam uxorem; éo insolentiæ processit: yet it should be admitted, that among the numerous examples of such government, there are few instances, which may not be otherwise accounted for; and if the adverb have not the force of its primitive, or of a noun, there is generally a preposition or noun, understood. Magis, nimis, satis, are said to be old nouns, and may thus have a genitive; sponte, forte, fortuito, scil. casu are ablatives of the manner: ὀλίγου, ἀνλοῦ are genitives; τῇ, ἰδιᾳ, τἀνλῇ punctulo subjecto, are datives, δωρεὰν, and τὴν ταχίστην are accusatives, all syntactically governed, although accounted adverbs. The same may be concluded of quo-modo, post-ea, inter-ea, hactenus, ante-hac, (for hæc) ad-modum, magno-(o) pere, sci-(re) licet, and others.

Doubts, whether with respect to the sense, or syntactical construction, may be often resolved by resorting to the primitive word or words. Thus quare is equivalent to qua de re, cur to cui rei, adhuc to ad hoc tempus, antehac to ante hæc tempora, quin to qui non, the causal quod may be rendered as a relative, and ὅτι in the same manner.

The Greeks adopted different terminations to denote a diversity of place. Οθι, οι, ου, ησι, and ασι signify in or at a place; θεν from a place; ζε, δε, or σε to a place. Thus,

οἴκοθι, or οἶκοι domi	οἴκοθεν domo	οἴκόνδε or οἶκαδε domum.
ὁμοῦ,	ὁμόθεν	ὁμόσε.
ἀθήνησι	ἀθήνηθεν	ἀθήναζε.

Adverbs, which beginning with a vowel signify time, place, or manner, by assuming as a prefix π, become interrogatives, or by prefixing τ, are fit to answer a question. Thus,

ὅτε, ὁπότε when	πότε when? (*b*)	τότε then.
ὅθι where	πόθι where?	τόθι there.
ὡς how	πῶς how?	τοῖον in such manner.

Many adverbs, especially such as signify *quality*, or *manner*, and those which have been derived of adjectives, admit of comparison; as μάλα, μᾶλλον, μάλιστα; ταχύ, τάχιον, θάσσον, or ταχύτερον, τάχιστα; dure, facile, bene, sæpe, prope, docte, nuper, and others, are compared. In English a few are also compared; as often, oftener, oftenest; and some irregularly; as little, less, least; much, more, most, when taken adverbially; well, better, best; ill, worse, worst; far, farther, farthest; and further, furthest. (*c*)

The Greeks have six negative adverbs, μή, μήτε, μηδε, οὐ, or οὐκ before a vowel, οὐδέ, and οὔτε. Two negatives in the

(*b*) There was an ancient interrogative pronoun πος, πη, πο; its redditive was ὁ-πός, ὁ-πη, ὁ-πο: πος; *who* did it? ὁπος was from ὁ *this*, and πος *who*. Thus τις *who?* ὁστις *this who;* ποῦ, *in what place?* ὁ-ποῦ *this place*. Τε, the same as δε, is the Chaldaic דה *that*, and is emphatic. Πότε; που-τε, *when, particularly?* το-πότε *that when*, or *then;* ὁ-πότε *this when*, or *when*. Or ὅτε may be from the Hebrew עת *time*, *when;* πότε; πος-ότε, *what time?* τὸ-ὅτε *this time*, contracted into τότε *then*. Or, ὅτε, may have been originally for ὧ-τε, τότε for τῷ-τε, and πότε for πῷ-τε.

(*c*) In Hebrew, the comparative is chiefly made by the letter מ or מן, *as*, or *compared with* prefixed, and the superlative by מאד *very*, which are adverbs. But Hebrew adverbs are usually in fact nouns, with prepositions prefixed, or a final ם added. There are three which never stand alone, ה, כ, כש, and six which are negative, אל, אין, בל, בלי, בלתי, and לא.

Hebrew, Latin, and English languages, ordinarily counteract each other, and leave an affirmative sentence; but in Greek they strengthen the denial. Sometimes there is an accumulation of them;, as, Οὐδέποτε οὐδεὶς οὐ μὴ γένηται τῶν δεόντων. *Nothing of what is necessary will by any means be done.*

Yet there are exceptions; μὴ and οὐ coming together sometimes are to be rendered as one word, *but;* as, οὐκ ἂν ἔξαρνος γένοιο μὴ οὐκ ἐμὸς υἱὸς εἶναι, *you cannot deny but you are my son.* Also two negatives, separated by a verb, may affirm; as, οὐ δύναμαι μὴ μεμνῆσθαι αὐτοῦ, *non possum ejus non meminisse.* The sense of the passage will often be cleared by rendering μη *lest;* as, δείδω μὴ διῇται, *I fear lest he may pursue;* μη is therefore not necessarily always negative.(*d*)

In English, two negatives make an affirmative in the same proposition; "Nor did we get no hurt by Adam's fall." But it is otherwise if the sentence be divided; as, "He will not let you go, no, not with a mighty hand."

In the Latin language, there have been found many supposed exceptions to the rule, that two negatives affirm; but in many of them, the following negative, or negatives, may be exegetical of the first. Thus in, "Non me car- "minibus vincet, nec Orpheus, nec Linus." There are in this instance, three sentences condensed into one by the two conjunctions, and each *nec* does but extend the force of the non, and its predicate, to the nominative or subject introduced by it.

In the same manner may be explained the following modes of expression; "Nullo neque turpi, nec flagitioso quæstu;" "Quanquam negent, nec virtutes, nec vitia

(*d*) There are also other exceptions; as, Ὧν δὲ ἕνεκα ἀυτὸς τι οὐκ ἄκων εἰς τόδε τὸ τέλος κατέστην; "*Quibus vero de causis et ipse munus hoc non invitus susceperim.*" Xenoph. 1 Lib. p. 47.

crescere;" " Nullam esse artem, nec dicendi, nec disse-" rendi putant." Nec and neque may be used as mere connexives; and, though negative, must not conflict with either member of the sentence; as " Ne temere facias, " neque tu haud dicas tibi non prædictum;" *act cautiously, and do not say you were not forewarned.*

Exceptions to the rule, in the Latin language, have generally either been misunderstood, or extracted from writers, whose authority is scarcely admissible, in such an inquiry.

To the adverbs must be referred also certain of the inseparable particles. A is used as intensive, or negative, in the Moeso-Gothic, Greek, Latin and Anglo-Saxon languages; in the former sense the Greeks may have used it for ἀϱι, which is probably from אזא which signifies *to be strong;* or from ἀγαν *valde;* and in the latter for ἀπὸ, thus ἄλιμος is equivalent unto ἀπότιμος; or for ἀνεν or ἀτεϱ. It is also conjunctive, for ἁμα. The Greeks used δα also, and the Latins *dis*, intensively. And the Greeks had νὶ and νὴ, and the Latins *ne*, and *ni* for negatives; *ni* Moeso-Gothic, and *ne* Anglo-Saxon, were also negative inseparable particles.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF INTERJECTIONS.

THE interjection has been denied to have any thing to do with speech, and pronounced the miserable refuge of the speechless. It is, when vocal, a sound thrown into language expressing an emotion, or affection, which is chiefly understood by the attitude and the tone of the voice of the speaker. In writing, it is the arbitrary sign of an affection or passion, and therefore deservedly excluded from science, history, and laws. Whether distinct, or inarticulate, it interrupts the communication of sentiment by an unnecessary intrusion among the words, and is for this reason denominated an interjection.

Interjections in spoken language, have been termed voices of nature, rather than of art. But written interjections are generally derivatives, and frequently rather other parts of speech, than natural sounds; and often signify, in different languages, and sometimes in the same, various, and opposite emotions.

The real interjections, or natural sounds, are very faintly expressed by letters and syllables. When, for example, a suitable representation to the mind produces the convulsive motion denominated laughter, that noise, which is occasioned by the interrupted expulsion of the breath, has been in Latin writers imitated by the syllables *ha*, *ha*, *he*, and English authors have followed them. But the sound of laughter is often very different, in different persons, and in all distinguishable from those syllables, when read by them. Yet the difference in this instance may not be greater, than that, which generally

obtains between real, and written interjections. Hence it is, that public speakers, who are much addicted to the use of interjections, generally become objects of ridicule. A large and unaffected audience will impute such flourishes to intemperate zeal, or licentiousness; or be disgusted with it as vanity, and disingenuousness.

The emotion expressed by an interjection might be in many instances described in words; and therefore it has been deemed an abbreviation, "vox, citra verbi opem, "sententiam complens;" but the resemblance would be little nearer than a verbal frigid description of a tune played on an organ.

It has been usual with Hebrew, Latin, and English grammarians to denominate any inflected word, whether noun, adjective, or verb, if introduced without connexion, and implying an emotion, an interjection. But such words denote ideas, which are known; and the hearer, or reader is supposed to be able, from the circumstances of the case to complete the sentence, which through haste is omitted, except the word which is the principal constituent. Thus Malum! Infandum! Pax! Silence! and the like, have the substantive verb understood.

When interjections are supposed to govern cases, it is the better opinion, that such cases are either absolute, or otherwise syntactically constructed. Thus, proh dolor! is the same as proh quantus est dolor; proh Deûm fidem! is proh! imploro Deûm fidem; heu me miserum! stands for heu! quam me miserum sentio; nugas! is equivalent to nugas dicis; quid multa? is quid dico multa verba? mehercule! is, me Hercule adjuvante? Ὢ τοῦ ἀδικήματος! *O the injustice*, that is ὑπὲρ or ἕνεκα τοῦ, &c. ah me! that is, ah! behold, or pity me; wo is me! means, sorrow is to me. By a due attention to the expressions of some old authors, who have given their ideas more at large, we may learn to supply the omissions of writers, who are

more concise; and shall discover, that many of those special cases, and exceptions in syntactical government, which interrupt the learner, or load his memory, are easily and rationally resolved by supplying a word, or words, which the writer thought it unnecessary to insert. When different cases follow the same, or different interjections, the variety depends not upon the interjection, but upon the words, which are omitted; of these the particular case is some index to the hearer or reader; this, with the sense necessary by the circumstances of the occasion, together with the emotion of the speaker, generally renders the omitted words sufficiently certain. If the sentence cannot be completed, the speaker, or writer is without apology.

CHAPTER IX.

OF PREPOSITIONS.

THE words, which bear this denomination, are not the only ones, which may *precede* the terms introduced by them into discourse. The name appears also improper, because prepositions sometimes follow the words, which they connect with others; as, aurium tenus. They are connectives, and do indeed generally unite a word, or words with sentences, and that without altering the syntactical construction; yet they effect other highly important purposes. That words denoting agents, actions, and objects acted upon, should follow in succession; and that terms, expressing concrete properties, should stand with the words denoting the substances, to which the qualities belong, is natural. But when the abstract is used for the concrete, or another substantive is introduced, of which nothing is asserted, it is the office of the preposition to step into the sentence with it, and speak its relation.

The various terminations, which have been denominated cases, and by some thought to be prepositions coalescing with nouns, denote certain relations of the things expressed by such words: but distinct prepositions answer the same purposes, with greater variety. By their aid, combinations of terms, with their relations, are connected into sentences also, with the utmost distinctness, and precision of meaning.

If to return all prepositions to verbs, which in theory have been deemed the parents of language, were practicable, and effected, syntactical construction would be de-

stroyed, and an incoherent jumble of words succeed, such as was, it is presumed, never in use among any people. In the languages of the ancient Asiatic nations, though verbs be the roots of all their words, it is not credible, that at any period of the world, they were confined to the use of such roots only. If all the English words, which have come down through European languages from oriental fountains, could be traced back to their originals with certainty, the chief importance, that could result, would merely be to ascertain respectively their primary import. Whether modern changes be termed corruptions, or improvements; there can be no difficulty in deciding, that the conversion of prepositions, and other parts of speech generally, into verbs, would neither be evidence of wisdom, nor of regard to public utility.

A modern author, to whom we are all indebted, supposes that prepositions answer the same purposes, with respect to complex ideas, which articles do to individual ones. That as the article renders more particular a general term, a preposition either subtracts from, or adds to the terms in a sentence, which express a complex idea of an extent too large, or too limited for the purposes of the speaker, or writer. Thus he says in the expression; "*A "house with a party-wall,*" the complex term house is deficient, and the preposition directs to *add* what is wanting; but if we say; "*A house without a party-wall;*" the complex term house is redundant, and the preposition directs to *take away* the redundancy. Hence he infers the importance of prepositions to prevent the incumbrance of innumerable complex terms. But these effects of the prepositions *with*, and *without*, may spring from their particular meanings, and not from them as prepositions. For if we change the expression to, *a house instead of a party-wall;* then the complex term house is neither restricted, nor enlarged, and this specious reasoning seems to be defeated.

As our ideas, and language, generally originate from sensible objects, so almost all prepositions are primarily expressive of situation, or motion; and thence chiefly by analogy they denote time, cause, and effect; and various other relations. To follow their changes of signification from the relations of bodies, to those of an intellectual kind, is both a pleasing, and useful employment, and has been thought to be the best method of ascertaining their proper use, when applied by analogy to intellectual, and moral subjects.

There is a numerous catalogue of participles; such as, according, admitting, allowing, bating, comparing, concerning, considering, excepting, granting, notwithstanding, regarding, relating, respecting, saving, seeing, speaking, supposing, touching, and the like, which may begin, or be introduced into sentences, and be followed by a preposition, or a noun, or pronoun placed objectively, but are without dependence, or other visible connexion. In some instances if translated into other languages, they must be rendered by prepositions. They are denominated by some, prepositions, by others conjunctions; some account them participles put absolutely, with some word with which they may accord in sense, as, *understanding*, *we*, *ye*, *they*, &c. So implicitly do we pursue the grammars of other languages, that every one fears to own a principle, or make a rule not found in them.

It is one characteristic of prepositions that they are indeclinable; but so are other parts of speech. They also connect words; and so do conjunctions, in some instances; this circumstance is an important criterion, though not infallible. They show the relation of words to each other; this is a real distinction as far as it goes, but seems not to be universal. They are set before nouns to govern them; this will generally distinguish them from other indeclina-

ble words; but interjections are said to govern cases (*a*) This characteristic also is applicable to some adverbs, and must be confined to those languages, which have cases. Some grammarians give as a mark of prepositions, that they show the state, situation, or position, of persons, or things; but this often fails, when prepositions are used in secondary or more distant senses.

If the participles before mentioned, be tested by these characteristic marks, it will appear, that instead of expressing respectively a relation of the words they introduce, or the state of the things to which they refer, they in every instance require to act, or express a present imperfect action. The opinion therefore that such participles are put absolutely with a noun, or pronoun understood, seems preferable.

There are eighteen principal prepositions in the Greek language, whereof ἀνὶ, ἀπὸ, ἐκ, and πρὸ govern the genitive only, ἐν and σὺν the dative, εἰς, and it is said ἀνα the accusative, διὰ the genitive, or accusative, and the residue govern respectively the genitive, dative or accusative. The force of the preposition, as it requires its following noun to express origination, a final cause, an object, or an instrumental cause, will usually discover the case, which is suited to its nature, and point the writer or speaker to the genitive, dative, or accusative in the Greek; or the ablative, or accusative in the Latin; for the ablative of the latter answers to the genitive and sometimes to the dative of the former. Ἄγχι, ἄμα, ἄνευ, ἕνεκα, ἐκτὸς, ἐντὸς, μέχρι, and πέρα, though generally deemed adverbs, have

(*a*) Prepositions are thought often to precede the subject and verb, as they certainly do the verb alone. Thus it has been said, that *after* is as properly a preposition in the sentence, *I came after he departed*, as if it had been expressed, *I came after his departure.*

been ranked with prepositions, and when they govern a case which is usually the genitive, their title to be so accounted is plausible. The Greeks had also inseparable particles denominated prepositions. Of these ἀρι, ἐρι, βου, βρ, δα, ζα, λα, λι, and νη sometimes, increase the force of the word; δυς expresses difficulty; νε, and νη generally deny; and α, for ανευ, or ἀ ερ denies, but for αμα conjoins, and for αγαν increases.(*b*)

Latin grammarians enumerate about thirty prepositions, which govern the accusative, fifteen which are followed by an ablative, and four which, in different senses, govern the accusative, or ablative, according to the circumstances of the case. The inseparable prepositions are am, con, di, re and se. The senses of the Latin prepositions appear more determinate, than those of the Greek; thus for πρὸ in Greek, *before*, the Latins have coram, *before*, in place, ante *before*, in time, and præ *before*, in preference. Ἀπὸ and ἐκ are often promiscuous, whilst *a* and *e* must not be confounded.

As the several relations, which are expressed in some other languages by cases, are in the English denoted by prepositions, our grammarians have usually distinguished such relations by the names of the cases in use in the Latin language. But as no preposition in our language occasions any change in the noun, which it accompanies, such a discrimination has been before alleged to be foreign to us, and worse than useless. The pronouns nevertheless, which are used objectively, alone, can be used, and never those which denote agents, with the prepositions of the English language.

Prepositions when compared are considered as changing their character and becoming adjectives; for they seem to admit of inflections in no language.

(*b*) Vide p. 168, ante.

CHAPTER X.

OF CONJUNCTIONS.

THE connexive particles of the English language are numerous, and therefore embarrassing to foreigners; but this circumstance is of great advantage to perspicuity, and precision. The correct knowledge of them, and of their uses, like distinctness of pronunciation in oratory, is so essential, that without it no one is fit to appear, either as a speaker, or writer.

To be able merely to pronounce from memory, this particle to be a conjunction, and that a preposition, is of small importance. It is no weak argument of the inutility of exquisiteness in nominal discriminations, that the general characters of these parts of speech, and the particular dividing lines, have never as yet been definitively settled. But the senses of the words, and the proper introduction of them into discourse, and their effects, should be known, and can be learned only by conversation with the intelligent, attentive observation, and careful scrutiny into their derivations, and various uses.(*a*) Yet every scholar is expected to observe when a word is

(*a*) Horne Tooke has thrown much light upon the origination of the English particles. He thought that an, and, but, else, if, still, though, unless, without, and yet, were imperatives of Anglo-Saxon verbs; *lest*, and *since* participles; *that* a pronoun; and *as* and *so* equivalent to *that*. But Dr. Jamieson in his Hermes Scythicus has made farther progress in this interesting inquiry, which it is hoped will be brought to still greater certainty. He derives *and*, our conjunction, from *and*, the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon

used merely for connexion of sentiment, to express a quality of an action or quality, or to denote the relation of its following noun; and accordingly to be able to pronounce it a conjunction, an adverb, or a preposition.

The relations of the adjective to the substantive; of the finite verb to its subject, or object; and of the adverb to its verb, or adjective, may be discerned without distinct words to express them. If a noun be introduced in any other circumstances, its relation is usually expressed, in the English language, and ordinarily by a preposition. But if a noun, implying the repetition of a verb; or if a sentence, or member of a sentence, including, or implying a finite verb, be annexed to a sentence, or proposition, a word denoting such connexion, must be either expressed, or implied, and this is a conjunction. A conjunction therefore resembles a preposition in this, that it may express the relation of one word unto another, or a sentence; but its effect is also, either to connect into one compound sentence, what might be several sentences, showing at the same time the dependence; or at least, by joining several words, it renders either the subject, or predicate of a proposition complex. That prepositions connect words, and conjunctions sentences, is by no means a universal distinction. Thus; "A man of wisdom and "virtue is a perfect character," is justly said not to be resolvable into two sentences, without destroying the sense. The "*and*" must therefore connect words, not sentences; but *and* in this sentence does not express the relation of *virtue* to *man*, it brings *virtue* into the sentence, under the same circumstances that *wisdom* was placed in, that is, as connected with *man* by the preposi-

preposition, in Greek ἀντι, and Latin *ante*. *Yet* he supposes the Anglo-Saxon *get*, or *gyt*, which corresponds to the Greek ἑτι, and Hebrew עוד *adhuc*.

tion *of*. *And* therefore here simply expresses such connexion.

This class of words is so denominated, because the conjunction makes one sentence of more, or conjoins several words under the same circumstances in one sentence. But that it also shows the dependence of the parts of a sentence, the diversity of its species plainly proves; they being so many discriminations of the various effects of such particles upon the meanings of different sentences, when thus conjoined.

Conjunctions serve for convenience or elegance, but are not absolutely necessary; as the sense may perhaps in every instance, be expressed without using a conjunction.

Much ingenuity, and labour have been expended on the classification of conjunctions to very little advantage. Such artificial distinctions have little perceivable subserviency either to grammatical science, or the art of logic. To teach, when, and how conjunctions are to be used in the construction of sentences, and what their effects, belongs to grammar; and such knowledge is supposed in the art, which teaches to investigate truth, and communicate it to others. Every logician should be able to resolve those complicated expressions, which by the frequent insertion of the relative pronoun, and by other means, produce obscurity. This he never accomplishes more successfully, than by resolving them into distinct sentences, or into members connected by this species of words. Conjunctions, nevertheless, according to their respective meanings, justly bear certain appellations; and may claim them also by prescriptive right.(*b*) The principal follow.

(*b*) There are some amphibious words denominated adverbia conjunctiva, or conjunctiones adverbiales, the

Copulatives, συμπλεκτικοι, as, *also*, *and*, *both*, *neither*, and *nor*, may join several subjects, or objects, when that, which is affirmed, or denied, will regard each, or all of them. They are used in like manner to connect several attributes, when each of them is, or all of them are affirmed, or denied of the subject, or subjects. When this species of conjunction connects single words, it mostly places them in the circumstances under which the words are, with which they are joined; so that the meaning of another similar sentence is produced, without a repetition of the words. Like modes tenses and cases in the Latin, and Greek languages, follow them when a similar sense is thereby secured; but it is otherwise, when a different sense is intended; as, " Confidebam; ac mihi persuase-" ram fore," &c. " Nisi me lactasses amantem, et falsâ spe " produceres." So when the introduced word would be differently affected, if substituted, the case must be changed; as, " Constitit asse, et pluris;" but pretio may be understood before pluris. So, " Est domus fratris, et mea," may have domus before mea. " Malo esse Romæ, " quam Athenis," may have in urbe before Romæ. Yet the similarity of case, &c. is not by any other force of the conjunction, than that of its introducing the additional word into the constructional circumstances of the word, to which it is conjoined, that a similarity of meaning may be maintained. Sometimes the introduction of another word, or words, may require a change in the construction of the sentence: as when two, or more singular

reason for which is thus assigned by Vossius. " Significa-" tiones interdum ita vicinæ sunt adverbiis, ut etiam doctis-" simi dissentiant, utrùm quid conjunctionibus, an adverbiis, " debeat accenseri." " *Primum*, *deinde*, *præterea* et alia— " adverbia sunt, quatenus verbo junguntur ad circumstan-" tiam explicandum; conjunctiones autem, quia etiam respi-" ciunt juncturam orationis."

nouns, connected by a copulative conjunction, cause the verb, adjective or relative to be plural; as, "Pater mihi, et mater mortui sunt." Yet this is not always necessary, for the adjective, pronoun, or verb may agree with the nearest or most worthy name, as; "Sociis, et rege recepto."

Adversatives, ἐναντιωματικοί, as, *although*, *but*, *nevertheless*, *notwithstanding*, *though*, *yet*, &c., are the reverse of the copulatives, and express that the following judgment is in some respect diverse from that, which has preceded.

Disjunctives, διαζευκτικοί, as, *either* and *or*, are used to oppose the several parts of a proposition to each other, and to allow only an alternative. They follow the rules of the copulatives, in connecting similar cases and tenses, and are therefore grammatically conjunctions, whilst in strictness they are logically disjunctives.

Either, and its negative *neither*, (*c*) when unaccompanied by the expressions to which they relate, are pronouns; but in the presence of the things they denote, they are generally mere conjunctions.

Causatives, ἀιτιολογικοί, as, *because*, *for*, *then*, *since*, *that*, *therefore*, *wherefore*, &c., whilst they connect different propositions, express that one is the cause of the other.

The words ὅτι, *quod*, and *that* may be used, each as a pronoun, or as a conjunction. Perhaps *ut* and *uti* were ὅτι originally. Quod has been deemed a derivative of καὶ and ὅτι. *That* seems to be an Anglo-Saxon word.

Conditionals, as, *if*, *provided*, &c., make one proposition, or part of a sentence, a term, upon the truth of which, as an antecedent, the other depends, as a consequent. When any conjunction is taken to express the sense of possibility, or conditionality, as, dummodo,

(*c*) *Neither* is not a disjunctive, it creates no opposition.

licet, ne, quo, ut, and utinam often do, the subjunctive mode in Latin should follow. But when conjunctions do not express a connexion in sense hypothetically, the indicative is most proper. Thus, cum *since*, dum *provided*, licet *although*, ne *lest*, quod *that*, and ut *that* have a subjunctive; but cum *when*, dum *while*, ne *not*, quod *but*, and ut *when* have usually the indicative. Licet, some grammarians have said, has always the sense of the impersonal, whilst others deny the existence of any impersonal verb.

In the Greek language also, hypothetical expressions require a subjunctive; or when accumulated, the optative. But it is said that every conjunction in that language, except ἐὰν, ἤν, and their compounds, may be used with an indicative mode.

Exceptives, as, *except*, *unless*, &c. denote, that the truth of one proposition depends upon that of another.

Some conjunctions express the relation of one sentence to another; others conjoin only the members of the same sentence. Of the former sort are *again*, *besides*, *further*, *moreover*, &c., of the latter are *lest*, *nor*, *than*, *that*, *unless*, &c. but, generally, conjunctions of every species will serve either of those purposes. *When*, *where*, *whence*, *whether*, *whenever*, and *wherever*, whilst they denote time or place, may also connect sentences, and have therefore been denominated adverbial conjunctions.

Latin conjunctions, accordingly as they stand in the first, or second place in a sentence, or indifferently in either, have been denominated prepositive, subjunctive, or common. (*d*) Of the subjunctives, ne, que, and ve are

(*d*) Latin prepositives are ac, ast, at, nam, nec, nisi, quare, quin, seu, si, sin, sive: subjunctives autem, enim, ne, que, quidem, quoque, &c. The common ergo, igitur, itaque, quoniam, tamen &c.

always joined to other words; and are called enclitics, (*e*) because, they draw towards them the accent.

Among the Greeks γε, δεν, δην, νυ, περ, ρα, τε and τοι have been denominated πληρωματικαι, or mere expletives; but they add emphasis, and should be so rendered, as to attain this object. Especially ρα is ever important, and means *as is well known.* Also και is often used merely to fix the attention upon the word, which it renders emphatical. In other instances it is omitted; that the transition may be more rapid. τε is not always expletive, it is sometimes to be rendered *and,* or if with και, *both;* as, ην τε και ενομιζετο ευσεβεστατος. *He both was, and was esteemed very pious.* τε and δε came, it is supposed, from the Chaldaic relative דִּ *that;* μεν *indeed* from the Hebrew אמן *truth;* γε and κε from זה *this.*

(*e*) Απο του εγκλινειν, *inclinare,* quia accentus fit inclinatior, depressiorque: ut qui in proximam declinet syllabam; vel quia sub unum ita coalescunt accentum, ut una vox videatur. Vide ante p. 57.

AN ESSAY ON GRAMMAR.

PART III.

OF SENTENCES.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE CONSTITUENT PARTS OF A SENTENCE.

THE province of grammar is to guide us in expressing our thoughts, or in the interpretation of the words of others. Whether the arrangement of thoughts, or words be, in any particular instance, well calculated to develop truth, belongs to another department of science. Logical rules are sometimes important to discover a defective definition, or an illegitimate conclusion. But syllogistic argumentation has been chiefly confined to the schools. This not being the course of thought naturally pursued, nor well adapted to the investigation of truth, difficult in practice, and sometimes suspicious, modes and figures have been chiefly abandoned for that good sense, by which every man is informed, that the terms of a conclusion ought not to be more general than, or differing in sense from those of the premises. The Socratic mode of disputation also, is little adapted to produce truth, the respondent being obliged to the greatest exertions, whereby the acumen of the inquirer may gain an undue advantage.

The forensic manner is justly preferred, and every successful effort in rescuing it from pompous display,

insidious ornament, and empty sounds, by showing how to discriminate between truth and errour, is a real benefit to man.

Custom has established certain laws of speech, to which words, and sentences must be conformed. These, before they were written, were presumed to be known. They receive no additional authority by having been reduced to writing, and denominated grammar; but ignorance of them is somewhat the less excusable. As the possible combinations of the letters of an alphabet far exceed the words of a language, so the phrases, produced by the different collocations of words in sentences, are too numerous to be individually recognized, and taught with advantage.

The distinction of the parts of speech is in some respects artificial, and arbitrary; but applicable to all languages. In like manner the construction, Σύνταξις, of sentences, founded on such a classification of words, will be found, on a close comparison, to be, to a considerable extent, analogous; (*a*) juxtaposition being in some languages supplied by cases, genders, and numbers in others; and modes and tenses, perplexingly numerous in some, being superseded by words in others, which express possibility, or certainty; liberty or necessity; proximity, or distance in point of time, with more pleasing variety, and less embarrassment to the learner.

Every simple sentence contains expressly, or impliedly, a subject, and a verb. The verb, when it does not contain, is generally followed by a predicate; and when

(*a*) "Syntaxis omnium harum linguarum," viz. Hebraicæ, Chaldaicæ, Syriacæ, Samaritanæ, Æthiopicæ, et Arabicæ, "in plerisque congruit, non tantum inter se, et cum cæteris orientalibus, sed etiam cum Græca, vel Latina." *Castell. in Harmon. Lexic. Heptaglot.*

transitive requires an object. The simplicity is not destroyed by the introduction of words expressive of origin, cause, end, relation, or other circumstance affecting the subject, copula, or predicate.

There may be several subjects to the same verb, several verbs to the same subject, or several objects to the same verb, and the sentence be simple. But when the sentence remains simple, the same verb must be differently affected by its several adjuncts, or the sense liable to be altered by a separation. If the verb, or the subject be affected in the same manner; or the sentence is resolvable into more, it is compounded. Thus *violet, indigo, blue, green, yellow, orange, and red, mixed in due proportion, produce white*, is a simple sentence, for the subject is indivisible. But *violet, indigo, blue, green, yellow, orange, and red are refrangible rays of light*, is a compound sentence, and may be separated into seven.

One subject, or predicate may include terms, or propositions incidental to that, which is principal, and expressive of some qualification, condition, supposition or other circumstance; or such matter may be mere introduction; as, *it is true; it is an errour; I deny; I doubt* &c.

In every case, if the sentence be capable of a division into different propositions it is compounded, otherwise it is simple, however amplified, by terms and imperfect phrases.

Sentences have been divided with respect to their meanings into imperative, interrogative, declarative, and conditional. This distribution might be further extended, but it is of small utility in grammatical resolution.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE SUBJECT OF A PROPOSITION.

THE subject follows the verb, generally in Hebrew, and often in the Greek; in Latin it elegantly follows the object, rarely the verb. In English it should precede the verb, except the latter be connexive, interrogative, in the imperative mode, or there be no danger of ambiguity.

An infinitive mode, a clause, a sentence, a word used artificially in the genitive, dative or in any other case in Greek and Latin, may occupy the place of a subject; and so may any thing, whereof something may be affirmed, or denied.

The subject, if a noun, must, in English, and in Hebrew, be in its simple state; in the Greek, and Latin, in the nominative case; for every other implies some relation inconsistent with the independent condition of the subject of a proposition. And if there be two, or more nouns singular, or plural, of which the assertion is made, they are for the same reason, and not by force of conjunctions, to be put in the same state, or case.

Pronoun-substantives of the first, or second person, when subjects, should to prevent ambiguity, be expressed in English; except where the verb is used imperatively. This reason fails in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, where personal terminations abound; in these they are generally omitted, except for the sake of emphasis.

Pronouns, whether substantive, relative, or interrogative may be subjects in the room of their principals, and so may adjectives also; as *the young;* οἱ νεοὶ; stulti &c.

When the adjective, in such circumstances, is neuter, which can never happen in Hebrew, or English, it is often considered as an abstract noun; as τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the goodness of God.* The substitution of χρῆμα, ῥῆμα, *negotium*, or *thing*, is but at best an approximation, and sometimes an incoherence in sense. Attention will generally detect the noun, infinitive clause, or sentence, which may supply the ellipsis. (*a*)

The least hesitancy, in connecting the proper subject with its verb, embarrasses the hearer, or reader. In Latin, and Greek every person singular, and plural, is distinguished, that it may claim its subject of the same number, and person. In Hebrew there is a further distinction, of gender; except where doubt is necessarily excluded; as in the first persons of both tenses, and in the second singular, and third plural of the perfect tense.

In English the natural collocation of the words removes the necessity of strict concord; yet we have the third person singular of the present; and the second person singular of both tenses distinguished by particular terminations.

Though verbs are strictly never capable of number, person, or gender, yet the artificial concords of every

(*a*) Plato has θεῖον ἡ ἀληθεια, *truth is a divine* (thing), and Epictetus says ἀθάνατόν χρῆμα ἡ ἀληθεια, *truth is an immortal thing;* whence it may be inferred that χρῆμα was understood. At other times πρᾶγμα, seems better to suit the sense, or the plural πράγματα; for such neuter adjectives are often in this number; and may require also ὄντα or γινόμενα to be understood with them.

This is imitated also in Latin; as, Triste lupus stabulis. Dulce satis humor. Turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor.

language must be observed, at the hazard of grammatical reputation. *I* and another are *we; thou* and a third are *ye*. Where several subjects are grammatically conjoined by connexives, which bear a disjunctive sense, the verb must be singular; if by copulatives, it must be plural. When in Greek or Latin two, or more nouns, or pronouns, are connected by a copulative, it is presumed, that the verb was understood to be repeated. (*b*) When the subject is an infinitive, a clause, or a sentence, the verb is the third person singular. In Greek when the subject is the neuter plural, it is taken collectively, or as one universal, and may have its verb in the singular; as, ζῶα ῥέχει *animalia*, scil, *omne animal currit*. The same thing sometimes happens when the plural is masculine, or feminine; as, ἀχεῖλαι ὀμφαι μιλεων. Plural verbs are often put with subjects in the dual; the design of which is not to express two, except they be a natural pair, or joined by office, enmity, or duty. (*c*)

If the subject be a noun of multitude used collectively, the verb must be singular, if distributively plural; as, "Pars epulis onerant mensas." This rule is the same in English, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; except that in the

(*b*) It is otherwise in the Hebrew; a conjunction found between substantives, or adjectives, often denotes difference thus לב ו לב means *with a different heart*. When words are to be taken distributively, the conjunction is omitted and and the verb may be singular. Thus "a man, a man" with a verb singular is *every man*. "Two two entered," singular, they entered by pairs. And generally, in Hebrew, plural nouns with singular verbs are to be understood distributively.

(*c*) An inverted collocation in English sometimes misleads our judgment of the proper subject of a verb, thus *the wages of sin is death*, means *death is the wages of sin*.

last, verbs are often used in their radical form without regard to rules of concord, and as if incapable of variation. The genders in Hebrew verbs are often promiscuous, or used to confer, or withhold honour.

Those Greek and Latin verbs, which are termed impersonal, perhaps always express a predicate; to which the following clause, or some other thing is the subject. If to fulgurat, lacessit, ningit, pluit and tonat, cœlum, or some other noun, be supplied, these and such verbs may be used personally; and because the subject, or object may express the same idea as the verb, it is probable such kindred noun is the natural subject. It is the infinitive only, that is impersonal in verbs, and frequently it is as little different from a verbal noun, as the gerunds, supines and participles. To deem it personal in Greek and Latin, when it stands alone, as we may do in Hebrew or English, is an errour of an opposite kind; cœpit, or some other verb is ever implied.

Where an appellative in English is used without the most definite article it is often to be understood collectively; as, *man is corrupt.* The article *a* or *an* reduces to one of the kind, and *the* to an individual, or to more described or already known. In the Latin there is no article, but the same end is attained by the use of demonstrative pronouns, and other definitive words. ה emphatic answers, in the Hebrew, in many instances, to *the* and *this.* The Greek article, which is also distinguishably from the same word, when a substitute, by its adjunct, denotes emphasis, or speaks its noun to have been before mentioned, or known; or at least to have been of public notoriety.

In English *a* partakes more of the nature of an adjective, *the* of a demonstrative pronoun. The latter therefore more nearly resembles ה, yet not perfectly, since *the* is never a substitute, allows the intervention of an adjec-

tive, (*d*) is not used with proper names, except for the sake of distinction, and may accompany appellatives, in all conditions as, subjects, instruments, causes and objects, singular and plural, to particularize the things signified, or may be omitted, though the noun has been before mentioned, or known to be of public notoriety.

When more adjectives or nouns are qualified by the same article, it is not necessary to repeat it; as, *the first, second, and third classes. A minister, and people.* Adjectives follow the same rule, as *every man, woman, and child. My father and mother.* The article or adjective may nevertheless be repeated for the sake of emphasis; or to avoid impropriety; as, an ox, and a horse.

With subjects, predicates, and nouns in all other conditions, words expressing concrete qualities, or the defect of them, may be connected, without assertion, either by juxta-position as in the English language, or by the accommodation of their endings to the gender, number and case of their substantives in the Greek and Latin. Hereby speech is greatly accelerated; for thus we condense into one sentence, what must otherwise occupy many. Also several adjectives may stand with the same noun, without the necessity of a repetition; as, A wise, benevolent, and pious man.

Participles follow this rule of adjectives; and in Greek, and Latin agree with their nouns in gender, number and case; though in fact they are incapable of any of them. But there are some exceptions; as πληθος στρατιας ουρανιον, αινουντων τον θεον. Luke ii. 13.

Sometimes the signification of the noun in point of sex, rather than its gender, which may have been given to it from its termination, or some other cause, will

(*d*) *All, as, how, many, so,* and *too,* require the articles generally to follow the adjective.

guide the termination of the adjective; as, κόριον καλλίστη for κάλλιστον, *virgo formosissima.* Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητέυσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, here the αὐτοὺς agrees with the individuals of the τὰ ἔθνη. So Ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα, φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῇ, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες, ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι νόμος: here οὗτοι has ἔθνη for its antecedent. In like manner in Latin we read; "Pars virgis cæsi." "Duo millia crucibus adfixi." *Curtius.*

Two or more nouns in the singular have their attributive in the plural; if their genders be different, the adjective will agree with that, which is principal. But when an infinitive, or a member of a sentence takes the place of a noun, the adjective is in the neuter. And participles and pronoun adjectives follow the same rules. In Hebrew, the adjective generally agrees with its noun in gender and number, but pronouns follow the gender of their antecedents, and not of the nouns, with which they stand. So in English *my*, *thy*, *his*, *her*, *its*, *our*, *your*, and *their* agree with the nouns they represent in number, gender, and person. But adjectives having no change expressive of number, gender, or case, cannot accord with their nouns. If *this*, and *these; that*, and *those* be considered to be adjectives they are an exception, for they must agree in number. English adjectives because without case, gender, and number are liable to be used as adverbs; but rarely with propriety. This should therefore be avoided as unpleasant to the ear, and productive of confusion in construction.

When an adjective simply denotes a quality, it is in the positive degree; and it has been shown, that many admit imperfect, comparative, and superlative degrees. The two last in Greek, and Latin admit of endings to correspond to the genders, numbers, and cases of their nouns; and should agree with them. In Greek, that noun, with which the comparison is made, is put in the

genitive, a preposition being sometimes understood. In Greek, and Latin the genitive naturally follows comparatives, and superlatives, when used in a partitive sense; yet it is plausibly imagined, that the genitive arises from the implied word, with which the partitive agrees; as, major, or maximus juvenum, scil. juvenis. It may be resolved by certain prepositions, and an accusative, or ablative. The ablative after a comparative is probably always governed by *ex*, *in*, *præ*, *pro* &c. understood. This ablative may be also resolved by *quam*, (*e*) when the word, which would have been an ablative, becomes the subject, or object of a conjoined proposition; or is coupled in case with the preceding noun. In English *than* has the same effect, and is therefore a loose translation, where an ablative follows.

In Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, superlatives are variously effected, as by repeating the adjective, inserting a preposition, using the positive degree partitively, or repeating a noun; as, *servant of servants*, &c.

Qualities are also expressed by nouns associated with others in the same word, in Greek and Latin; in Hebrew they are united by a maccaph; (*f*) but in English they should be connected by a hyphen, that they may become one compound word; as, copy-book, pen-knife; other-

(*e*) Ablative cases absolute are more elegant, than compound sentences, formed by cum, dum, postquam, quando, quanquam, si &c. Also participles should be preferred to such subjunctive propositions; thus ad emendos libros, is better than, ut emeret libros; and redempturus filiam is preferable to ut redimeret filiam. Also non potest non dolere sounds better than, fieri non potest, quin doleat; and gaudeo te venisse, than guadeo quod venisti.

(*f*) Maccaph resembles a hyphen, but ranges with the top of the line; it has an effect somewhat similar.

wise the substantive would be converted into an adjective.

Two, or more nouns signifying the same person, or thing may stand as one subject, or predicate, or otherwise in the same circumstances, and agree in case, as, *urbs Athenæ, populum làte regem.* This has been justly deemed an ellipsis; for when words are thus placed in apposition, it is manifestly, the saving of a distinct assertion, or the omission of the verb of connexion.

When another noun is introduced to denote the cause, possessor, &c. this relation in Latin, and Greek may be expressed by the genitive; (*g*) but if acquisition be designed, the dative must be used. It is an errour to suppose the genitive is governed by the noun, neuter adjective &c.; such genitives express the sources, causes possessor &c. of the things, signified by the terms which are supposed to govern them; as, *filius patris, tantum fidei.* (*h*) This genitive may be supplied by prepositions and the accusative, or ablative in Latin. In Greek it may be also strengthened by prepositions. In English these relations are mostly expressed by prepositions. But when two nouns come together, the former generally receives the possessive sign, if right or possession

(*g*) It is also said, that a genitive is frequently used, not actively, but passively. Thus διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων is not *doctrines from,* but *concerning demons.* It is probable such genitive is ever governed by a preposition understood; and would be improper in the Latin language, where a genitive follows not a preposition.

(*h*) It has been asserted that, "neither in Greek nor Latin there is any such thing, as a verb, or adjective, which of itself is capable of governing the genitive." A correlative noun, as filius, nata, uxor &c.; or causâ, ratione, ενεκα, crimine, &c. or officium, oppidum &c. is probably understood; and to it the sense will, perhaps always, direct.

be implied. When two or more names are given of the possessor; in Greek, and Latin all are in the genitive; in English the possessive sign follows the last only; but each name must have it, where different persons are denoted.(*i*) In Hebrew, the word which must have been the genitive in Greek, or Latin, remains unaffected; while the word, which would have been in some other case, loses its ם final, or changes ה into ת, being the word, the sense of which is really restricted.

Sometimes before the subject, and often in other parts of a sentence, a condition, or other matter is expressed, in what is denominated an absolute form. It is indeed independent of the sentence, but not free from syntactical principles. When the genitive in Greek is thus absolute, it is selected to express origination; when the dative, it is the instrument, or the cause; which are easily and too frequently confounded; or a preposition is understood. In Latin *a*, *ab*, *cum*, *ex*, *in*, *sub* &c. are ever implied with the noun, and its concomitants. It is an errour to suppose a participle necessary in those instances, in which another noun, or an adjective supplies its place, merely because the participle of existence is conveniently introduced in rendering such clause into English. Where the absolute case is hypothetical, and such it usually is, when connected in sense with a participle, it may be resolved by a conjunction, and the potential mode. Thus, si Deus juvet, is equivalent in sense, though not in elegance unto Deo juvante.

The perfect participles of deponent verbs, in Latin, having a past rather than a passive sense, are not used absolutely; but accord with their respective nouns. The English present participle may sometimes be esteemed absolute, and be followed by nouns, and other words,

(*i*) Vide Appendix, Rule 67.

forming together a distinct member of a sentence expressing a cause, instrument, term, condition, or other circumstance.

In English, Latin, and Greek the participle may stand alone; as, *notwithstanding*, *provided*, *seeing*, *supposing* &c. "Exposito, quid iniquitas loci possit;" quid &c. being put artificially. Στάντων, μὲν Μενέλαος ὑπείρεχεν εὐρέας ὤμους. *Standing* (scil. they) *Menelaus was higher by his broad shoulders.*

There are many Greek participles, such as ἀνύσας, ἀπίων, ἔχων, λαβων, φερων &c. which seem to be, whilst they really are not redundant; as, ὤχετο ἀπίων *abiit discedens;* παιζεις ἔχων ἔφη, *jocaris inquit;* λαβων ἑωυτον ὤχετο *subducens se effugit.*

In the different languages, words of several kinds may stand in a sentence, absolute, or independent. But, because they may have no grammatical connexion with any other word in the sentence, it must be by no means concluded, that they have no constructive relation unto any implied word whatever.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE COPULA.

THE conclusion of our minds, upon the comparison of our ideas, is denominated a judgment. When those ideas are expressed in terms, there must be an affirmation, or a negation, to complete the proposition, or announce such judgment. It is scarcely to be imagined, that man was ever so destitute of language, as that he should, like the children, express the subject and predicate one after the other, without more to denote their agreement. The subject, or that of which something is asserted, and the predicate, or that which is affirmed, are the matter; the assertion, or copula, is the form, or that which gives essence to the proposition, and is therefore contained expressly, or impliedly in every one. Thus *John affirms*, is the same as *John is affirming;* here *is*, which is implied in *affirms*, is the assertion of the speaker, and *affirming* is the action, which is predicated of John. So *John denies*, contains an affirmation, whilst it expresses a negation.

The copula is ever in the verb, and there is no verb, which, when alone, can answer merely this purpose. Thus the verbs *be*, *sum*, εἰμί, and הָיָה, when followed by no predicate, import existence; which is the predicate, and more than a simple affirmation. But when there is one expressed, whether it be a substantive, substitute, adjective, verb, participle, adverb, member of a sentence, or clause, the verb of existence drops every other property, but that of assertion, or mere connexion. Reason dictates, that where words are simply connected, their circumstances should not be changed; and therefore in Latin,

Greek, and English, usually the same case follows, which preceded them. The verb of existence is sometimes only implied in these languages; in Hebrew it is rarely expressed to effect a present tense. Its place, in English, is between the subject, and predicate; in Greek usually before the subject, or after the predicate; for juxtaposition well supplies its place.

The copula naturally exhibits the quality of the proposition; which is affirmative, unless the contrary be expressed. The regular place of negative adverbs is with it; but if adjectives of such description be adopted, they should stand with the terms.

There are many other verbs, which simply connect predicates; or at least require no object of action. When the words, which follow them, express neither origin, end, instrument, nor object; such words can be placed in no other condition, than in that of the subject, of which they are affirmed, or with which they are simply joined. Such are γίγνομαι, φῦμι, καλεομαι, πέλομαι, τυγχάνω, and ὑπάρχω; ambulo, eo, evado, existo, fio, forem, fugio, jaceo, incedo, maneo, redeo, sedeo, sto, venio, vivo, &c. appellor, constituor, creor, designor, dicor, deligor, ducor, eligor, habeor, nominor, nuncupor, salutor, videor, vocor, &c.(*a*)

(*a*) It has been thought, that certain past participles in English, such as, appointed, called, created, named, styled and termed, have the subjective case after them. English nouns exhibit not different forms for subjects and objects. But we have different pronouns for these ends, and the above participles sometimes require objective pronouns; as, I have appointed, named, styled, &c. him; but when they follow the connexive verb *be* or its participles, subjective pronouns may be placed after them, because they then import only the manner of the connexion previously expressed.

When a finite connexive verb is followed by a noun, pronoun, adjective, or participle in Greek, or Latin, it is in the nominative case, because a nominative has preceded. And English pronouns conform to the same rule, with respect to the verb *be* in all its parts; as, *I am he.* The infinitive is usually preceded by an accusative, and followed by one; but if the foregoing word be in any other case, the same must follow; as, licet esse bonos, scil. nos esse; or, licet esse bonis, scil. licet nobis. Expedit vobis esse bonos, scil. vos esse. Est sapientis esse contentum sua sorte; scil. hominem esse, &c. Interest civium esse liberos, scil. homines esse, &c. or liberos esse interest civium. *You took me to be him; I seemed to be he.* Cupio dici doctum, scil. me dici, or cupio dici doctus.

When a possessive case follows the substantive verb, and such case has not gone before; it is said to be produced by some word understood, which signifies interest, possession, property, or duty; as, hominis est errare; pecus est Melibœi; *it is John's*, &c. But the noun is necessarily put in the genitive to express the relation, which the sense requires. In like manner, if acquisition be intended, the noun should be in the dative, and thereby *sum* has the force of *habeo.* There may be two datives; in such instance, the verb of connexion, to give effect to both, may receive, what it has no title to, the sense of the English verb *bring*; but in these circumstances it is an errour to suppose, that the verb of existence imports more than a mere connexion, or affirmation.

The copula is sometimes blended with the subject; as sum homo. Sometimes with the predicate; as, Jacobus sedet. And sometimes with both; as, vivo. When logicians complain of this, as if the verb should be used for no other purpose, but to denote the connexion between the terms of a proposition, they seem to have forgotten,

that rules arise from custom; and follow, not go before, the modes of speaking.

The terminational distinctions for gender, number, case, and person, in all languages in which they exist, must be made to agree, in the predicate, with the word to which they relate, when a simple affirmation, or negation is intended. In English, adjectives, and participles admit no change; in Hebrew they sometimes vary for gender, and number; but in Greek, and Latin, they designate their substantives by agreement in gender, number, and case; which must be observed as carefully after verbs of connexion, as where such adjectives, or participles stand with their respective nouns.

An appellative noun is often understood, where the name of an individual is expressed, and the adjective will accord with the former; as, centunculus trita scil. herba, *the pounded chaff-weed;* so perhaps arbor is understood with patula fagus.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE PREDICATE.

IN the Greek, and Latin languages, the subject, the object, and the oblique cases are generally distinguishable by their terminations, and there can be little danger of ambiguity, whatever the collocation of the words may be. The Greeks rarely began a sentence with a verb; and the Romans thought it more natural, and elegant to place the casual word foremost, the subject in the middle, and the verb last; as, Galliam Cæsar occupavit. But this does not appear to have been the most ancient manner of writing. In the Hebrew, the verb, where there is no affix, generally precedes its subject, and the subject the object. But in connexive sentences, the predicate often goes before. This last is common in other languages; as, insipientis est dicere non putaveram; dicere non putaveram is the subject. *It is credulity to believe the aspersions of politicians; credulity* is the predicate. To separate the predicate is generally indispensable to clearness of conception; and to make it distinguishable to others is essential to perspicuity.

Sometimes the predicate exists with the copula in the verb; and sometimes it is found in the verb, and its object; or in the verb and other words, which immediately follow it in sense. A great proportion of the verbs in any language denote action, or influence; and the object, unless it be clear, should be expressed.(*a*) In English the

(*a*) Sometimes the verb is understood; as, "Fortuna fortes," scil. adjuvat. "Quos ego," scil. puniam. In like manner the word, which should express the object, may be omitted, if the sentence can be free of ambiguity.

object is in the same form as the subject, except it be a pronoun; then an objective case must follow, or rather one of those pronouns which stand as objects: some there are, which are never subjects, and vice versâ.

In Greek, and Latin, relative pronouns in their cases are adapted to the conditions in the propositions, in which they stand; and their gender, and number must accord with those of their antecedents or consequents. Thus σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς. *Vessels of mercy which he had prepared unto glory, whom he hath also called* (to wit) *us;* ἃ refers to σκεύη, and οὓς agrees in gender with ἡμᾶς.—English pronouns also often precede whatever they are designed to represent.

The Hebrews had no characteristic termination for the object, but to prevent ambiguity they often placed את before it. This is by some deemed the sign of the accusative, by others an article of that case. It is a word of very uncertain meaning, probably from אתה *to approach*, and seems sometimes to be a preposition in the sense of *to*, *towards*, *with*, &c. It follows the connexive verbs, as well as the transitive. So also do the prefixes ב and ל; as, God is בעזרי *my helper*, *among my helpers*. If את be a Hebrew preposition expressing the object of an action, it cannot be expressed in Greek, Latin, or English; for, in none of these, does there exist any preposition expressive of that relation. The collocation of the objective noun in English excludes ambiguity, and prevents the necessity of a particular termination, prefix, or preposition.

Accusative, or objective terminations are mere technical marks, to prevent, in the languages where they exist, an uncertainty, which a more orderly arrangement would have excluded. Or if they denote a relation, it is difficult to say what it is, or to form an idea of any more than that, which is expressed by the noun, and the action,

which the verb denotes, passing upon that thing as its object.

Thus we may say, induo tibi vestem, or te veste; circumdo urbi murum, or urbem muro; prohibere alicui aliquid, or aliquem aliquâ re. The accusatives express the objects of the action; the datives express acquisition; and the ablatives are governed of prepositions understood.

Another species of action might as properly have given name to an objective case, as that of accusation. The verb has but one object of its action, and if there be two accusatives, a person is generally the object, and the other accusative follows κατὰ, secundum, or some such word understood. This second accusative may often be substituted by an adverb.

Verbs termed intransitive seem to lose that character with respect to nouns of a similar import, which are deemed their objects; as, πλέων πλοῦν, navigans navigationem; οἶνον ἔῤῥουν *they flowed wine.*(*b*) Perhaps every verb signifies the beginning, continuance, or cessation of motion, which it has been observed is motion, and if so, there can be no neuter verbs. The kindred noun may be in many instances, considered as an instrument; and then, instead of an accusative, it may be an ablative in the Latin, or a dative in the Greek. In English such relation must be expressed by a preposition, a happy mode of denoting almost all relations, except that of the object. Thus we may say vivere vitam, *to live a life*, vivere vitâ *to live by, from*, or *in life.* If κατὰ, circa, or propter be understood, various equivalent expressions may be adopted in English; as, *according to*, *about*, *in respect of*, &c.

Many verbs, in Greek, and Latin, admit of another, instead of an accusative case; or are followed by two

(*b*) Gen. i. 11. תדשא דשא 20. ישרצו שרץ.

cases, but in different senses, which are denoted by the cases, or by prepositions understood.(*c*)

Verbs, which import a state of the mind, as memini, obliviscor, recordor, and reminiscor, may have the accusative of the object; or the cause of the affection may follow in the genitive, or in an ablative with a preposition; as, memini aliquod; alicujus, or de aliquo.

Verbs of accusing, acquitting, admonishing, and condemning, as active verbs may have an objective case, which is usually of the person; but that word which expresses the origin, or cause of the acquittal, condemnation, &c. should be in the genitive. Sometimes actione, culpâ, re, or causâ, may be understood before the genitive, which still has its relation properly denoted by that case. But it is a mistake to suppose the genitive governed, either by the verb, or its objective noun; in the phrase *arguere aliquem furti*, the theft is neither the origin of the person, nor the effect of the accusation, but its cause, or origin. If the expressions be arguere aliquem de crimine furti; the theft might be the origin of the crime, that is of the charge, and the language be correct; but nothing is gained by the change either of the language, or sentiment.

The genitive in the Greek usually follows verbs of action, or mental affection, to express their cause, or origin; and this is sometimes imitated in Latin.(*d*)

(*c*) The verbs celo, doceo, induo, moneo, posco, and the like are often said to govern two accusatives, but Sanctius observes, " Hoc est falsissimum, nam in altero eorum deest " præpositio Græca κατὰ, id est, *per*, vel *in*, vel *juxta*," &c.

(*d*) If any choose to understand a preposition with such genitive, still it is the relation, which is signified, and the government is not really effected by the verb; though the sense of the verb may point to the relation, and the case. It is a very ancient rule, that, " Omnis genitivus regitur,

In these languages, verbs of abounding, or wanting, do not govern a genitive, or an ablative of the object, for this would be a solecism in syntax. The genitive is governed by copia, or some other noun, and such ablative is governed of a preposition understood; as, *vacat culpâ* scil. *a*; or the genitive is used to denote the cause, source, or origin of the excess, or defect; as, πάντων δέω, *omnium careo*, or *omnibus* scil. *ex*.

The verbs, emo, facio, habeo, loco, volo, &c. though they be followed by a genitive, or ablative of the price, do not govern these cases. They only govern an accusative of their object respectively; whilst the ablative is really governed of some preposition; as, pro nihilo ducere.

The particular genitives of the nouns tantum, quantum, &c. are governed of ære, pretio, &c. When the adjectives are used, they are necessarily put in the ablative to agree with their nouns; as, magno pretio æstimare.

Verbs which signify to compare, declare, give, or take away, not only suppose an object of action, which must be in the accusative; but the three former also require the case of acquisition, termed the dative. The latter kind have the dative, but it is probably borrowed from the Greeks, whose dative in such circumstances is ever governed by a preposition expressed, or implied, and termed the casus præpositionis. Eripuit me morti is used in the sense of *à* or *ex* morte; but would naturally signify *to* or *for death*.

" vel à substantivo, vel a Græcâ præpositione expressâ vel " suppressâ." But it is the relation, under which the word is introduced, that requires it to be put in the genitive; it is the meaning of the speaker, and not any other word that produces the effect: yet certain words denote such relations in discourse, and we therefore say that they govern or direct such construction of the sentence.

Verbs of binding, clothing, depriving, filling, loading, &c. like all others of the transitive kind, have, or may have an objective case; when an ablative also follows, it is of the instrument, or denotes some other relation, fit to be expressed by some preposition, which corresponds in sense to the ablative, and may be supposed to be understood. They sometimes admit a dative, which denotes acquisition. The genitive is more rare, but this must be substituted, when the cause, or origin of the action, or affection is intended; as, adolescentem suæ temeritatis implet.

The same meaning may often be expressed by the nominative, an active verb, and an objective case; or by the same words so changed that the object becomes subject, the nominative the ablative, and the verb, passive; as, Petrus docet Jacobum, or Jacobus docetur à Petro. Thus abutor, creor, epulor, fruor, fungor, pascor, patior, vescor, utor, &c. when taken actively may have an accusative of the object; as, operam abutitur, munera fungi; but they are, in the passive sense, followed by the ablative, which may be considered the ordinary condition of a noun expressing an instrument, or the relation may be expressed by a preposition serving to that case.(*e*)

The instrumental cause, when put in the dative in the Greek, is generally without a preposition expressed, and the same is true of the ablative of the instrument in Latin. But when the Greeks used their genitive for this purpose, they expressed, for the most part, the relation by ἀπὸ, ἐκ, παρὰ, πρὸς, or ὑπό. In both languages, the active

(*e*) The preposition is often omitted, when the relation is clear without it; as where an ablative follows, afficio, assuesco, beo, communico, confido, consto, creor, dignor, domo, impertio, impertior, munero, muto, nascor, participo, prosequor, substo, &c.

verb and its object are more frequent, than the passive, and the instrument. When the passive is adopted, and the object becomes subject, the verb, which in the active was generally followed by two cases, loses the objective; and is said by grammarians, to retain only the other case, or cases. Sometimes such verb is followed by an accusative, but it is not the object of the verb; its relation is such, as secundum, quod, ad, per, κατὰ, or the like preposition might express; and it is therefore usually said to be governed by such word understood. It is not probable that the Greeks, or Romans, thought such words necessary, the accusative termination sufficiently denoting the relation.

It is more than possible that Latin supines are really nouns of the fourth declension; and that when they follow verbs of motion, the accusative is used, without a preposition, as sufficiently expressive of that action, or other object, towards which the verb denotes a tendency. That which is denominated the supine in *u*, is often found in the old books in *ui*, and may be the dative case following adjectives in the very relation denoted by such case; as, facile factui *easy to the accomplishment*, jucundum auditui *pleasant to the hearing*. At other times it is plainly the ablative case; as, "Postremus cubitum eat, "primus cubitu surgat;" and instances of plural cases are also found; as, "vocatus meos." Virg.

A verb, a phrase, a clause, or an entire proposition may become a term in the principle proposition, or stand as an object to the verb.

When a verb follows a verb, it should be in the infinitive mode, and in English be preceded by the preposition *to*; except after the verbs, bid, can, dare, do, feel, hear, let, make, may, need, see, shall, and will.

When such infinitive is resolved by a conjunction,(*f*) such conjoined sentence, though possessing all the constituents of a simple sentence, is really but a predicate. This is more usual in English, than in Latin, or Greek; where an accusative generally precedes the infinitive. Such an infinitive expresses without number or person another action; but the agent is already exhibited in the character of an object; it not being so properly an accusative before the infinitive by any syntactical connexion, as an accusative, or object, to some other verb expressed, or understood. The resolution by a conjunction is more intelligible, as it affords to one verb an object, and furnishes the other with a subject; but it is less concise, and perhaps less elegant in those languages. Such second action may be, though indefinite, expressed as complete or imperfect; but must ever depend upon the finite verb of the sentence, for its connexion with absolute time.

The Greeks, especially the Attics, and the Latins after them, often substituted a nominative, instead of an accusative, with an infinitive mode, as in, "aiunt rex hoc "fecisse; dicunt tu esse dives." *Sanctius*. But a nominative following the infinitive of a connexive verb seems frequently to agree with the subject of the preceding verb implied, not repeated; as, vis videri probus; cupio esse clemens.

In Latin, an infinitive mode, a subjunctive with at,

(*f*) If the foregoing verb expresses possibility, or may admit uncertainty in the action expressed by the following verb, the potential mode with *ut*, or *ne*, is to be preferred to the infinitive. Hence verbs of asking, as obsecro, puto, postulo, precor, quæro and the like are followed by *ut*, or *nè;* whilst cogo, constituo, impello, and verbs which exclude contingency generally require the following verb to be in the infinitive.

quod, &c. a member of a sentence, or a term understood, is, for the most part, the real subject of that, which is denominated an impersonal verb. It is inattention, which turns cœpit, debet, desinit, incipit, potest, solet, and, to say the least, many other personal, into impersonal verbs. In English there seems to be no apology,(*g*) and but little in Greek, and Hebrew, for the supposition of such a species of verbs. And generally, the reasons, which exist for particular oblique cases after personal verbs, will be found applicable to verbs of this description.

Refert, and interest, have as objects the neuter accusatives, mea, tua, sua, nostra, and vestra; unless they are governed by some preposition. When they are said to govern a genitive, they really govern an accusative of some noun implied, which requires the noun expressing its cause, origin, &c., to be in the genitive: but when tanti, quanti, &c. accompany them, these words are preceded in sense by some ablative of price, or value. (*h*)

(*g*) The little magical pronoun *it*, which can be subject, or object, and though termed of the third person, and neuter, may stand for man or woman, I or thou, cause or effect, action or passion, condition or discourse, may also take the place of that, which is either wholly unknown, or for want of attention is not distinguished. Thus many English verbs are deemed impersonal, because their subject lies concealed; and even Greek, and Latin verbs, are in the same manner conveniently disposed of, their nominatives being put out of sight, by the little English intruder, *it*.

(*h*) In Terence we read, id tua nihil refert, where *id* is the subject to the verb, *nihil* is its object, and *tua* must be governed by some preposition, as *ad*, implied. If *tua* be supposed the ablative, the sense is contravened; for if *re* be separated as its noun, without which its gender is unaccountable, *tua re* will denote the cause or instrument, which is contrary to the meaning. In like manner we read in Cicero;

Many verbs, termed impersonal; as, itur, oportet, piget, pudet, statur, &c. are entire propositions, containing the subject, as well as predicate in themselves; or having a subject understood. Other verbs of this description, such as, decet, delectat, fallit, fugit, juvat, latet, præterit, &c. have usually an agent expressed; or an infinitive mode, as their subject, and a person for their object; as, delectat me studere, studere is the subject, me the object, and delectat a personal verb.

Miseret, pœnitet, piget, and pudet, govern transitively an objective case; but when a genitive follows, it is governed by some noun understood, which is the cause of the affection; or rather it naturally expresses the origin, or cause of the misery, repentance, or shame, which is the nominative to the verb, but which needs not to be expressed, as it is sufficiently seen in its kindred verb.

The dative of acquisition may follow libet, licet, &c. and all other verbs, the meanings whereof admit nouns under such circumstances. In Greek, and Latin, the termination sufficiently denotes this relation; in Hebrew, and English it must be expressed by a preposition.

Gerunds in dum of neuter verbs, are to all purposes verbal nouns, and become very frequently subjects to the verb of existence, which is then necessarily in the third person singular, but by no means an impersonal verb; it is generally followed by a personal pronoun in the dative case, or some other dative of acquisition. But where the gerund would govern a case, the gerundive or future participle of the passive is usually adopted, and made to agree with the noun.

hoc inter me et illos interest, &c. from whence we infer, that mea interest is the same as hoc est inter mea. If an example in poetry could be found, the opinion of the poet would be determined by the length of the final *a*, which in the ablative is long, in the accusative short.

It has been said, there is no government in the Latin language, which may not be resolved by prepositions. We have seen, that this would be impracticable with respect to the objective case, and improper with respect to the Latin genitives, and datives. Yet certainly much may be done by prepositions in expressing the relations, which belong to time, and place. Before names of countries, and provinces, the preposition is usually expressed; but omitted before the names of cities, and smaller places. (*i*) The prepositions, which would express a tendency towards a place, or duration of time, denote relations, which are suited only to the accusative; those which imply locality, or the being in, or at a place, or a part of time, in which any thing happens, can stand only with the ablative. Those cases are therefore adopted, when the prepositions are omitted. When genitives of place in i, or æ, occur, urbe, oppido, loco, &c. (*k*) are implied; so when measure is put in the genitive, a general appellative term is to be understood with it. Other words of place follow the course of proper names.

As the preposition is often omitted before the Latin ablative, so is it also before the Greek dative, when it expresses time, or place.

Uncompounded prepositions are never used in Latin to aid the expressiveness of their genitives and datives, as they are in the Greek. But in both languages there are prepositions, that may denote different relations, which are to be distinguished by the different cases, which they are said to govern, whilst, in fact their various senses are discovered by cases adapted to the intended relations.

(*i*) Domus and rus may be used with, or without a preposition, and treated as if names of places.

(*k*) Terra was divided into aqua and humus, hence jacet humi is said to be used for jacet in terrâ humi.

Adjectives, and participles often follow the verb of existence, and are predicates to the subjects, of which they express qualities. They are evidently incapable of sex, plurality, or any relation, which a case could denote; but notwithstanding all these things; and though there be no danger of ambiguity, they must nevertheless agree with their subjects, in the signs of gender, number, and case, in Greek, and Latin; and usually in gender, and number, in the Hebrew. But when an infinitive, or member of a sentence, is an antecedent to a relative; or as a substantive to an adjective; the relative, or adjective in Greek, and Latin, must be in the neuter, and singular; and when they are in the place of a nominative to a verb, it must be in the third person singular.

If the subject be a collective noun, the verb may be plural; and so may the adjective, or relative, and of the gender of the individuals intended by such noun; as pars erant cæsi. Pars (formicarum) obnixa trudunt. Or they may be singular; as, pars arduus—equis furit. Where different genders are intended, the masculine is preferred for living things; as, Ego et mater—sumus tuti.

Qualities like the substances to which they appertain, may have origin, cause, action, and various other relations; adjectives may therefore, like substantives, be accompanied by genitive cases, and by others with their prepositions; and as they express qualities, though in the concrete, they have also a close affinity with verbs, and may be followed by nouns, and verbs. Thus in the phrases *The house is worth money; the picture is like thee;* the adjectives plainly require objects; so auri, after cupidus, denotes the cause of the affection; and agros, after populabundus, expresses an object.

None can mistake the reason, that adjectives, which import an affection of the mind govern the genitive; or fail to discern, wherefore verbals in *ax*, participials in

ns, and *tus*, and in general all adjectives, which express a state, or condition, should have a genitive of the origin, or cause of that, which they express, for no other case would denote such circumstance.(*l*) When the meaning is changed, the construction must be varied. An accusative, or ablative will be recommended by the preposition, which expresses the intended relation.

Because there can be no mistake of the relation, when the ablative is put for the instrumental cause, the preposition is usually omitted. The Latin dative, expressing acquisition, will generally be discovered by the sense, after an adjective, or verb, when examples of the government of such adjective, or verb, may have been forgotten. And the same cases succeed to adjectives, and verbs, of similar import, because the same relations follow them respectively.

The Greeks used prepositions more frequently than the Romans; and in Hebrew, and English, there are almost no other means to accomplish the purposes of the Greek, and Latin cases.

In English the possessive case never follows a preposition, but it may be supplied by *of*, or otherwise. Nouns follow prepositions, whatsoever relations they express, in their natural state; different prepositions express different relations, under which their nouns, or pronouns are introduced; but these remain the same, and are not strictly in dative, objective, or ablative cases. Me, thee, him, her, it, us, you, them, whom, and whomsoever, follow prepositions, but are properly denomi-

(*l*) It is this circumstance, which chiefly distinguishes the participial from the participle; for whilst the latter expresses the action with the quality, and like its parent verb requires an object, as amans patriam; the former denotes the affection rather than the action, as amans patriæ.

nated objective cases only, when they follow verbs of action. I, thou, he, she, we, ye, they, who, and whosoever, never follow prepositions; they denote only subjects, except when they follow a connexive verb.

This adaptation of pronouns, to the words with which they stand connected in sense, may prevent ambiguity, where the arrangement is somewhat inverted; and it is necessary to the imperative mode, if such it deserves to be called; but every license assumed by those, who, for the sake of ornament, depart from the natural collocation of words in English sentences, is unjustifiable, and a trespass upon the order of our language.

If the prepositions in the Greek, Latin, and English languages, have been, like those of the Hebrew, originally nouns, and verbs; and if it were possible to discover, in every instance, the root; we might have, what we certainly in several of them do enjoy, considerable clearness with respect to their meanings; but the aberrations from the original force of the words are so considerable, as to render this an uncertain criterion.

The Greeks enforce sometimes their genitives and datives by prepositions, which with different cases express very different relations. In like manner, in, sub, subter, and super, when with an accusative, denote relations accordant with that case, usually tendency; but when with an ablative, they express a termination of motion, or describe a state of rest.

A, ab, abs, absque, clam, coram, cum, de, e, ex, palam, præ, pro, sine, and tenus, denote relations, which should precede nouns in the ablative; all others uncompounded, are ordinarily adapted to the accusative.(*m*) Tenus, with the

(*m*) *Usque*, and *procul* being often followed by a preposition, seem justly to forfeit the character. The right of *prope* is doubted; it may be an adverb always, like *proxime*,

plural, has mostly a genitive, and should follow its noun. In composition, they often have an accusative, or ablative, and then retain respectively their uncompounded force. Ad, ante, con, in, inter, ob, præ, post, sub and super, when combined with verbs, and frequently also when compounded with adjectives, import acquisition, or some other relation suitable only to nouns in the dative case. The compounds of *di* are generally followed by a preposition, and so are many of those that have been mentioned.

In the Latin language, prepositions in composition do not generally govern the same cases, which they require when alone; but the dative is more commonly demanded by the sense, there being usually acquisition, as well as an object of the action. Yet sometimes the same case, is required in composition, that is required by the simple preposition; but its force is then very clear. Also the same preposition may often be repeated, or another admitted: as, evadere undis, or ex undis; adire scholam, or ad scholam; abire loco, or ex loco; evadere insidiis expresses the force of *e*, but evadere insidias the force of the verb.

In English a preposition is used to denote the relation, after a word compounded with a preposition. To, from, in, with, and upon, are most used, and often follow words compounded of Latin prepositions, which bear a very different import. But in such case the compounded word is used in a sense, which partakes sparingly of the force of the preposition; thus, *I was averse to the man*, means I disliked him; but *I was averse from the man*,

and have a preposition implied after it; *versus*, and *secus* have been questioned, but they have titles, as good as that of *circiter*.

seems to point us to the Latin word *aversus*, and to express that my back was turned upon him; *he depended upon it*, he relied upon it; but *he depended from it*, is he hung from it; *he differed with him*, is he disputed with him; *he differed from him*, is he possessed different sentiments.

CHAPTER V.

OF CONJUNCT SENTENCES.

SHORT sentences may be sentimental and striking; and are the usual expedient in polished written discourses. But the impression they make is transient, because they put the memory, and the attention to too severe a test. Sentences long, or compounded are occasionally necessary in argumentation, and on other occasions. The accurate knowledge of connexive words, and phrases is highly important both in constructing such sentences, and in discerning the subserviency, or mutual dependence of the several members. In this lies much of the skill requisite to successful public declamation.

It is probable, that conditional and hypothetical expressions were anciently made by imperative verbs, which have passed into conjunctions, thus *if* means *give*. In like manner relative neuter pronouns, which had stood as objects to the principal verb, have taken also the epithet conjunction, as ὅτι, ut, quod, and that.

Conjunctions of every species may connect, either sentences, or the members of a sentence; yet the former purpose is more usually answered by again, besides, further, moreover, &c. ἀλλὰ, ἄν, δὲ, δὴ, γάρ, ἐαν, ἤ, ἐι, καὶ, μὲν, μὴν, σὺν, τὲ, &c. ac, atque, aut, nec, neque, vel, &c. And the latter by lest, so that, than, that, unless, &c.

English conjunctions connect pronouns with pronouns, in the same case. Thus, *He is taller than I. He praised him rather than them. He and I went abroad.* Conjunctions supply the place of other words, and are therefore to be followed by the same cases, or by pronominal ad-

jectives under the same circumstances, which such omitted words would have required, if they had been inserted. Also pronouns are to be connected with nouns, as if the latter were pronouns, or possessed the same variety of cases; as, *They found John and me absent.*

The copulative, and disjunctive conjunctions above mentioned, with quam, nisi, præterquam, an; and adverbs which denote similarity, as, ceu, tanquam, quasi, &c. usually, in Latin, connect members of sentences under the same circumstances, with respect to modes, tenses, and cases; but a variation of intention will produce a diversity in all these respects.

When the same subject, or predicate is enlarged by different nouns connected by copulatives, the verb, adjective, or relative, is generally plural: but disjunctive conjunctions leave such nouns to be understood severally, and the verb, adjective, or relative is singular.

As cum, dum, quod, and ut, have different meanings, and require different modes, so in general, conjunctions used declaratively accompany an indicative; whilst the conditional, and hypothetical demand the potential mode. Etsi, jamdudum, jampridem, jam olim, ne *whether*, perinde, quanquam, and tanquam for sicut, mostly go with the indicative. Cum *since*, dum *provided*, dummodo, etiamsi, licet, ne *lest*, quamvis, quando, quasi, quidem, quo, tanquam *as if*, ut, and utinam are followed by a subjunctive.

Those conjunctions, which when standing first in a sentence may be succeeded by an indicative mode, will for the most part, when following a proposition, introduce a subjunctive.

So various are the meanings of the Greek conjunctions, that the safest criterion is the sense of the conjunction at the place, and to this let the mode be accommodated. Yet sometimes the indicative follows a conjunction,

which clearly expresses conditionality, or possibility. And why should the same doubt be again expressed, by a mode, which has been already denoted by a conjunction?

As in English, conjunctions were anciently supplied by such imperatives as *give*, and *grant;* which were followed by a finite verb; so our conditional conjunctions, which are equivalent, supersede the necessity of a subjunctive mode. Even that, which has been so termed, less frequently follows such conjunctions, than the indicative.

The Greek conjunction ὅτι may be resolved frequently into ὁ τί, of which ὁ is the object of the preceding, and τὶ the object of the following verb; as εἶπεν ὅτι βούλεται, *he told what he desires;* at other times, the ὅτι is the object of the foregoing verb only; as, λέγεις ὅτι πλούσιος εἰμὶ, *you say that* viz. *I am rich.*

The Dorians changed τ into κ; thus τίς became *quis*, and τί *qui*. Perhaps also ὅτι became *ut* the adverb, and ὅτι *ut* the conjunction. Ut expresses the end designed, and should never be confounded with quod, which denotes either the efficient, or instrumental cause, and may precede the indicative, or subjunctive. Ut often follows adeo, ita, sic, tam, &c. but is usually omitted after verbs of asking, desiring, permitting, and the imperative mode.

In like manner the English *that*, *thata* Gothic, was originally a relative. It is now also a conjunction, being used often, where otherwise it would be in the plural. It usually occurs without an antecedent; and introduces another proposition, member, or sentence.

When more conditionality is intended, than the conjunction expresses, a verb of the same effect may be thrown in. Thus instead of, *If thou goest*, we may use, *If thou mayst*, *canst*, *shalt*, or *wilt go;* or the finite verb may be omitted, and implied as, *If thou go.*

The conjunctive particle is inserted before the last

word in an enumeration of nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, &c. but if attention is required, it is repeated before every one, as it succeeds. The total omission aids rapidity, and has often a happy effect.

Some conjunctions correspond to others: thus μὲν is followed by δὲ; τε after a word, πλεον, or δε, are succeeded by και before another word; ει μην δη, *at qui si*, is elegantly succeeded in the next member by ειδε, *secus; πλεον, πλεια*, and ει precede η.

In the Latin adeo, ita, sic, tam, &c. are succeeded by ut; et, etsi, tametsi, or quamvis, by tamen; ante, magis, prius, tam, or tantum, by quam; but aut, et, nec, qua, sive, tum, which is sometimes preceded by cum, and vel, may be respectively placed in different members of the same sentence. When this happens, a translation into English should vary the terms.

Custom has established, and perspicuity also requires certain corresponding words in the English language. *As* may have *so* or *as; so* may have *that* introducing a consequence, or *as* a comparison; *neither* requires *nor; either*, and *whether* should be followed by *or; though*, by *yet*, or *nevertheless*. *That*, or *as* may follow *the same*, or *in the same manner*. *As* must correspond to *such*, or *equally; that* answers to *for the reason; scarce*, or *scarcely* is followed by *when; rather more* and comparatives, by *than*.

The Hebrew language has no potential, or subjunctive mode. (*a*)

(*a*) This is supplied by conditional conjunctions, as, אם *if*, כי אם *but if*, אם לא *if not*, לו לא *unless*, לו and אלו *if*.

The Hebrew conjunctions are for the most part nouns, verbs, or compound words; but are evidently used as conjunctions, because they thus receive no affixes. There are also two conjunctions denominated inseparable, being always

prefixes. Of these ש *because*, or *that*, is less common; it regularly introduces a cause, but may either precede or follow that of which the cause is assigned. The other inseparable conjunction is ו, *vau*, which is always naturally copulative.

Vau has been supposed, by Masoretic grammarians, to have sometimes a conjunctive, and at others a conversive effect; which two senses they have distinguished by points. It must be confessed that some index was wanting to discover, when their preterite, and future tenses must be rendered according to their manner, or changed, in translations into modern languages. To make this *vau*, which is strictly conjunctive, such an index, was ingenious.

Their present time was ordinarily expressed by a participle, with the verb of existence understood; their active participle was the theme, with vau inserted after the first radical; in their passive it was placed before the last radical. The root, or perfect tense, expressed an action indefinitely past at the time of speaking, or writing. The future, after a perfect, often, perhaps generally signified, not a time to come after the speaking, or writing of him, who uses it; but a time future with respect to that, of which the party is writing, or speaking. Hence it must necessarily follow, that if a succession of past actions are to be described, the first must be in the perfect tense, and all the other actions, being future with respect to that, must be put in the future tense. But when a translation is made of such successive actions from Hebrew into Greek, Latin, English, or any other language, where no such future exists, the verbs, which follow, whether with, or without the conjunctive vau, must be necessarily rendered by past tenses; hence the vau has been termed conversive.

When there are two, or more futures, the first without, and the rest with a vau prefixed, the vau is not conversive; that is, all are to be translated as futures. The first is a future with respect to the time of writing, or speaking; and all the rest are futures, with respect to the actions, as they

succeed; these will not be correctly rendered, but sufficiently approximated by a translation into futures, which relate to the time of the discourse, and this is all, that modern languages can effect without a circumlocution.

In each of the foregoing conditions vau is merely conjunctive, and not conversive. So perfectly connexive is it, that it often supplies tenses, numbers, and persons; and when prefixed to a theme, introduces it merely to denote the action which the root imports, under all the circumstances of the preceding verb; an eminent instance of the simplicity, and argument of the antiquity of the language. Hence, after a future tense, many perfect tenses may follow all connected with it, as futures; and if no terminations expressive of numbers, and persons are suffixed, the themes, or perfect tenses in the third person, are also of the same number, and person, with the preceding future. If other perfect tenses connected, or not, by vau, follow a perfect, which has no vau, by the same principles they must be all taken to express actions indefinitely past.

The reason that vau is not conversive, where several imperatives follow each other, is this; that they all partake of the present, so far as to refer to the time of the speaking, or writing; and all imply the future, with respect to the accomplishment of that, which is commanded; and consequently, the succeeding imperatives cannot be converted by vau into perfect tenses, or be made to denote a Hebrew future, that is, a future with respect to the time previously spoken of.

When an imperative is succeeded by one, or more futures, having vau prefixed, it merely connects them, and they are still futures, and so to be rendered.

It has been said, that vau is conversive, when prefixed to perfect tenses, which follow an imperative; but the truth seems to be, that such perfect tenses, or themes, are to be considered as of the mode, tense, number, and person of the foregoing imperative, the vau supplying all by the perfectness of its connexion. Such imperative sense might easily

have been taken for a future; since every imperative verb is properly future, with respect to its accomplishment, though present in its expression.

The proper test of the connexive effect of vau is to be sought in examples. ויאמר Gen. i.3. *and he said*, expresses a future, with respect to the things before affirmed; יהי *let there be*, is a future to express a command; and ויהי *and there was*, is a future with respect to the time of such command. Ver. 4. וירא *and he saw*, is a future, with respect to the time of the creation of light; ויבדל *and he divided*, is a future with respect to seeing the light. Ver. 5. ויקרא *and he called*, is a future, as to the time of making the division; קרא *called he*, is not future, but contemporaneous with יקרא and therefore expressed as indefinitely past. Such a return after many futures, to a perfect tense, that is to the expression of an action past, with respect to the time of writing, or speaking, is obviously proper, when the nominative, or subject to the verb is changed, as והאמן *and he believed*, Gen. xv. 6.

CHAPTER VI.

OF INTERJECTED SENTENCES.

INTERJECTIONS have been already denied to be connected with the sentences, into which they are introduced. When they seem to govern cases, either some other word, or words, must be supplied to produce the effect; or the interjection retains its primitive sense.

When a vocative or nominative follows O, ohe, heu, heus, proh, &c. it addresses, and may well stand without such interjections; or a verb may be understood with the nominative; O vir (est) bonus! en (est) crimen. When an accusative follows en, it may express the imperative הנה *behold.* Ecce may be resolved into en, and ce, the expletive particle from the Greek κὶ. But these are sometimes considered as adverbs. Væ is the Greek noun ὀναὶ *miseriæ*, and the nominative to the substantive verb, which when used to express tendency, must be followed by a dative case.(*a*) Hei is the Hebrew noun הי, an expression of lamentation, and is followed by a dative, in the same manner as væ.

In English, O! oh! and ah! are put with the objective case of a pronoun of the first person, but with the nominative of the second; because the first person is the object of some verb understood; and the second is the subject; as, O (pity) me! O thou (art a) wretch! O (it is) shameful!

Those of aversion, grief, and joy are for the same reason followed frequently by pronouns in the objective case.

(*a*) אוי is an expression of grief, from אוה *to desire.*

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DIVISION OF SENTENCES BY POINTS.*

THE Greek and Latin languages, admitting a collocation of words in sentences, ornamental, and pleasing, this circumstance attracted the attention of orators in early times to the division of discourse into sentences, members, and lesser subdivisions. They could defer until the end of the sentence, a word, which the hearer or reader would be in expectation of, from its commencement. Such an orderly arrangement, bringing the sentence to its just close, was denominated a period, περίοδος, *circuit*. But when this term passed from rhetoricians to grammarians, any complete sentence, whatever was the arrangement of the words, received the appellation of a period. Both Suidas, and Cicero ascribe to Thrasymachus the invention of the period, and colon.(*a*) The colon or member was to the period, what a member is to the body, entire in itself, and yet dependent upon, and necessary to it. It was connected in sense only, without affecting the syntactical construction of the former part of the sentence. Quintilian speaks of commas, or *fragments*, as well as of colons and periods, by which he unquestionably means subdivisions, members, and complete

* "Distinguendi ratio vulgò refertur ad orthographiam, "cùm ad syntaxin potius pertineat." *Vossius* de ratione interpungendi.

(*a*) Ὁς πρῶτος περίοδον καὶ κῶλον καλλίστους. *Suidas* de Thrasymacho. "Princeps inveniendi fuit Thrasymachus; cujus "omnia nimis etiam extant scripta numerose." Cic.

sentences.(*b*) The Greek and Latin languages were written, for several centuries after the Christian era, in large uncial letters, at equal distances, without more space between the words. Jerome, in his version of the Old Testament, adopted some method of distinguishing, what he deemed the sentences, members, and subdivisions, according to the sense.(*c*) It has been thought, that he did it without points or stops, by writing a subdivision, or member, which he terms a comma, or colon, in one line, resembling the irregular verses of poetry. But the ancient Greeks and Romans had points, for many centuries before their words were divided from each other, by spaces. At the termination of a comma, or subdivision they placed a single point, ranging with the lower ends of the uncial letters; this the Greeks called ὑποστιγμὴ, the Latins *sub-distinctio*. They marked a colon, or *member* of a sentence, with a single point, placed opposite to the middle of the letters, this they denominated μέση στιγμὴ, and the Latins *media distinctio*. For the period, or complete sentence, the point was placed opposite the tops of the letters; this was termed τελεία στιγμὴ, and *plena*, or *per-*

(*b*) "At illa connexa series tres habet formas; *incisa*, quæ "κόμματα dicuntur; *membra* quæ κῶλα; et περίοδον, quæ est "vel *ambitus*, vel *circumductum*, vel *continuatio*, vel *conclu-*"*sio*." *Quintil.*

(*c*) "Nemo cum prophetas versibus viderit esse descrip-"tos, metro eos existimet apud Hebræos ligari; et aliquid "simile haberi de psalmis et operibus Solomonis; sed quod "in Demosthene et in Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scriban-"tur, et commata; qui utique prosa et non versibus con-"scripserunt, nos quoque utilitati legentium providentes "interpretationem novam, novo scribendi genere, distinxi-"mus." *Hieron*, Præf. in Esaiam.

fecta distinctio.(*d*) Aristophanes is said to have first used the σιγμή, but perhaps punctuation of some sort existed in the days of Aristotle. (*e*) Cicero often refers to points.(*f*) But although men of learning and accuracy, among the Greeks and Romans, inserted them in their writings, it is equally clear, that transcribers often, perhaps usually, omitted them. The Greeks, according to Montfaucon, used the virgula, which we denominate the comma; he found it in their manuscripts, for such they must have been, written more than a thousand years before. They have no semicolon; and the character, which we use by that name, is affirmed by the same writer, to have been introduced into Greek manuscripts, as a note of interrogation, in the ninth century. The note of interrogation, which we use, is believed to have been originally the same, by a change of the places of the two points.

Before words became separated by spaces they were sometimes divided in whole, or part, by points of different kinds, or letters placed horizontally. But this practice must have been of very limited extent.

As long as the large uncial letters, and the Roman capitals, were only in use, the single dot, or point might have well answered the three purposes mentioned, by being placed at the top, in the middle, or at the bottom, of the letter; but when the smaller letters were introduced, a change became necessary.

(*d*) Some have inverted the order of these points;— "punctum positum ad mediam literam notabat comma; ad "caput literæ, erat nota coli; ad imam literam significabat "periodum." *Vossius.*

(*e*) Τὰ γὰρ Ἡρακλείου διαστίξαι ἔργον. Rhet. liii. c. 5.

(*f*) "Interpunctæ clausulæ in orationibus."

Cic. de orat. iii. 26.

The present names and characters are easily accounted for, from this history of facts. The τελεία στιγμὴ retains its form and effect, but now occupies the place of the ὑποστιγμὴ, and is denominated a period, because it terminates the period or sentence. The μέση στιγμὴ retains its form, nearly its ancient altitude, and its effect in the Greek language; but has received the name colon, from its ancient use in terminating a *member* of a period. In the Latin language, and in the English, the form of the Greek colon is changed. Two dots, one above the other, imitating the sophpassuck of the Hebrews, which is probably their oldest point, have the ancient name, and nearly the effect of the Greek colon. The ὑποστιγμὴ, *subdistinctio*, of the Greeks still retains its place, and effect, has changed its form into a curved virgula, and adopted the name comma, which signified at first the fragment, or subdivision, *cut off* from the sentence. To the Greek scholar, the respective names of those three points declare their several uses; nor can the intention of the semicolon, from its name, be misunderstood.

Punctuation in the Greek, and especially in the Latin language, where both the collocation and the choice of the words admit of great refinement, and elegance, was, as has been mentioned, rather the study of the orator, than the grammarian: but it had not arrived at absolute certainty.(*g*) In English, punctuation, though at a great remove from the work of ancient rhetoricians, is nevertheless not without its difficulties. It has been said; " if " we examine the structure of a compounded sentence, " and consider how it is framed and connected, we shall " easily discover those particular places, where it is to " be divided by stops and pauses." But there is a great

(*g*) " Quomodo autem distinguendum sit, non penitus " convenit inter eruditos." *Vossius.*

diversity in the modes of punctuation adopted by different writers; and also in the rules of those grammarians, who have judged for themselves. An adequate knowledge of the subject must be acquired therefore, not so much from rules, as attention to the structure of sentences, and the syntactical construction of language. Yet after all, the pointing of the sentence, will often depend on the intention of the writer; for the same words, differently pointed may present very different meanings. There are a few general principles. The *comma* chiefly distinguishes single words, or imperfect phrases, marks off a parenthetic proposition, an address, an absolute noun with a participle; a preposition, conjunction, or other words when followed by adjuncts; or it becomes the substitute for an implied word. The *semicolon* denotes a longer pause. When a slight connexion exists between short sentences, it is substituted for the period, to save delay; it divides a compound sentence, and gives ease to the reader, when it would be otherwise too long; and, generally, is used, when divisions and subdivisions are necessary in the same sentence. The *colon* is much superseded by the semicolon; the construction must be complete, before it is introduced; its principal utility lies in distinguishing a concluding proposition, or supplementary clause, from the rest of the sentence; and as such appendage is rarely repeated, so one colon is enough for a sentence. The *period* terminates a perfect sentence.

The space of time to be respectively given to these pauses, must depend upon a variety of circumstances; but that they should have some proportion to each other, whatever be the rapidity of the movement, both the pleasure of the hearer, and ease of the speaker require.

The *note of interrogation* speaks its design, and often demands a pause, longer than that of a period: that the hearer, or reader, may reflect on an answer. But where

so much reflection is unnecessary, it may be equivalent to a colon, or even to a comma. The *note of admiration*, exclamation, or supplication, is said to require both an elevation of voice, and a momentary pause. The propriety of inverting it, to express contempt, is denied; the repetition of it at the same place is an insult offered to the reader, who is impeached of inattention; and the frequent recurrence of the note of admiration, rarely fails to excite a disgust at the ostentation. A *parenthesis* (which encloses an *interposited* sentence) requires a fall and rapidity of the voice in reading the intercalary words; and also some pause to produce the change and return, and supersedes the necessity of a comma, or semicolon, but not of a note of interrogation. It should be avoided as much as possible, because it generally produces an unpleasant effect. A *dash* is used to denote an abrupt suspension, or change; it requires a pause, is the usual apology for negligence, or ignorance. A frequent repetition, or numerous succession of dashes, when the writer has knowledge to write correctly, is deemed at least a familiarity bordering on disrespect.

APPENDIX.

A

SYLLABUS

OF

ENGLISH GRAMMAR;

OR

PRACTICAL RULES

EXEMPLIFYING

The principles of the preceding essay.

(*Copy-right on the first leaf of the Essay.*)

INTRODUCTION.

LANGUAGE is the representation of ideas by words, spoken or written.

Grammar is the science, by which the constituent principles of language are investigated, and different modes of expression analyzed.

It is divided into four parts, denominated

Orthography, Etymology, Syntax, and Prosody.

The first comprehends the origin, forms, and sounds of the *letters;* and their combination into *syllables.*

The second treats of the derivations, meanings, and variations of *words.*

The third teaches the structure, division, and punctuation of *sentences.*

The fourth contains rules of *versification.*

PART I.

OF LETTERS AND SYLLABLES.

1. LETTERS are naturally divisible into vowels, which denote simple sounds, and consonants, which modify sounds.

2. There are six vowels, a, e, i, o, u, and y; (*a*) the rest are consonants. (*b*)

(*a*) The different sounds of *a*, are heard in tale, far, call, hat; of *e*, in me, met; of *i*, in hire, fit; of *y*, in fly, chrystal; of *o*, in note, who, nor; of *u*, in cube, cup, full.

(*b*) *C* and *g* are hard before *a*, *o*, *u*, *l*, and *r;* soft before *e*, *i*, and *y*. *Ch* is like *k*, in classic words, *sh*, in French, and *qu*, in choir, &c. *Gh*

3. A combination of two vowel-sounds uttered in the time of one, is termed a diphthong; of three a triphthong; also several may be thus united. (*c*)

4. Every articulate sound, and in a larger sense, every sound, though not modulated, if it constitute part of a word, or be itself intelligible, is denominated a syllable.

5. The length of time we occupy, in pronouncing a syllable is termed its quantity. (*d*)

6. Accent is said to be a mere stress of voice, which lengthens a vowel-sound not terminated by a consonant, or, in other instances, alights upon a consonant. (*e*).

---

sounds as *g* in the beginning, and *f*, in the end of a word. *Ph* is like *f*, or *v*. *Ti* before a vowel like *shi*: *x*, like *z* in the beginning of a syllable, and *ks* in the end.

(*c*) Most speakers condense the vowels of diphthongs, and utter the compound so much in the manner of a simple sound, that diphthongs in the English language may be conveniently classed, in general, under the vowel-sounds, which they most nearly approximate; except *oi*, *oo*, *ou*, and *oy*.

(*d*) The quantity of a vowel is very different from the kind of its sound; and many, if not each of the kinds of vowels, may be prolonged or shortened; for example, the first *a* in *fātalist*, *fātality*; *fāther*, *fär-cical*.

(*e*) The following are the most usual grammatical characters.

An acute accent á denotes a *sharp*, or elevated voice.
A grave à marks a *depression* of voice.
A circumflex â or ˜ an *undulation* of sound.
An asper ἁ a *rough* breathing.
A lenis ἀ a *smooth* breathing.
A cedille ç notes the soft sound of c before a, o, u, in French words.
A long syllable is marked thus ā.
A short syllable thus ă.
A diæresis aë shows that the vowels are to be *divided*.
A hyphen - connects different words, or syllables *into one* word.
A period . terminates a *sentence*.
A colon : precedes a final *member*.
A semicolon ; goes before a smaller, or *half-member*.
A comma , *cuts off* the smallest part of a sentence.

PART II.

OF WORDS.

7. THE parts of speech, or classes of words, may be nine; noun, article, adjective, pronoun, verb, adverb, interjection, preposition, and conjunction. (*a*)

OF NOUNS.

8. NOUNS are the names of persons, things, abstract ideas, or their respective negatives; as, man, house, virtue, nothing. (*b*)

A note of interrogation ? marks a question.
A note of admiration ! denotes surprise.
An index ☞ points the attention.
A dash — denotes an abrupt, or significant pause.
A parenthesis ( ) or [ ] includes an *inserted* word, or sentiment.
An apostrophe ' signifies a *turning away*, or omission.
An asterisk * or *star*, points to a note; more than one marks an omission.
An obelisk † or *dagger*, refers to the margin, or denotes a word obsolete.
A caret ʌ shows the place of *defect*.
An ellipsis .... or —— denotes that letters or words are *wanting*.
A paragraph ¶ marks the *annexation* of a new subject.
A section § originally *ss*, signum *sectionis*, is a sign of a subdivision.
A quotation " " includes borrowed words.
A brace } connects words or lines.

(*a*) Words are also divided into primitive, as *man;* derivative, as *manly;* and compound, as *mankind:* into monosyllables, of one; dissyllables, of two; trissyllables, of three; and polysyllables, of many syllables.

(*b*) Other parts of speech, as verbs, adjectives, pronouns, the arti-

9. Nouns proper are the names of individuals; as, John, London. Nouns common belong to all of a species, or genus; as, man, animal.

10. A noun common may stand for one, or for more, of a species or genus; and it accordingly admits in most instances, of a singular, and of a plural form; as, house, houses.

11. Nouns proper, being the names of individuals, exclude the idea of plurality. The names of virtues, and vices, and other abstract terms; also of herbs, and things weighed, and measured, with few exceptions, follow the same rule.

12. The ordinary plural is made by adding *s*, or, for distinctness of sound, *es;* as, book, books; box, boxes; church, churches. *O* final, in some words, takes *s*, and in others, *es;* as, folios, cargoes. (*c*)

13. Nouns are denominated masculine, or feminine, according to the sex, which they denote.

14. There are many nouns common to those classes, and may signify either males, or females; or even include both. (*d*)

---

cle *a* or *an*, and all words put artificially, that is for themselves, may become nouns; also cardinal numbers followed by *of*, or used in the plural; as, the I am, the self existent, in general, in particular.

(*c*) *Y* after a consonant is changed into *ies;* as *vanities; f*, or *fe* into *ve*, for the most part; as, *leaves, lives, &c.* Some singular nouns end in *s;* as *victuals, odds;* other nouns are found in the plural only; a few are the same in both numbers; as, *alms, deer, news;* but *means*, referring to one, is singular, implying more is plural. Many are irregularly formed in the plural; as, men, women, feet, teeth, geese, kine, lice, mice, &c. Foreign words bring their own plurals; as, antipodes, beaux, cherubim, credenda, data, effluvia, ellipses, hiatus, literati, minutiæ, radii, species, stamina, strata, vortices, &c.

(*d*) Child, cousin, friend, neighbour, parent, &c. may be males, or females. Father, and mother, husband, and wife, master, and mistress, &c. are different words to denote the different sexes. The distinction

15. Nouns signifying inanimate things, which are without sex, are called neuter. (*e*)

16. When nouns have the additional meaning of property, or possession, an apostrophe is added; and sometimes also an *s*, which must be sounded in speaking; as, boys' hats, John's book. (*f*)

17. Nouns singular in *ss*, and plurals in *s*, admit only the apostrophe in writing; in speaking there is no change; as, for righteousness' sake; representatives' wages. (*g*)

OF ARTICLES.

18. ARTICLES limit general terms, that they may denote particular objects.

19. *An* or *a* separates an individual; or a species from a general class, without shewing whom, or which, and is used only with the singular. (*h*)

---

sometimes depends on the termination; as, actor, actress; emperor, empress, &c. and sometimes on a word prefixed; as, male-child, female-child; he-goat, she-goat.

(*e*) Inanimate things receive sex figuratively; thus, angel, death, sleep, sun, time, are accounted males; and a boat, a city, the church, a country, fortune, the earth, a gun, the moon, nature, a ship, the soul, a vessel, virtue, and vice, are females.

(*f*) The noun in its simple state, expresses the name only, of the person or thing; when any thing is affirmed of it, it is the *subject* of a verb; in other instances it is generally the *object* of an action, or relation, and follows a verb or preposition.—These two relations are discovered by the situation of the noun; others, except that of possession, may, in general, be referred to prepositions, expressed or implied, and are, by far, too numerous to be reduced to six cases.

(*g*) The additional *s* is often omitted, where the singular noun ends in *s*, the apostrophe only being substituted in writing. But this should not be imitated.

(*h*) But such a singular noun may include many individuals; as, a hundred, a thousand, a few things, a great many men. In these instances

20. *The* more strictly defines the term, and particularizes an individual, or certain individuals, already known, or directs to that which follows: *the* may therefore limit plurals, as well as singulars; as, The spirit of truth—will guide you into all the truth; that is, into all the truths of the gospel. (*i*)

21. The absence of both the articles from before a noun, leaves it to be understood most generally; as, "The pro-" per study of mankind is man." But the prefixing an article to a proper name renders it an appellative term: as, he is a Solomon, she is the Dorcas of the society: except when another word is implied; as, the (river) Delaware, the (ship) Franklin.

22. *An* retains its *n* before a vowel, or a silent *h;* but drops it before a consonant, or either of the vowels, *o*, *u*, or *y*, when sounded as, or with a consonant; as, an apple, an hour, a house, a ship, such a one, a union, a youth.

OF ADJECTIVES.

23. An adjective expresses a quality belonging to a noun, without other circumstance. (*k*)

---

few and *many* are perhaps nouns in the singular, and *things* and *men*, objects of the preposition *of*, understood. If *a* be omitted in *a few men*, *a little reverence*, *few* and *little* become adjectives, and the certainty denoted by the article that there were some men and some reverence is removed. When the same individual is designated by another noun, the article should not be repeated; as, *he is a better soldier than scholar*, refers to one person; but, *he is a better soldier than a scholar*, implies two persons, he is a better soldier than a scholar is, or, would be.

(*i*) *The* is used with the words, better, least, and more. *A* has nearly the meaning of *one*, and *the* approximates the force of a demonstrative pronoun.

(*k*) An adjective therefore generally supposes a noun, or has some word equivalent to it; as, *to see is pleasant*, the infinitive is used as a noun.

24. Adjectives admit of changes of termination, accounted degrees; as, whitish, white, whiter, whitest. (*l*)

25. When adjectives, to express a quality faintly, receive the termination *ish*, they are then in the imperfect degree; as, whitish.

26. Those which denote a quality without increase, or diminution, are in the positive degree, or state; as, white.

27. Adjectives, which express a quality in a greater or less degree, by receiving the termination *er*, or *r*, if they end in *e*, are in the comparative degree; as, blacker, whiter. (*m*)

28. When an adjective indicates its quality in the highest, or lowest measure, it is in the superlative degree, which is made by affixing *est;*(*n*) or *st*, if the simple adjective terminates in *e;* (*o*) as, blackest, whitest.

Nouns may become adjectives, when used to denote the qualities of other nouns, but when joined by a hyphen they coalesce into one word; as, a college-boy, the college-wall. Sometimes also adjectives are used as abstract nouns; as, black fades, and is less becoming than blue.

(*l*) These are denominated the imperfect, positive, comparative, and superlative degrees. The two last may be denominated degrees of comparison, but the two first imply, or suppose no comparison. These several degrees are mostly confined to adjectives of one syllable. A great variety in the degrees of qualities may be expressed by different combinations of words, chiefly adverbs.

(*m*) Double comparatives and superlatives, and adjectives used with verbs, where adverbs should have been substituted, rarely fail to disgust.

(*n*) When the positive ends in *y*, and is compared, the last letter is changed into *i*, before *er* and *est;* as, lovely, lovelier, loveliest.

(*o*) Many adjectives, the most of dissyllables, and polysyllables generally, although they admit not the comparative and superlative terminations, may be accompanied by the comparative adverbs *less* and *least*, *more* and *most*, with equal advantage of variety. *Very*, *exceedingly*, and the like, make the superlative of eminence.

29. Nouns used adjectively, numerals, and adjectives denoting qualities, which can neither be increased, nor diminished, admit not of comparison; as, all, every, some, one, first.(*p*)

OF PRONOUNS.

30. A PRONOUN is a word used for some other part of speech, chiefly a noun. (*q*)

31. *I* and *me* singular; *we* and *us* plural, are the first persons; *thou*, *thee*, *you*, singular, *ye* and *you*, plural, are the second; *he*, *him*, *she*, *her*, and *it*, singular, *they* and *them* plural, are the third. Their compounds and relatives, may be accounted of their respective persons.(*r*)

32. My, our, thy, your, his, her, its, their, whose, and whosesoever, are possessive pronominal adjectives.

33. Ours, yours, hers, and theirs, are pronoun substantives, used either as subjects, or objects; as singulars, or plurals; and are substituted both for the possessors, and things possessed.

34. His, its, whose, mine, and thine, are sometimes used as such substantives; but also are at other times pronominal possessive adjectives.

(*p*) The most frequent irregularly compared adjectives are the following; bad, worse, worst; far, farther, farthest; fore, foremost, or first; good, better, best; late, later, latest, or last; little, less, or lesser, least; much, many, more, most; near, nearer, nearest, or next; nether, nethermost; old, older, oldest, or eldest; under, undermost; upper, uppermost; utter, uttermost, or utmost.

(*q*) Pronouns are either substantives, or adjectives. They are also imperfectly classed into personal, relative, possessive, and demonstrative pronouns.

(*r*) The first person is at the same time the speaker, and a subject of discourse; the second person is addressed; and the third spoken of; which discriminations, whilst they exist only in pronouns, must also be supposed in nouns, for the sake of the corresponding distinctions in verbs.

35. Myself, ourself, ourselves, yourself, yourselves, herself, and itself, are compounded of pronominal adjectives, and the noun *self*. Himself and themselves are used objectively, and sometimes improperly as subjects.

36. The pronoun adjectives this, plural, these; that, plural, those, are, called demonstratives, or relatives; each, either, every, and neither, distributives; which and what, interrogatives, or relatives; all, another, any, both, few, first, last, many, none, one, other, some, and such, indefinites.(*s*)

37. Personal Pronouns.

		Singular. Subjects.(*t*)	Objects.	Plural. Subjects.	Objects.
First person.		*I*,	*me*,	*we*,	*us*.
		Myself,	*myself*,	*ourselves*,	*ourselves*.
		Ourself,	*ourself*,		
Second person.		*Thou*,	*thee*, *you*,	*ye*, *you*,	*you*.
		Thyself,	*thyself*,	*yourselves*,	*yourselves*.
		Yourself,	*yourself*,		
Third person.	*m.*	*He*,	*him*,	*they*,	*them*.
		Hisself,	*himself*.		
	f.	*She*,	*her*,	*theirselves*,	*themselves*.
		Herself,	*herself*,		
	n.	*It*,	*it*,		
		Itself,	*itself*,		

(*s*) Another, each, either, every, neither, and one, are singular. One, and other, when they have the possessive sign, or are used in the plural, may be considered as nouns All of these pronoun adjectives are more properly adjectives with their adjunct nouns, and in their absence, pronouns.

(*t*) A subject is that, which in the first person speaks, in the second is addressed, in the third of which something is asserted; as, *I write, write thou, he is writing; I, thou,* and *he,* are subjects. An object is that to which an action tends; as, *John pushes me, I regard him, it is no injury to me; me* and *him* are objects. This distinction is preserved in many languages in their nouns, as well as pronouns, and marked by different terminations, called the nominative and accusative cases. Vide No. 54.

38. *Who* and its objective *whom* are personal, and may be used for any of the three persons, in the singular, or plural; the same may be said of *whosoever* and *whomsoever; whoever* is either a subject or object, singular or plural; *whoso* is a subject, and singular. *Whose* may relate to persons or things. *Who*, *which*, *that*, and *what* (*u*) are most frequently relatives, the phrase or word, to which they refer, is termed an antecedent.

OF VERBS.

39. A VERB, whilst it implies time, predicates, connects an attribute, or expresses an action, or inclination.

40. A verb, in sense, is either transitive, which supposes an object, towards which its action passes, or of which it affirms something; as, *to write a letter*, *to read a book*, *to hear a lecture;* or intransitive, which asserts, when finite, something only of its subject; as, *I run*, *you walk*, *he is*. Every individual of each class is, in form, either regular, or irregular; a few are also defective.(*x*)

(*u*) *What* has the force of *that*, *which*, and may be an object and subject at the same time; as, *what you did was not censured*, which is equivalent to *that*, *which you did*, *was not censured;* or it may have the effect of two subjects; as, *what was done*, *was not censured;* or of two objects; as, *he told what he heard.* The same variety of construction may be given its compound *whatever*.

(*x*) Verbs are regular when their past participles and past tenses are made by adding *d* or *ed;* irregular, if in any other manner. Defective are such, as want any of the parts. The irregular and defective chiefly follow. The parts which are in Italics, may be also made regularly.

Abide	abode	abode
am or be	was	been
arise	arose	arisen
awake	awoke	awoke.

Bear	bore	born
bear, *to carry,*	bare, or bore	borne
beat	beat	beat, or beaten
begin	began, begun	begun
behold	beheld	beholden
bend	*bent*	*bent*
bereave	*bereft*	*bereft*
beseech	besought	besought
bid	bid, bade	bidden
bind	bound	bound
bite	bit	bit, bitten
bleed	bled	bled
blow	blew	blown
break	brake, or broke	broken
breed	bred	bred
bring	brought	brought
build	*built*	built
burst	burst	bursten
buy	bought	*bought.*
Can	could	
cast	cast	cast
catch	*caught*	*caught*
chide	chid	chid, chidden
choose, or chuse	chose	chosen
cleave, *to stick,*	*clave*	*claven*
cleave, *to split,*	clove, or cleft	cloven, or cleft
climb	*climb*	climbed
cling	clang	clung
clothe	*clad*	*clad*
come	came, come	come
cost	cost	cost
crow	*crew*	crowed
creep	*crept*	*crept*
cut	cut	cut.
Dare, *to venture*	durst	dared
deal	*dealt*	dealt
dig	*dug*	digged
do	did	done
draw	drew	drawn
dream	*dreamt*	*dreamt*
drink	drank	drunk
drive	drove	driven, drove
dwell	*dwelt*	*dwelt.*

Eat	ate	eaten
engrave	engraved	engraven.
Fall	fell	fallen
feed	fed	fed
feel	felt	felt
fight	fought	fought
find	found	found
flee	fled	fled
fling	flung	flung
fly	flew	flown
forget	forgot	forgotten, forgot
forsake	forsook	forsaken
freeze	froze	frozen
freight	freighted	*fraught.*
Get	gat	got, or gotten
geld	*gelt*	*gelt*
gild	*gilt*	*gilt*
gird	*girt*	*girt*
give	gave	given
go	went	gone
grave	graved	*graven*
grind	ground	ground
grow	grew	grown.
Have	had	had
hang	hung	*hung*
hear	heard	heard
heave	*hove*	*hoven*
help	helped	*holpen*
hew	hewed	*hewn*
hide	hid	hidden
hit	hit	hit
hold	held	holden, or held
hurt	hurt	hurt.
Keep	kept	kept
knit	*knit*	knit, or knitted
know	knew	known.
Lade	laded	laden
lay	laid	laid
lead	led	led
leave	left	left
lend	lent	lent
let	let	let
light	light	light

lie, *to lie down,*	lay	lien, or lain
load	loaded	*loaden*
lose	lost	lost.
Make	made	made
mean	meant	meant
may	might	
meet	met	met
melt	melted	*molten*
mow	mowed	mown
must	must	
Ought	ought	
Pay	paid	paid
put	put	put.
Quit	quit, or quitted	quit
	quoth	
Read	read	read
rend	rent	rent
ride	rode	rid, or ridden
ring	rang	rung
rise	rose	risen
rive	rived	riven
run	ran	run.
Saw	sawed	*sawn*
say	said	said
see	saw	seen
seek	sought	sought
seethe	*sod*	*sodden*
sell	sold	sold
send	sent	sent
set	set	set
shake	shook	shaken
shave	shaved	*shaven*
shear	*shore*	shorn
shed	shed	shed
shine	*shone*	*shone*
shew	shewed	shewn
show	*shown*	shown
shoe	shod	shod
shall	should	
shoot	shot	shot
shrink	shrank	shrunk
shred	shred	shred
shut	shut	shut

sing	sang	sung
sink	sank	sunk
sit	sat	sat, or sitten
slay	slew	slain
sleep	slept	slept
slide	slid	slidden
sling	slang	slung
slink	slank	slunk
slit	slit	slit, or slitted
smite	smote	smitten
sow	sowed	*sown*
speak	spake, or spoke	spoken
speed	sped	*sped*
spend	spent	spent
spill	*spilt*	*spilt*
spin	spun, or span	spun
spit	spat	spitten
split	*split*	*split*
spread	spread	spread
spring	sprang	sprung
stand and compounds	stood	stood
steal	stole	stolen, or stoln
stick	stuck	stuck
sting	stang, stung	stung
stink	stank	stunk
stride	strode, or strid	stridden
strike	strick	struck, or stricken
string	strung	strung
strive	strove	striven
strew	strewed	strown
strow	strowed	strown
swear	swore, or sware	sworn
sweat	*sweat*, swet	*sweat*, swet
sweep	swept	swept
swell	swelled	*swollen*
swim	swam	swum
swing	swang	swung
Take, and compounds	took	taken
teach	taught	taught
tear, *to rend*,	tore, or tare.	torn
tell	told	told
think	thought	thought
thrive	*throve*	thriven

41. When verbs simply declare, or affirm, they may be said to be in the indicative mode, and have numbers and persons. (*y*)

42. When a verb, in its theme or natural state, expresses a command, permission or request, it is said to be in the imperative mode; which is only of the second person, and generally precedes its subject; (*z*) as, *go thou.*

---

throw	threw	thrown
thrust	thrust	thrust
tread	trod	trodden.
Wax	waxed	waxen
wear	wore	worn
weave	wove	woven
weep	wept	wept
will	would	willed
win	won, wan	won
wind	*wound*	*wound*
wis	wist	wist
wit, wot	wot	wot
work	*wrought*	*wrought*
wreathe	wreathed	*wreathen*
wring	*wrung*	*wrung*
write	wrote	written, writ, wrote.

(*y*) A mode is a form of a verb, indicating the manner of the being, or action, denoted by the verb. Verbs in the indicative, and imperative modes, not only express the radical idea, or intention of the speaker, with assertion, command, &c. and denote the time, but show whether the subject be one or more; and also, in the singular, distinguish between the persons. The first person is proper only to the speaker, the second person is used when a party is addressed, the third is adopted when any thing is spoken of. In the past tense the third person is the same as the first, and in neither tense does the plural ever vary from the first person singular, in the regular verbs.

(*z*) A verb in the indicative may precede its subject; it then usually asks a question, or expresses possibility or conditionality; as, *goest thou? were I, he, we, &c. to go.* The idea of possibility, liberty, or pow-

43. Verbs, which express action, being, or suffering, indefinitely with respect to number, and also without person, are said to be in the infinitive mode, and are generally preceded by *to;* as, *to go.* (*a*)

44. The indicative mode has two tenses or times, a present; as, *I write;* and a past; as, *I wrote;* the imperative, a present only; as, *write thou.* (*b*)

45. Examples of verbs regular, irregular, and defective. (*c*)

---

er is connected also with that of any action, by placing the infinitive of the verb expressing such action after a verb, which imports any of these; or by a particle expressed or implied. *May*, expresses liberty, *can*, ability, they are present tenses used indicatively, in their proper meanings; but if they were potential modes, potentiality would be once expressed by the force of the word, and once implied by the mode, and the potentiality of the mode would render the former doubtfulness doubtful. If all the verbs denominated auxiliary be combined with the infinitives of other verbs, and the meanings of the compounds be denominated according to those of the respective auxiliaries, there will be as many modes as auxiliaries, unless some of the helping verbs are perfectly coincident with each other in sense.

(*a*) Vide the exceptions to this rule in No. 76.

(*b*) *Shall* and *will* are in the present tense; and like other tenses in the English, indefinite. It is by their meanings, which suppose the action, or event to come, and not by rules of grammar, that they supply the place of a future tense. *Shall* foretells only in the first person, in the others, it threatens or engages. *Will* in the first person promises or threatens, in the rest foretells. They should be used for a future with an infinitive thus; *I shall go, thou wilt go, he will go, we shall go, you will go, they will go.*

(*c*) In conjugating an English verb, the present and past tenses in the first person, and the past participle, only are mentioned, as *love, loved, loved;* because even in irregular verbs the present participle follows the theme. An English participle is part of a verb, expressing its attribute with time, but without person or assertion. There are two participles, denominated active and passive; but this distinction is far from universal; that of imperfect and perfect is more important, and nearly the same as of present and past.

REGULAR VERBS.

	Indicative mode.				*Imperative and Infinitive.*	*Participles.*
	Singular number.			Plural.		
Tenses.	*I,*	*thou,*	*he, she, it,*	*we, ye, they.*		
Present.	Love,	lovest,	loves, or -eth,	love,	love,	loving.
Past.	loved,	lovedst,	loved,	loved,		loved.
Present.	grant,	grantest,	grants, or -eth,	grant,	grant,	granting.
Past.	granted,	grantedst,	granted,	granted		granted.

IRREGULAR VERBS.

	Indicative mode.				*Imperative and Infinitive.*	*Participles.*
	Singular number.			Plural.		
	I,	*thou,*	*he, she, it,*	*we, ye, they.*		
Present.	Write,	writest,	writes, or -eth,	write,	write,	writing.
Past.	wrote,	wrotest,	wrote,	wrote,		written.
Present.	do,	doest, dost,	does, doth,	do,	do,	doing.
Past.	did,	didst,	did,	did,		done.
Present.	let,	lettest,	letteth, lets,	let,	let,	letting.
Past.	let,	lettedst, let,	let,	let,		let.
Present.	have,	hast,	has, or hath,	have,	have,	having.
Past.	had,	hadst,	had,	had,		had.
Present.	will,	willest, wilt,	wills, will, -eth,	will,	will,	willing.
Past.	would,	wouldst,	would,	would,		willed.

DEFECTIVE VERBS.

	Indicative mode.				*Imperative and Infinitive.*	*Participles.*
	Singular number.			Plural.		
	I,	*thou,*	*he, she, it,*	*we, ye, they.*		
Present.	May,	mayest,	may,	may.		
Past.	might,	mightest,	might,	might.		
Present.	can,	canst,	can,	can.		
Past.	could,	couldst,	could,	could.		
Present.	be, am,	beest, art,	be, is,	be, are,	be,	being.
Past.	was, were,	wast, wert,	was, were,	were,		been.
Present. Past.	ought,	oughtest,	ought,	ought.		
Present. Past.	must,	must,	must,	must.		
Present.	shall,	shalt,	shall,	shall.		
Past.	should,	shouldst,	should,	should.		

OF ADVERBS.

46. An adverb is not a name of an immediate attribute, nor does it usually denote the quality of a substantive; but it expresses some modification, or circumstance of an action, or quality; and has been termed, an attribute of an attribute; as, *very good, he reads well.*(*d*)

47. An adverb should never, in discourse, take the place of an adjective, nor vice versâ. (*e*)

48. In English, two negatives make an affirmative, in the same proposition; as, "Nor did we get no hurt by "Adam's fall." But it is otherwise, if the sentence be divided; as, "He will not let you go, no, not with a "mighty hand."

OF INTERJECTIONS.

49. An interjection, is, when vocal, a sound thrown into language expressing an emotion or affection; as, *oh.*

(*d*) If we describe adverbs as words used with other words to modify their significations, many verbs and adjectives will be included: and if we add that they express some circumstance, or relation of an attribute, or action, they will not be distinguished thereby from prepositions.

(*e*) Some of the most common adverbs are the following; abundantly, alike, almost, already, always, apart, aside, backwards, better, best, certainly, chiefly, daily, doubtless, downwards, elsewhere, enough, especially, ever, far, foolishly, formally, forward, generally, greatly, haply, hardly, henceforth, here, hereafter, herein, heretofore, hither, hitherto, how, immediately, instantly, justly, lastly, lately, less, more, most, much, nay, never, no, not, now, oft, often, once, only, otherwise, peradventure, perchance, perhaps, possibly, presently, quickly, rather, really, scarcely, seldom, slowly, sometimes, soon, straightway, sufficiently, surely, thence, there, thither, thrice, together, truly, twice, universally, upwards, verily, very, weekly, well, when, whence, where, whither, whilst, why, wisely, worse, worst, yearly, yea, yes, yesterday.

In writing, it is the arbitrary sign of an affection, or passion; as, *ha, ha, he.* (*f*)

50. Written interjections are often derivatives, and frequently rather other parts of speech, than natural sounds; as, *brave, glory.* (*g*)

OF PREPOSITIONS.

51. PREPOSITIONS are connectives, (*h*) and do unite words, mostly nouns, with sentences, expressing the relation under which they introduce them, without altering the syntactical construction: as, *from Dan to Beersheba.* (*i*)

(*f*) It interrupts the communication of sentiment, by an unnecessary insertion among the words, and is for this reason denominated an interjection. When different cases follow the same or different interjections, the variety depends not upon it or them, but upon the words, which are omitted.

(*g*) The following are the English interjections, which most frequently occur; to wit, of *attention*, hah, lo, hallo; *aversion*, fie, tush, avaunt; *calling*, so, ho, soho; *correction*, hah, sirrah; *grief*, ah, alas, alack; *joy*, hey, io, huzza; *praise*, brave, glory; *wishing*, O, O that; and of *wonder*, O, hah, heigh.

(*h*) It is one characteristic of prepositions, that they are indeclinable; but so are other parts of speech. They also connect words, and so do conjunctions in some instances; this circumstance is an important criterion, though not infallible. They shew the relations of words to each other; this is a real distinction, so far as it goes, but seems not to be universal. They show the state, situation, or position of persons or things; but this often fails, when the prepositions are used in secondary, or more distant senses. As the several relations, which are expressed in some other languages by cases, are in the English denoted by prepositions, our grammarians have usually distinguished such relations by the names of the cases in use in the Latin language; but as no preposition in our language occasions any change in the noun, which it accompanies, such a discrimination is foreign to us, and worse than useless. They choose objective pronouns, but so do verbs.

(*i*) The principal prepositions are the following; above, about, after, against, amidst, among, amongst, around, at, before, behind, below, be-

OF CONJUNCTIONS.

52. A CONJUNCTION expresses the relation of one word, phrase, or sentence unto another; or unites in one sentence, what might be several. (*k*)

53. Conjunctions, not only connect the members of the same sentence, but may express the relations, which different sentences bear to each other. (*l*)

---

neath, beside, betwixt, between, beyond, by, down, for, from, in, into, near, nigh, of, on, out, over, through, throughout, to, towards, toward, under, unto, up, upon, with, within, without, &c. As our ideas, and language, generally originate from sensible objects, so almost all prepositions are primarily expressive of situation, or motion; and thence chiefly by analogy, they denote, time, situation, cause, effect, and various other relations.

(*k*) The conjunctions most used in the English language follow; viz. again, also, although, and, as, because, both, but, either, for, however, if, lest, likewise, neither, nevertheless, nor, now, or, otherwise, provided, since, so, than, that, therefore, though, unless, whereas, wherefore, whether, yet.

(*l*) The classification of conjunctions, usually made, is the following. *Copulatives* are also, and, both, neither, (Vide p. 181, ante,) nor, &c. which may conjoin several subjects, or different attributes, and produce a saving of words. *Disjunctives* are either, or, but, yet, &c. these by opposing the parts of a proposition also prevent a repetition. They are disjunctives in meaning, but conjunctions in their effects on words and sentences. *Adversatives* are but, nevertheless, though, yet, &c. which express, that the following position is opposed to the preceding. *Causatives* are because, since, therefore, &c. these denote that one proposition expresses the cause of another. *Conditionals* are if, provided, &c. which import that one proposition is the term, or supposition, upon which another depends, as a consequence. And *exceptives* are unless, &c. which denote that the truth of one proposition depends upon that of another. Vide No. 55. in note.

PART III.

OF SENTENCES.

54. EVERY simple sentence in the English language, contains either expressly or by implication, a verb in the indicative, or imperative mode; if in the former, such verb has a subject, and either connects, has an object, contains a predicate, or asks a question; (*a*) as, *I am reading*; *I read a book; I read; readest thou?* if in the latter, it is in the second person, precedes its subject and object, if any, for the most part, and does not assert, but commands, exhorts, or invites; as, *read thou*, or *ye, the book.*

(*a*) A subject is a word, chiefly a noun, of which something is asserted; a predicate is that, which is affirmed or denied of the subject; as, *man is an animal. Man* is the subject, *animal* is the predicate; *is* is termed the copula. The word which follows a transitive verb is denominated the *object;* as *man pursues advantage; man* is the subject; *pursues advantage* is the predicate; *pursues* is the transitive verb, contains the assertion, and expresses an action; *advantage* is the object, upon which it passes. In some languages, subjects and objects are distinguished by terminations denominated cases. In English, this discrimination is made among the pronouns by different words, in nouns, only by their collocation. When the verb is in the indicative mode, the sentence is explicative, or interrogative. Simple explicative sentences are usually universal, or particular; and affirmative, or negative. A *universal* proposition is that, in which its subject includes its species, or individuals, but whether they are to be taken collectively or distributively, must depend on the sense; and it either contains, with its subject, such word, as *all, every, no,* or, *none;* as, *all men are mortal;* or the subject is indefinite; as, *men are mortal;* or the subject is an individual; as, *the president is mortal.* The predicate may also reduce the proposition to particularity; or a negative particle may effect it. A *particular* proposition is that, in which the subject is limited to one or more of the species or individuals contained in it; and such limitation is usually signified by an article, or the words, *few, many, some,* or the like; as, *few politicians are disinterested.* An *affirmative* proposition is that, in which the predicate is represented to agree

55. A compound sentence is that, which is divided, or is capable of a division into simple sentences; as *he is ignorant, who knows not grammar.* (*b*)

---

with the subject, and every part of the predicate is asserted of it; as, *negroes are human beings.* A *negative* proposition denies the agreement of the predicate with the subject; as, *negroes are not descendants of Canaan.* A negative particle joined to a copula, may change a universal, to a particular proposition; thus, *all negroes are not wise,* is equivalent unto, *some negroes are not wise;* but *no negroes are wise,* is not the same as, *some negroes are unwise.* Simple interrogative sentences have the subject after the indicative verb; as, *dost thou write? What hast thou seen?* Simple imperative, or hortative sentences have their subjects, which are always of the second person, for the most part after the verb in its natural state; as, *attend my son, receive thou my advice.*

(*b*) A sentence is not compounded, because words expressive of origin, cause, end, relation, or other circumstance affecting the subject, copula, or predicate have been introduced into it. A simple sentence may have several subjects, or objects to the same verb, provided the verb be differently affected by them, and the sense liable to be altered by a separation of them: or there may be several verbs to the same subject. But in every instance when the sentence is resolvable into different propositions, without destroying the sense, it is a compound sentence.

Compound sentences may be as various, as the relations under which different propositions can be conjoined. *Copulative* sentences are those, in which two or more sentences are associated, or coupled together by *also, and, both, within, nor, &c.* as, *wealth produces pride, and poverty discontent. Disjunctive* are those, in which one is opposed to, or limited by another; their relations are expressed by *either, or,* &c. as, *either I am deceived, or the event has passed. Adversative* are those, which contain conflicting propositions, connected by *but, nevertheless, though, yet,* &c. as, *it is an old argument, but truth is not weakened by time. Causative* sentences are such, as shew in one proposition, the cause, or reason of another, which is discovered by the words, *because, since, therefore,* or the like; as, *because you have deceived me, I can trust you no more. Conditional* sentences are those, in which one proposition contains the terms, condition or supposition, and the other expresses the event or result; they usually contain such hypothetical term as, *if, provided, unless,* &c. as, *if you will trust me again, I will not deceive you. Exceptive* sentences are those, in which one proposition is a saving or exception out of the other; as *I can testify for you, except that one fact is against you. Comparative* sentences are those, in which one proposition repre-

56. A verb, not in the infinitive, must have a subject, and agree with it in number, and person; as, *I write, thou speakest, John hears.* (*c*)

57. If the subject be a noun of multitude, or a cardinal number, used collectively, the verb must be in the singular; if distributively, in the plural; as, *a company marches; the people run; fifty is not enough.* (*d*)

58. Two or more nouns, connected by a copulative conjunction, though one subject, must have a verb, or pronoun in the plural; as, *Peter and Paul were apostles, they taught;* but if by a disjunctive, or the nouns (*e*) be taken severally, the singular is required; as, *Peter or Paul was to be blamed at Antioch.* (*f*)

59. An infinitive mode, a word put artificially, a sentence, or a member of a sentence, may become the sub-

---

sents, or is compared with another; thus, *as a sheep before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth* Vide No. 53. in note.

(*c*) Sometimes the subject is understood; the pronoun *it*, rarely follows *as;* thus we say, *as follows, as appears;* it may nevertheless be expressed, as in the phrase; *as it seems.* Vide note (*o*) to No. 65. When *as follow, as concern,* and the like expressions occur, the discourse will furnish the plural subject. Yet some imagine *as* may be deemed the subject, and that whether the verb be singular, or plural.

(*d*) The words part, number, train, and the like may signify more than one, and be taken distributively, and consequently the verbs, to which they are subjects, may be in the plural; as, *part of the citizens vote.* This is proper, because their votes are distinct; on the contrary, *part of the army was captured,* leads the mind to conceive of a capture of a portion taken collectively, and is equally correct. Army, kind, party, sort, are used as singulars; audience, council, court, enemy, &c. are taken as plurals.

(*e*) Pronouns are also within the reason of the same construction; as, *I and thou are we; you and a third are ye.* The verb expressed is sometimes in the singular, and understood with the other subject, or subjects; as, *not Cæsar only, but Brutus died also.*

(*f*) In disjunctive sentences the verb agrees with the nearest subject; as, *you or I am sent for; he or we were present.* But when different words are thus required by the several subjects, it is better to repeat

ject to the verb, the substantive to the adjective, or the antecedent to the relative; and then the verb must be put in the third person singular; as, *to err is human; to behold the light is pleasant.* (*g*)

60. When the radical form of a verb precedes a pronoun of the second person, expressed or implied, or goes before a noun addressed, it is imperative; as, *go thou, and say to him, live.* (*h*)

61. When a relative pronoun is the subject to a verb, the verb must agree with it in number and person; as, *who can call thee wise, who lovest folly?* (*i*)

62. But if the verb have a subject, the relative is governed by the verb, or some other word; as, *the messenger whom I sent, has returned; whom have I sent, but thee?* (*k*)

63. My, thy, his, her, and its, represent singular nouns; our, your, and their, plural; or two or more singular nouns, or personal pronouns; his, her, its agree with the nouns, which they represent in gender, and all of them

---

the verb in its changed form; as, *you are sent for, or I am; he was present, or we were.*

(*g*) When the infinitive, which is the subject, is the verb *to be,* followed by an adjective, such clause may stand as a substantive; for such adjective forfeits its character, having neither a substantive, nor any thing in its place; as, *to be guilty is to be liable to the demands of justice. Guilty* agrees with nothing, unless the sentence be inverted, in which case *liable* is in the same condition. The verb of existence expressing an assertion, and an adjective a quality, they are together, equivalent to a finite verb.

(*h*) Vide exceptions in No. 42. in note.

(*i*) When two nouns, or a noun and pronoun have gone before, both of the same person, the relative may agree with either; as, *I am the man, who bears affliction; who* agrees with *man;* but it might agree with *I;* as, *I am the man, who bear affliction;* and the verb must agree with the relative in number and person.

(*k*) When the relative is an object, it generally precedes the verb; as, *the book, which I read.*

in person; as *John and I recite our lesson: his turn is next.* (*l*)

64. This and these, that and those, agree with their nouns in number; as, *this is the man, these are the men.*(*m*)

65. Pronouns, whether personal or relative, must agree with their nouns (*n*) in gender, number and person, so far as they possess them; as, *man, who is born, is mortal; he cannot live always; the soul, which was superadded, survives.* (*o*)

66. When two nouns come together, the former may have the possessive sign, if right or possession be implied; as, *Peter's house.* But if they stand for the same person or thing, they must be in the same state, whether as subjects or objects; as, *Isaiah the prophet. Thou, John, hast obliged me, Thomas.*

67. When two or more names are given the possessor, the possessive sign must follow the last only: if there be several entitled, it may follow each, or the last; as, *Alexander the emperor of Russia's consul; Mary's, Elizabeth's and Ann's reigns. Paul's sister's son.* (*p*)

(*l*) All of them are used with nouns of any gender or number. Also the antecedent of *your* may be singular as well as plural, then it is equivalent to *thy*.

(*m*) When contrasted, *this* and *these* refer to the latter, *that* and *those* to the former word, thing or things, person, or persons.

(*n*) *What, which, that* and *this*, often have a sentence, or clause, for their antecedent.

(*o*) If the antecedent be a noun of multitude in the singular, the pronoun should be singular or plural, according as the noun is used in a collective, or distributive sense; as, *the clergy withdrew themselves; the parliament pursued its own business.*

The relative *who* is put for persons, *which* for things; but *it* may stand for any person singular, masculine, feminine or neuter, for cause or effect, action or passion, a condition, a discourse, or for that which is wholly unknown, and thus supply the place of a subject to a verb; which ought not to be deemed impersonal, because its subject is not distinctly known. *It is I, thou, he, we, ye, they, who, &c.*

(*p*) When different persons are named, the ' may be annexed to

68. The present participle may stand with a noun, pronoun, (*q*) or other word absolutely, and such member of a sentence is equivalent, in sense, to a proposition; as, *the sun rising, labour commences.*

69. Present and past participles may stand absolutely, and perform the office of a conjunction; as, *seeing, provided*, &c. (*r*)

70. The verb *have* is followed by a participle of the past tense; and *be*, by either of the participles; as; *the first speaker has closed; the second is beginning.* (*s*)

---

the latter; as, *John and Matthew's book;* but not if a pause intervene; as, *not only John's, but also Matthew's book.* If the words be in apposition, the possessive termination is often affixed to the former; as, *I lodged at Mr. White's, my cousin's husband.* When the words are thus said to be in apposition, and the first noun has the apostrophe and *s*, it is not to be repeated, as, *I left my horse at Johnson's the farmer;* because *Johnson's* is equivalent to *Johnson his* scil. *house*, and not strictly a possessive case, and so the word *farmer* is in apposition. The *s* should not follow additional words of description; as, *Dr. Blair of Edinburgh's sermons; sermons of Dr. Blair of Edinburgh*, is better. The possessive sign may be often advantageously exchanged for the preposition *of;* but they are not to be used together for the same purpose.

(*q*) Neither are the objective pronouns, nor possessive nouns to be used thus absolutely. When an adjective with its adjunct stands absolutely, the words *he being*, or some others are implied; as, *conscious of his integrity, no defence was prepared;* that is, *he being conscious*, &c.

(*r*) When the participles according, admitting, allowing, concerning, considering, excepting, granting, regarding, speaking, seeing, supposing, and the like, stand without dependence, or visible connexion, they are put with some noun, pronoun, or clause understood, and often have the force of a preposition.

(*s*) *I intend to have written* (*statuo scripsisse*) is a kind of phrase necessary in a variety of instances. *Intend* is the present tense, indicative mode, first person singular; *to* is a preposition going before an infinitive; *have* is the infinitive after the finite verb *intend; I intend to have* is equivalent to a future, and might as correctly be denominated a future tense, as *I will have. Written* is the past participle of the verb *write;* and signifies the act accomplished, at the future period before expressed: as, *I intend to have written, before the mail shall leave us to-morrow.*

71. The verb *be* is often followed by an adjective, and in every form, requires the same state of the noun or pronoun to follow it, which had gone before it; (*t*) as, *thou art he; who did they say I am? he took John to have been him:* but when possession or right is intended, a word implied requires the possessive; as, *It is John's*, that is, *it is John's book.*

72. Nouns are in the same form, whether as subjects, or objects; and follow, in their natural state, transitive verbs, their participles, and prepositions, whatsoever relation they express; as, *kindness produces kindness, and ever has brought a reward to its possessor.* (*u*)

73. The pronouns me, thee, him, her, it, us, you, that, those, this, these, them, what, which, whom, each, either, neither, and their compounds, and other objective pronouns may follow prepositions,(*x*) transitive verbs, their infinitives or participles; (*y*) as, *conscience is guiding him, will support him, and yield to him consolation.*

(*t*) The verb *be* is the only one in the English language, which can express separately the essence of a verb, and connect a predicate to a subject, without other effect. But when it follows alone, or connects not another predicate, it contains the predicate of existence; as, *he is*, that is, *he is existing; he is in the city*, means *he is existing, or abiding, in the city.*

(*u*) Intransitive verbs also sometimes require objects; as, *he went a journey;* but, for the most part, there is a preposition understood, or a relation not expressed; as, *he stood the whole time;* that is, *through the whole time.*

(*x*) Sometimes prepositions are separated from the pronouns which they govern, and placed at the end of the sentence; as, *whom did you go with?* But prepositions generally precede the nouns, pronouns and infinitives which they introduce; whilst adverbs for the most part, precede the adjectives, and follow the verbs, with which they are connected in sense; except the verbs be, can, do, have, may, shall and will.

(*y*) The past participles of verbs of every kind, after the verb *be*, are

74. When present participles are preceded by an article, or pronoun adjective, they become nouns, and must not be followed by objective pronouns, or nouns without a preposition; as, *the reading of many books wastes the health.* (*z*)

75. A verb, a phrase, a clause, or an entire proposition may become a predicate, in whole or part, in the principal proposition; or stand as an object to the verb; as, *truth is the agreement of ideas and their signs, with things and facts.* (*a*)

76. When a verb follows a verb, it is in the infinitive mode; and is immediately preceded by the preposition *to*, except after the verbs be, bid, can, dare, do, feel, hear, let, make, may, read, say, see, shall, and will; (*b*) as, *I love to walk; I can ride.*

77. Conjunctions supply the places of other words, and introduce terms under the circumstances, which the omitted words would have required; thus, *he praised him, rather than them*, scil. *praised them. He is taller than I*, scil. *am.* (*c*) *They found John and me absent,*

---

followed by the subjective pronouns; but after the verb *have*, they require the objective; as, *William was styled he, who had conquered; they have styled him conqueror.*

(*z*) But such nouns, like all others, may be used without an article, being sufficiently discovered by the following preposition; as, *he was sent to prepare the way, by preaching of repentance.*

Also an article, or pronoun adjective, may precede a clause, used as a noun, and commencing with a participle; as, *his teaching children was necessary.*

(*a*) Infinitive modes, and clauses are sometimes put absolutely; as, *to proceed; to tell the whole truth.*

(*b*) But when the participles of any of these verbs, which have participles, are followed by an infinitive of another verb, the preposition *to* is generally inserted; as, *he had dared to speak; he was made to tell; he was willing to go.*

(*c*) There is one anomaly; the object *whom*, and not the subject *who*,

scil. *they found me; I spoke and wrote to him*, scil. *I wrote.* (*d*)

78. The noun or pronoun in an answer, must be considered as constructed with the words of the question repeated; as, *who came first? He. Whom did he bring? Me.*

79. Qualities may have various relations; therefore adjectives may not only stand with or without their substantives, or be affirmed of them, but have objects, and be followed by infinitives, (*e*) and prepositions; as, *it is worth money; fit to be eaten; good for something.* (*f*)

---

must follow *than*, without respect to the word, which may be implied. When a verb follows *than*, and has no subject, *that which* will often supply the ellipsis; as, *he lived more expensively; than suited his purse.*

(*d*) Some conjunctions correspond to others, to adverbs, adjectives, or phrases; thus,

as may have	so, or as;
so,	that, or as;
neither,	nor;
either, or whether,	or;
though,	yet, or nevertheless;
such,	as;
equally,	as;
the same,	as, that;
in the same manner,	as;
for the reason,	that;
scarce, or scarcely,	when;
rather more,	than;
and comparatives,	than.

(*e*) Infinitives also follow particular nouns; as, *he possessed anxiety to go.*

(*f*) The adjective usually precedes its noun; as, *a worthy man;* but not when placed in the circumstances mentioned in this rule, and in some others; as, *a man worthy to be praised; a scholar well learned and virtuous, but unfortunate; the prodigal is unhappy.* It is often separated from its noun, by the article *a* or *an*, and sometimes by *the;* as, *how hard a lot; how difficult the labour; too great a price.* Sometimes it is elegantly placed before the verb; as, *wise is the man.* An adjective, especially *all*, often has respect to several nouns at the same time.

80. Nouns or pronouns are governed by interjections, only as other parts of speech; if they be not such, the construction is to be discovered by supplying omitted words. Thus, *O me!* is *O pity*, or *help me; O thou wretch!* is *O thou art a wretch; O shameful!* is *O it is shameful.*

THE DIVISION OF SENTENCES BY POINTS.

81. The period shows the termination of a sentence; or denotes an abbreviation, to be supplied in reading; as, *Vid. Part III. ch. vii.*

82. A colon separates a sentence, complete in its construction, from an additional member; there should not be two in the same sentence.

83. When a quotation or example follows a sentence, a colon should intervene; but if the example be introduced by *as*, *thus*, and the like, a semicolon should be placed before them; if the quotation be the object of a verb, a comma is sufficient; as, *Eve is thus described by Milton:* "*Grace was in all her steps.*" *Milton describes Eve; thus*, "*Grace was in all her steps.*" *Of Eve Milton says*, "*Grace was in all her steps.*"

84. Semicolons are to be preferred to periods, where the sentences would be short, and their connexion, or dependence in sense, slight: thus, "*The pride of wealth* "*is contemptible; the pride of learning is pitiable; the pride* "*of dignity and rank is ridiculous; but the pride of bigotry* "*is insupportable.*"

85. A semicolon is used to divide compound sentences, when that which immediately follows, has some dependence upon the former part; especially when the connexion is expressed by a conjunction; as, *a jest is not an argument; nor a loud laugh a demonstration.*

86. The comma is used to separate propositions in the same sentence; as, *if you will go before, I will follow. I shall, if you will go before, soon follow after.*

87. When the subject consists of several words, which are inseparable from it, a comma may intervene before the verb; as, *an inordinate desire of admiration, often produces a contemptible levity of deportment.*

88. The comma distinguishes whatever condensed phrase is equivalent to a proposition: as, *air is necessary to the life of animals, the growth of plants, the flight of birds, the formation of sounds, and other important purposes.*

89. The comma separates single words, whether nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, or adverbs, when more of the same class occur successively in the same construction; so when they are distinct members of a sentence, having respectively the force of a proposition: or are introduced by a relative, conjunction, or preposition; as, *climate, soil, laws, customs, &c. produce and continue a variety in the complexion, features, manners, and faculties of the human species.*

90. Conjunctions are generally preceded at the least by commas; but when two nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, or adverbs, stand connected by a conjunction, or occur in pairs, a comma before the conjunction is often deemed unnecessary, if they be without adjuncts; as, *Cicero and Demosthenes were orators. There is a discernible difference, between merit and demerit, virtue and vice, wisdom and folly.*

91. A member inserted in a compound sentence, but wholly detached from its construction, and omissible without injuring it, should be separated by commas. Any noun introduced by a preposition, also *in general,*

more or less, *as it were*, *in any respect*, and the like phrases should be thus separated.

92. Terms of address, words put absolutely with participles, and adverbs not adjunct to verbs or adjectives, are generally separated by commas; as, *My son*, *obey my voice*. *Flattery is*, *certainly*, *detestable*.

93. The parenthesis is to be avoided in general, but is necessary where the incidental sentence is interrogatory, exclamatory, apostrophic, or wholly detached. It requires a change of voice, and a pause, without a comma, semicolon, or colon.

94. The note of interrogation requires a pause, but its duration depends on circumstances. The note of admiration is put for an emotion of any kind; its pause is also variable: the voice should be elevated.

95. A dash denotes a significant pause. It may precede an apostrophic address; mark an interruption of the sense; or shew that the sentence is incomplete. It should never be substituted instead of the regular points.

EXAMPLES OF THE RESOLUTION OF SENTENCES.

1. "GRATITUDE IS A DELIGHTFUL EMOTION."*

Gratitude is a noun, here it is the name of an abstract idea, vide rule 8. in the singular, 11. and third person, 31. in note; occurring without an article, it is

* Examples are taken from other grammars, that the parsing here pursued, may be more easily compared with that of other systems.

The rules are numerically referred to, and continually, for the advantage of those, who are unaccustomed to grammatical resolution; in practice, both the reading and rehearsing the rule may be dispensed with, and the construction intelligibly described in the words of the instructor or learner.

used in its most general sense, 21. It is the subject, 54. in note, which *is* asserts to be *a delightful emotion.*

Is will be found in the third person, singular number, present tense and indicative mode, of the irregular verb *be*, 45. and agrees with *gratitude*, its subject, in number and person, 56.

Emotion is a noun, and common to a class, 10. It is spoken of, and is therefore of the third person, 31. in note; in the singular number; 10. following *is*, and connected in the same state with that of the subject, 71.

A is an article, limiting the general term *emotion* to mean one emotion, without shewing which, 19.

Delightful is an adjective, 23. in the positive state; or a word expressing, without increase or diminution, an adhering quality, 26. of the noun *emotion*, with which it stands; 79. in note (*f*); and thus defining the individual emotion, particularized by the article *a*. The sentence is simple, 54. and a declarative proposition, in which *gratitude* is the subject; *is* the copula, or connexive verb, and *a delightful emotion* the predicate, 54. in note; or that which is here affirmed of the subject, as its equivalent.

2. "VICE PRODUCES MISERY."

Vice is a noun common to a genus, or whole class, 9. It is not restricted by an article, 21. It is in the third person or spoken of, 31. in note; and the subject, of which it is asserted, that it *produces misery*, 37. in note.

Produces is a regular verb, 40. in note,(*x*) transitive, expressing an action, which falls on an object, 40. It simply declares or asserts the act of producing, and is in the indicative mode, 41. It expresses a time indefinitely present, and is in the present tense, 44. in the third person singular, 45. and thus agrees with its

subject *vice*, 56. The object of the action of the transitive verb *produces*, is *misery*.

Misery is a noun common to a class, 10. and is here to be understood generally, because not restricted by an article, 21. and yet as excluding plurality, because used in an abstract sense, 11. It is the object of the action expressed by the verb *produces;* and being a noun, it retains its simple state, 72.

This is therefore a simple, affirmative proposition, in general terms, and expressing a general truth; *vice* is the subject, *produces* contains the assertion, and the words *produces misery* constitute the predicate, or that which is affirmed of *vice;* 54. in note (*a*).

3. "WISDOM OR FOLLY GOVERNS US."

Wisdom is a common name, in the singular, vide rule 10. in the third person, being spoken of, 31. in note; and used as a subject, or that of which something is asserted, 37. in note.

Or is a conjunction, connecting the words *folly* and *wisdom*, 52. but it is in meaning disjunctive, as it opposes folly to wisdom. It prevents the repetition of the following words of the sentence, 53. in note.

Folly is a noun common, in the singular, 10. the third person, 31. in note, and a subject of affirmation, 37. in note.

Governs expresses action, and is therefore a verb, 39. transitive, 40. and regular, 40. in note. It simply declares, and is in the indicative mode, 41. It expresses a present influence, and is in the present tense, and third person singular, 45. Because the words *wisdom* and *folly* are connected by the disjunctive particle *or*, *governs* is in the singular, 58. and agrees with each in person, 56.

Us is a personal pronoun, of the first person, 31. in

the plural, put objectively, 37. and follows the transitive verb *governs;* 73.

This is a compounded sentence, because the two subjects stand affected by the verb in the same manner, 55. in note. It is of the disjunctive kind, ibidem. It affirms that we are governed, and asserts the alternative, that it is either by wisdom or folly. Such can be contradicted either by denying that which is affirmed; in this case, the government; or by denying the opposition implied in the *or*, by shewing an intermediate state, that is, one which is neither of wisdom nor folly.

4. "THEY COULD OBTAIN THE OBJECT OF THEIR "WISHES, IF THEY WOULD BE RESOLUTE."

They is a personal pronoun, and a subject; but as it has in this sentence no antecedent, its gender is unascertained; vide rule 37. It is the third person, or spoken of, 31. in note.

Could is an irregular, and defective verb; vide *can*, 40. in note. It is in the past tense, third person plural of the indicative mode, 45. It agrees with its subject *they*, in number and person, 56. *They could* is equivalent unto *it was in their power.*

Obtain is a transitive verb, 40. and regular, 40. in note. It is here used without number, or person; and is therefore in the infinitive mode, 43. It is in the infinitive, because it follows the finite verb *could*, 76. By the same rule it appears, that *to* is properly omitted after the verb *can.*

The is the more definite article, particularizing the word *object*, 20.

Object is a noun common, standing for some one of a species; and designated as most prominently desired, 10. It is spoken of, and is therefore the third person; it is one and therefore singular; 10. it is the object of the transitive verb *obtain*, and in its original state, 72.

Of is a preposition, or a word used to express the relation of the words *their wishes;* which it introduces into the sentence, without changing its construction, 51.

Their is a possessive pronominal adjective, 32. requiring a plural antecedent in the third person, 63. It refers as a pronoun to the antecedent of *they*, 63. the first word in the sentence; it expresses the wishes to belong to them, and thus denotes possession. As an adjective it expresses a quality of the noun *wishes*, and is without change for gender, case, or number, as other English adjectives are.

Wishes is a noun common, 9. plural, 12. and objectively following the preposition *of*, 72.

The sentence is compounded, 55. of two propositions. The words, *if they would be resolute* are the proposition, which contains the condition or supposition; and the words *they could obtain the object of their wishes*, are the other proposition expressing the event, or result, 55. in note.

If is a word conjoining the second proposition with the first; and though originally a verb, in the imperative, it is now properly denominated a conjunction, 52. and of that species, which is termed conditional, 53. in note. It imports, that the following member of the sentence is a term, upon which the former depends as a consequence.

They is a personal pronoun, in the third person, plural, and a subject to the verb *would*, 37.

Would is a verb expressing inclination, 39. Here intransitive, it asserts only of its subject, 40. It is irregular, vide *will, would*, 40. in note, and in 45. It is indicative, or simply declares such inclination of the mind, 41. It is plural, and the third person, 41. in note. And thus it agrees in number and person with its subject *they*, 56.

Be is a verb intransitive, 40. and irregular, 40. in note. It is in this place without number, and without person; and therefore in the infinitive mode, 43. It is in that mode, because it follows the verb *would*, 76. By the same rule, and for the same reason also, it has not the preposition *to* before it.

Resolute expresses a quality, not in the abstract, and is therefore an adjective, 23. The noun to which it belongs, is the antecedent to *they*, which is not given; it here relates to persons not things. It follows *be*, 71.

5. "IF THE EXCELLENCE OF DRYDEN'S WORKS WAS "LESSENED BY HIS INDIGENCE, THEIR NUMBER WAS "INCREASED."

If is a conditional or hypothetical conjunction. Vide rule 53. in note. It expresses the proposition, which it introduces, to be a supposition or term, upon which the assertion, *their number was increased*, is suspended, *ibid.*

The is the more definite article, 20. It is not an attribute of the word excellence, even of a definitive kind, nor does it point out "that particular excellence," for none such is spoken of, but the excellence of Dryden's works, of whatsoever species. *The* limits our thoughts to one of the properties of Dryden's works, namely, *the excellence*, not the number, &c. 20.

Excellence is a noun common, in the singular, 10. and imports all, that in Dryden's works can be called excellent. It is the subject to the verb *was*, 54. in note; in the third person, 37. in note; and singular number, 10.

Of is a preposition introducing the term *works* into the sentence without altering the syntactical construction, and expressing that whatever is meant by the word *excellence* is a property of them, 51.

Dryden's is a noun proper, or name of an individual, 9. That it may signify not only the man, but his property or possession, it has the possessive termination,

the apostrophe and *s*, 16. It is introduced before the noun *works*, 66.

Works is a noun common, in the plural number, 10. and follows in its natural state the preposition *of*, 72.

Was is an intransitive verb, 40. and irregular; see *am*, 40. in note. As it simply affirms, it is in the indicative mode, 41. in the past tense, singular number, and third person, 45. It agrees with its subject *excellence* in number, and person, 56.

Lessened is the past participle of the regular verb *lessen*, 40. in note. *Lessened by his indigence* is the predicate of the first proposition in the compounded sentence, 54. in note; and follows the verb *was*, 70.

By is a preposition connecting the word *indigence* with the proposition, and expressing the relation of an instrumental cause, 51.

His is a possessive pronominal adjective, 32. As a pronoun it relates to the antecedent word *Dryden*, and agrees with it in gender, number and person, 63. It expresses the indigence to be Dryden's; and, as an adjective, denotes this quality of the indigence, namely that it was Dryden's; and like other adjectives, admits no change, unless it were compared, 24.

Indigence is a noun common, in the singular, 10. and in its natural state follows the preposition *by*, 72.

Their is a possessive pronominal adjective, 32. Its antecedent is *works*, in the plural, 63. and its effect is to refer the word *number* to them.

Number is a noun common in the singular, 10. and is spoken of, in the third person, 31. in note. It is the subject to the verb *was*, 54. in note.

Was is an intransitive verb, 40. and irregular, vide *am*, or *be*, 40. in note. It simply asserts, and is indicative, 41. in the past tense, 45. in the singular number, and third person, 41. in note. It agrees with its subject, *number*, in number and person, 56.

Increased is the past participle of the regular verb *increase*, 40. in note. It follows the verb *was*, 70. expresses a state; and is the predicate of the proposition, *their number was increased.* Vide 54. in note.

VARIOUS COMBINATIONS OF VERBS RESOLVED.

1. *I love* is a present tense indefinite, but may be rendered definite by any expression, which will connect it with absolute time. *I do love* is more emphatic, but not definite, or precisely ascertained in point of time, considered apart from every circumstance; *do* is a present tense and indefinite, and *love*, an infinitive, and thus of itself also indefinite. *I am loving* expresses an action as imperfect, or advancing. It is generally deemed to be definite. *Am* is the present indefinite; *loving* is the present participle, expressing an unfinished action, or state of continuance. If the phrase is confined to the time of the discourse, it is definite, but this is not always the case.

2. *I loved* was long erroneously termed an imperfect, or a preterimperfect tense. It is now accounted by all a past tense, and indefinite. *I did love* denotes time, that is past, according to Dr. Lowth; a past tense indefinite, according to Mr. Webster; but it is Mr. Murray's imperfect tense. *Did* is the past tense, perfect or complete, its time is indefinite; *love* is the infinitive, and consequently of itself indefinite. *I was loving* expresses time past, but that the action was then imperfect; Mr. Webster terms it also definite. *Was* is the past tense; *loving* is a present participle, and denotes an action imperfect. *Was* carries the act of *loving* to its own time, which is past, but how long past is indefinite. Yet such phrase

generally refers to some action, circumstance or expression which renders it capable of being ascertained, and thus it may be rendered definite.

3. *I have loved* was anciently termed the preterperfect tense, which is adopted by Dr. Beattie. It is the perfect of Mr. Murray. Dr. Lowth denominates the compound a present perfect. In this he is correct, as it would be improper to say *I have loved yesterday*. But he considers it as definite; this errour has been detected by Mr. Webster, who in his paradigma gives it the place of a past tense indefinite. *Have* is a verb in the present tense, and signifies to possess, or attain to. *Loved* is the past participle, and no other will make sense with the verb *have*. Such participles generally express a perfect, or complete action. *I have loved* is therefore a present perfect; or expresses an act as already past at the time of speaking: but how long the action was complete before the speaking, is not shewn, it is therefore indefinite.

4. *I had loved*, is a compound denominated variously, the plusquam-perfect, pluperfect, past perfect, and prior-past; all which names express an action or state prior to an action, which is also complete. But Dr. Lowth and Mr. Webster in this are discordant, the former accounting it definite, the latter indefinite. *Had* is a verb in the past tense, signifying possessed, or attained unto; an action or state, which is perfect or complete. *Loved* is the past participle, also expressing a perfect action, or complete state. *I had loved* denotes, that the affection had existed before some other event, or time, alluded to in the discourse. If such later period be connected with absolute time, yet that which is remote is unascertained, or indefinite.

5. *I will love* is agreed by English grammarians to express a future action, and that indefinitely. That such is the effect of the expression may be easily discovered

by reflecting on the senses of the words, and the effect springing from the combinations of them. *I will*, anciently *I woll*, is a present tense, and equivalent unto, I choose, or I incline. *Love* is in the infinitive mode, regularly following the finite verb *I will*, and expresses its action, or affection, indefinitely. The affection expressed by *love*, is that which is asserted by the word *will* to be at present intended to be accomplished; or in other terms to be future at the time of speaking the words. But when the future action denoted by the verb *love* is to be effected, is left wholly unascertained by the expression of the desire of the action; the time is therefore indefinite.

6. *I would love* is denominated by Mr. Murray an imperfect potential. (*a*) Dr. Lowth and Mr. Webster have termed it a past tense; and the latter justly pronounces it indefinite. *Would* is the past tense of will; *love* is the regular infinitive following the verb *would*. Both are indefinite. The meaning of the compound will greatly depend upon the circumstances, under which it is used. *Why did you love? Because I would love.* Here it imports not potentiality, but asserts a past inclination to love. (*b*)

(*a*) That it expresses possibility independently of other circumstances must be denied, for it may affirm, and often does, in the most positive manner, a former determination, or fixed resolution. That it expresses an imperfect action cannot be admitted; it is not discernible that any part of an English verb can be made to effect this, except the present participle.

(*b*) *I would love*, expressing a past desire of an action to come, but which action was then indefinitely future, the phrase is often understood to relate to a time future at the moment of speaking, and to express that the former purpose reached to the accomplishment of an action then and still future. But by the expressing of such desire as now past, for *would* is *wolled* the past tense of *woll*, that is *will*, there is plainly implied a change of purpose, the cause of which is either expressed or supposed to be known. When such cause of the change

7. *I can love* is universally agreed to express a present time. Dr. Lowth denominates it subjunctive; Mr. Murray potential; with the latter Mr. Webster agrees, and adds that it is indefinite. It does not always follow an indicative mode; and if it did, the reason of such circumstance must be sought in the meaning of the word, for our language has adopted no subjunctive form. The verb *can* may be termed potential, because it signifies to be able; but it has no peculiar form which denotes possibility. It expresses indicatively, and by the natural meaning of the word, that power, which is suitable to action. *I can love*, used alone, implies no conditionality, or possibility of a defect of such power; it expresses the present capacity of loving, but how long such capacity will continue, and when the affection will exist, or whether at any time, are left indefinite. *I can* is the indicative present, *love* the infinitive, and expressive of an action without number, or person, or any connexion with absolute time, except as it depends on the finite verb *can*. But as *can* expresses power, not accomplishment, *love* must denote an action or affection future at the time of speaking; and as every future action of a creature is liable to be prevented, so there is a possibility that the power expressed by *can* may fail of its exercise. *I can love* may therefore be used either positively, or if circumstances require, it may imply contingency, but this must be discovered by the discourse, without which it has no such meaning.

---

of will is capable of being removed, or the sentence expresses it under a condition, the future purpose is to be understood as reviving upon such removal, or to revive with the performance of such condition. In this manner it is, that *I would love*, may be used in reference to the future, and including a possibility.

8. *I could love* is accounted by Mr. Murray an imperfect tense, but it expresses no continuance of action. Dr. Lowth and Mr. Webster with evident propriety pronounce it a past tense. The former terms it subjunctive, the latter potential. (c)

Could is the past tense of *can; I could* is I was able; *I could love* affirms indicatively, I was able to love. It does not affirm the accomplishment of the action, or affection; it is indefinite, and might extend to the time yet to come, except that *could* being in the past tense implies a present suspension of such power. But if such cause of suspension be removed, the party might still love. The phrase *I could love* may therefore well be used with such language of conditionality, in which event, it may have relation to the future, and be used hypothetically. But such meaning belongs not to the phrase considered in itself, and alone.

9. *I shall have loved* is, according to Dr. Lowth, and Dr. Beattie, a future perfect; the same idea it is presumed Mr. Murray had, when he named it a second future; and Mr. Webster, when he gave it the appellation of prior-future. The phrase does express a future, which is perfect; and it is a future beyond a future, and therefore second, or prior. Dr. Lowth's opinion, that it is definite, is corrected by Mr. Webster, who considers it indefinite. From the Latin tense to which it corresponds,

---

(c) That the English language has an ample store of verbs, by which contingency, possibility, liberty, and conditionality may be expressed is an undeniable and happy circumstance; but that it possesses a peculiar mode, or form of each verb, into which it may be cast to give it this additional meaning, has never been shewn. To denominate those particular verbs, which may be used to supply such defect, mere modes of other verbs, is a faulty imitation of the grammars of other languages, and a departure from the truth of the fact; for it is not a mode, but the natural meaning of the verb, that effects the purpose.

it was anciently given as a subjunctive future; but Mr. Murray and Mr. Webster agree, and justly, in accounting it indicative, perhaps because the Latin is now known to be such. *I shall* is the present tense of the indicative, nearly equivalent unto *I must*, *I am under a necessity*. When *I shall* precedes an infinitive verb, the action or state, denoted by such verb, has not yet been accomplished, and is therefore future; thus *I shall have* affirms indicatively a future event, *I shall at some period, yet to come, possess*. *Loved* is the past participle, and expresses a perfect or complete act. The act or state, is that, which *I shall have*, or in future attain unto, or possess. But there is implied some other event or future period, to which, the phrase *I shall have loved* refers, and without which, it will be unintelligible, or ineffectual.

10. If the infinitive *be*, and a present participle, follow *shall* or *will;* the action expressed is imperfect. If they be followed by *be* and a past participle, the action is perfect; if by *have been* and a present or past participle, the action will be imperfect or perfect as before.

After the same manner, it is probable, every legitimate combination of verbs and participles may, by a little attention and practice, be easily resolved.

PART IV.

OF VERSIFICATION.

POETRY is the language of passion; the words also occur in such manner, with relation either to quantity, or accent, or both, as to have a pleasing effect upon the ear. (*a*)

(*a*) *Lyric poetry* is perhaps the most ancient; and consisted of songs of praise; such as those of Moses, Miriam, David, and Asaph. The fancied inspiration of heathen poets indulged its licentiousness in this species of poetry. Pindar, Anacreon, Horace and Sappho have written in this manner.

Pastoral poetry is descriptive of the simplicity and innocence, of the peaceful, pleasing scenes of rural life. Such are the Idyllia of Theocritus, the Eclogues of Virgil, and the Gentle Shepherd of Ramsay.

Didactic poetry aims at instruction in morals, writing, agriculture, &c. such are Horace's Art of Poetry, Virgil's Georgics, Pope's Essay on Man, and Young's Night Thoughts.

Epic poetry is dignified and pathetic narration on some interesting subject; such are the Ilias, Æneis, and Paradise Lost.

Dramatic poetry differs from Epic chiefly in this, that it introduces the actors speaking for themselves, the poet never appearing.

Elegiac poetry treats of death, laments a friend, or pursues some other mournful subject. Such are Ovid's, Milton's, Hammond's, Pomfret's elegies; and "Gray's Elegy written in a Country Church-yard."

Satire is poetry jocosely ridiculing folly, or severely lashing vice, and sometimes virtue. The Satires of Horace, those of Juvenal, and Butler's Hudibras are examples.

Epigrams are short poems resembling inscriptions written on various subjects; they may aim either at praise or ridicule; but must in every instance contain point, or some lively turn of wit. Martial excelled in this species of poetry.

Epistolary, *Descriptive*, and *Allegorical* poetry, with *Fable* and *Epitaph* are also species; but sufficiently designated by their respective names.

English verse is not in a classic sense metrical, but accentual and rhythmical. (*b*)

Two accented syllables are denominated a Spondee; two unaccented a Pyrrhic: if the first only be accented, it is termed a Trochee; if the last an Iambus. If the first only of three syllables be accented, it receives the name of a Dactyl; if the last, an Anapæst. (*c*)

After the same manner, some of the numerous kinds of English verses have received ancient names, as well as metrical division by the ancient feet.

When verses consist of three, four, five, six, seven, or eight syllables, and the even syllables are accented, the different measures are all denominated Iambic.

Heroic verse has generally in every line five accented syllables, and ten syllables in the whole; but if the accents be preserved, the number of the syllables is less necessary. There is also a cæsural pause, placed usually either between the second and third, or between the third and fourth accents.

(*b*) Nevertheless fondness of imitation has induced our grammarians to substitute accented for long, and unaccented for short syllables; thus we have English metre measured by the Greek and Latin feet. This practice naturally flowed from reading the classics, in the schools, just as we read English verse, that is by accent.

(*c*) *Spondee* was so called from *σπονδὴ a libation*, its majestic slowness being well adapted to the solemnity of sacrifices. *Pyrrhic* was from *πυῤῥίχη a war-dance* invented by Pyrrhus. *Trochee* from *τρέχω to run*, its rapidity being suited to the dance. *Iambus* was so called from Iambe its inventress. *Dactyl* from *δάκτυλος a finger*, the first bone of which is equal in length to both the others. *Anapæst* from *ἀναπαίω to strike back*, it being the reverse of the Dactyl.

Several other feet are borrowed from the Greeks and Latins, but they are not necessary; the pedantic enumeration of them has justly received from Dr. Kenrick the poetic sarcasm;

> "That all a rhetorician's rules,
> "But teach him how to name his tools."

" Dárk tho' not blínd, | like thée Mæónidés!
" Or Mílton thée; | áh could I réach yóur strain!
" Or hís, who máde | Mæónidés our ówn.
" Mán too he súng: | immórtal mán I' sing;
" Oft búrsts my sóng, | beyónd the bóunds of lífe;
" Whát, nów, | but ímmortálity can pléase?
" O' had he préss'd his théme, | pursúed the tráck,
" Which ópens oút of | dárkness ínto dáy!
" O' had he móunted | ón his wíng of fíre,
" Sóared, where I sínk, | and súng immórtal mán,
" Hów had it blést mankínd? | and réscued mé?"

This species of poetry is termed Iambic, but liberty is allowed of changing the place of some accents for the sake of variety; thus seven out of the eleven lines in the example, have the accent on the first syllable, or begin with a Trochee, or Spondee; and in the second line, it is on the fifth syllable, that is, the third place is a Trochee. Two long syllables may occur in this species of verse to great advantage. The Spondee may be used in any part of the line; this is proved by the fact, that the whole verse may consist of long syllables. A Trochee sounds pleasantly in the first place, and sometimes answers well for the third; but in the second it is intolerable, and rarely pleases in the last. (*d*)

There are Iambic lines of twelve syllables termed the Alexandrine measure.

" His fávour is your lífe, his árm is yóur suppórt;
" His hánd can strétch your dáys, or cút your mínutes shórt."

(*d*) Dr. Watts observes of heroic verse that, " scarce any other place " in the verse besides the first and third, will well endure a Trochee " without endangering the harmony, spoiling the cadence of the verse, " and offending the ear." But in the fourth he thinks, it may have beauty, as when a rugged verse describes a rugged way.

" Rattled the cl[illegible]ring cars, *and* the shock'd axles bound."
Pope.

There are others of fourteen. To this last species the common metre of four lines, is referred, having four accents in the first and third lines, and three in the second and fourth respectively.

Trochaic measure differs from Iambic in this, that the odd numbers of the syllables bear the accents.

Trochaic verse may consist of a Trochee and a long syllable. It usually contains two, three, or four Trochees; but it may consist of five or seven syllables, by receiving an additional long syllable.

"Hére are thóughts of lárger grówth,
"Rípening ínto sólid trúth;
"Frúits refíned, of nóble táste,
"Séraphs féed on súch repást."

Trochaic lines also exist of nine, ten and twelve syllables. These except the last are rarely to be found. The Trochaic measure is chiefly ludicrous, and seldom used in serious poetry.

Dactylic measure rarely occurs; but Anapæstic is found of several species; as of three, six, nine and twelve syllables, to some of which there is sometimes appended a short syllable.

The species of Anapæstic verse which contains three Anapæsts, or occasionally an Iambus and two Anapæsts, is rapid, pleasing, and much used in cheerful or humorous odes.

"Sir I'saac discóver'd it séems,
"The náture of cólours and líght,
"In remárking the trémulous béams,
"That swám on his wándering síght."

Sapphic measure requires eleven syllables, whereof the first, fourth, sixth and tenth are accented. It may therefore be measured by a Dactyl, two Trochees, a Pyrrhic, and Trochee. A Spondee sometimes takes the place

of the first, or of the last Trochee. After three lines, follows an Adonic of five syllables, the first and fourth are accented; and the feet may be deemed a Dactyl and a Trochee. But in ancient poetry, the first three lines contain each a Spondee, a Dactyl, and two Trochees; and the fourth consists of a Dactyl, and Spondee.

" Déath will invâde us, by' the means appóinted,
" A'nd we must âll bów tó the king of térrors,
" Nór am I ânxious, íf I am prepâred,
" Whât shape he cómes in."

The sounds of the vowels, the modulation of them by consonants, and the position of accents belong to the first part of grammar. The practical knowledge of these should be commenced in the cradle, corrected by competent early instructors, preserved from the contaminating familiarity of the gross, improved by conversation with the refined, and tested unremittingly by the works of the most modern and approved lexicographers. As the Greek and Latin orators and poets, derived their knowledge of sounds and quantity, not from rules, but conversation with the learned; so the pronunciation of our language must be chiefly gained by the same means, and tested by the same standard.

THE END.