La Trobe University

THE BORCHARDT LIBRARY

Presented by

PROFESSOR STEWART FRASER
"Antisthenes being asked, what learning was most necessary for man's life, replied, "To unlearn that which is naught."

Bacon's Apothems.

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

Locke.

NEW-HAVEN:
Printed by Oliver Steele & Co.
FOR BRISBAN & BRANNAN, BOOKSELLERS, NEW-YORK.
1807.
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, to wit:

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

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

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

H. W. EDWARDS,
Clerk of the District of Connecticut.

March 12, 1807,
PREFACE.

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

The "Diversions of Purley" first caught my attention in the year 1787. Not willing to rest my belief on the authorities cited by Mr. Tooke, I entered upon an investigation of his principles, for the purpose of obtaining full evidence of their
correctness; and my inquiries, while they have detected some errors in his work, have resulted in full persuasion of mind, or rather in absolute certainty, that his general theory is well founded. It is now an ascertained and a received fact, that the indeclinable words, in our language, (and probably in all others) are derived from declinable words, and were primitively significant, as verbs, nouns, adjectives or participles. Many of them may yet be traced to their roots, and their significations ascertained; and their present meanings, faithful to the original ideas, expressed by their radicals, cannot be defined, without resorting to the sense of the primitive words.

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

* Since the days of Wallis, who published a Grammar of the English Language, in Latin, in the reign of Charles II. from which Johnson and Lowth borrowed most of their rules, little improvement has been made in English Grammar. Lowth supplied some valuable criticisms, most of which however respect obsolete phrases; but many of his criticisms are extremely erroneous, and they have had an
In examining this subject with attention, I soon found it difficult, or rather impracticable, to exhibit the true state of the language, without altering some of the usual names, and the present distribution of the parts of speech. These names and this distribution have the sanction of antiquity; some of the classes of words still bearing the names assigned to them in the days of Aristotle; and I am no stranger to the power of custom. But in the sciences prescription cannot legalize error; and I fully accord with the sentiment in my motto, that the most necessary learning is, "to unlearn that which is naught." From a minute and careful survey of this subject in all its bearings, I am firmly persuaded that, with the present classification of English words, under the usual names, the true construction of sentences, with the force and effect of the words composing them, cannot be explained, so as to be clearly understood by a student. That the language has not hitherto been understood, so as to be grammatically explained, will probably appear evident to the readers of this work. Even the origin and uses of the two little words, an and the, have escaped the inquisitive researches of Grammarians; ill effect, in perverting the true idioms of our language. Priestley furnished a number of new and useful observations on the peculiar phrases of the English Language. To which may be added some good remarks of Blair and Campbell, interspersed with many errors. Murray, not having mounted to the original sources of information, and professing only to select and arrange the rules and criticisms of preceding writers, has furnished little or nothing new. Of the numerous compilations of inferior character, it may be affirmed, that they have added nothing to the stock of grammatical knowledge.
so that, at the very threshold of our rudiments, we stumble upon most palpable error.

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

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

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

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

*An*, the Latin *unus*, the Greek *en*, the Celtic *con*, *nuana* or *yunan*, are derived by Whiter from the element *an* or *en*, denoting *being*; the root of the Hebrew *an*, *I*, the Latin *ens*, being, and of the participial terminations in *amans*, *itens*—P. 475.
sentences and adjectives, as well as of nouns. The term does not comprehend the words arranged under it. I have therefore used, in lieu of it, substitute, a term which describes the use of the words of this class, and comprehends the whole number, whether the particular words stand for nouns, adjectives or sentences.

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

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

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

I have therefore given to this class of words the appellation of modifiers, a word well formed like magnifier, and happily expressive of their use, which is to modify the sense of verbs and
attributes. No word perhaps in any language could be equally well adapted to its use.

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

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

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

In the confusion which has proceeded from an ignorance of the real origin of the English particles, and the construction of sentences, words have been called by wrong names, and arranged in classes to which they have no relation. The substitutes, *as and that*, have been called *conjunctions*, altho they have no more connecting power, than *who or which*. They are not conjunctions in any legitimate English sentence; and
by classing them with conjunctions, verbs often occur, which are left without a nominative.

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

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

If it should be objected that a change of the names of the parts of speech, will create a difficulty in the learning of other languages, let it be
observed that some differences exist between different languages, which cannot be obviated; and it is not expedient to force an agreement between things, which nature or art has made dissimilar. The better way is, to explain every language just as it is, and frame a grammar of each language upon its own idioms.

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

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

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

_Darwin's Zoon, Sect. 39._
A PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL

GRAMMAR.

Of Language.

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

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

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

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

Of Grammar.

Grammar, as a science, treats of the natural connection between ideas, and words which are the signs of ideas, and develops the principles which are common to all languages. These principles are not arbitrary, nor subject to change, but fixed and permanent; being founded on facts and distinctions established by nature. Thus the distinction between the sexes; between things and their qualities; between the names of substances and of their actions or
motions; between unity and plurality; between the present, past and future time, and some other distinctions are founded in nature, and give rise to different species of words, and to various inflections in all languages.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Syntax explains the true mode of constructing sentences.

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

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

CLASSIFICATION OF WORDS.

Words are naturally divided into two Classes, primary and secondary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

5th. Words which join together the parts of a sentence
or of discourse, in a regular construction. These are called connectives or conjunctions.

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

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

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

II. Verbs which express affirmation, action or being.

The second class contains five species.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Names or Nouns.

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

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

On the other hand, Thomas, John, William, are proper or appropriate names, each denoting an individual of which there is no species or kind. London, Paris, Amsterdam, Rhine, Po, Danube, Massachusetts, Hudson, Patomac, are also proper names, being appropriate to individual things. Proper names however become common when they comprehend two or more individuals; as, the Capets, the Smiths, the Fletchers....

Two Roberts there the pagan force defy'd."

Hook's Tasso, b. 20.

Limitation of Names.

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

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

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

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

"Far in th' horizon to the north appeared.”  Milton.
"Sits on th' horizon round a settled gloom.”  Thompson.

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

**RULE I.**

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

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

Here man comprehends the whole species.

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

* “And thys eares warun of gelegen IX eorlas and an cyning.”
And this year were slain nine earls and one king.—Saxon Chron. p. 82.
er propensity than man to the perfect discharge of parental duties."—Life of Cowper.

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

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

"The men were overwhelmed by the waves, and absorb- ed by the eddies. Horses, baggage and dead bodies, were seen floating together."

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

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

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

"There are fishes that have wings, and are not strangers to the airy regions."—Locke, b. 3. ch. 6.12. If the rule is just, that fishes is to be "taken in its widest sense," then all fishes have wings!

"When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies"—What! all armies! "There shall be signs in the sun"—What! all signs?

"Nation shall rise against nation"—What! every nation? How the rule vanishes before the test!

**RULE II.**

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

"He bore him in the thickest troop, As doth a lion in a herd of neat."—Shakspeare.

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

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

NOTE.

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


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

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

"A is styled the indefinite article; it is used in a vague sense to point out one single thing of the kind, in other respects indeterminate." Murray. Gram. p. 29.

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

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

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

The history of this word is briefly this. An and one are the same word—as, the Saxon or English orthography, and one a corruption.
When the sense of words is sufficiently certain, by the construction, the definitive may be omitted, as "Duty to your majesty, and regard for the preservation of ourselves and our posterity, require us to entreat your royal attention."

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

Of the French un or une. The Greek en, the Latin unus, that is, unus with the usual ending of adjectives, and the Saxon an or one, are mere dialectical differences of orthography, as are the German ein, and the Dutch een. Before the conquest, an was used in computation or numbering—an, two, three—one, two, three, &c.; and the a was used before consonants, as well as before vowels—"As him said hya an"—But to him said one of them—Alfred Osseius, Lib. 6. 30. "An eyning"—one king—Sax. Chron. p. 82. This word was also varied to express case and gender, like the Latin unus.

"And thus ymb one month"—And within this one month—Sax. Chron. 82. "The on than anum scipe weron"—Who were in that one ship.—ibid. 98. An therefore is the original English adjective or ordinal number one; and was never written a until after the conquest.

The conquest, with other innovations, introduced into books the French un, une, from the Latin unus; the French being the only court language for three or four centuries. But the English an was retained in popular usage; and both words, or rather both orthographies, maintained their ground—but the meaning of both is precisely the same. The only differences between the words are these—an is no longer used in arithmetic or as an ordinal number—the its only signification is unity—not can we use an as a substitute, without a noun, as we do, ant—John is one of them. But altho an cannot, in these applications, be used for one, the latter can always be used for an.

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

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

In the German, Dutch and French, this word is called an article also, but the article and the ordinal number are not distinguished in
The definitive *a* is used before plural names, preceded by *few* or *many*—as *a few days, a great many persons.* It is also used before any collective word, as, *a dozen, a hundred,* even when such words are attached to plural nouns; as, *a hundred years.*

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

"*Full many a gem of purest ray serene.*"  
*Gray.

"*Where many a rosebud bears its blushing head.*"  
*Beattie.*

**RULE III.**

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

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

**RULE IV.**

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

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

*The origin of this use of *a* before *many* is to be sought in the primitive character of *many,* which was a noun in the Gothic and Saxon, synonymous with *multitude. A many* was therefore correct. Its use as an attribute is secondary or derivative; but this use carries with it the definitive *a,* in anomalous phrases.
"The almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden."—"Or ever the silver cord shall be loosed—or the golden bowl be broken," &c. Ecclesiastes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"These swell their prospects and exalt their pride." Rape of the Lock.

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

In addresses and exclamations, the definitive may be, and usually is, omitted—as "Sink down, ye mountains, and ye valleys rise"—"Be smooth, ye rocks; ye rapid floods, give way." Pope Mex.

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

**NOTE 3** The definitive the is used before an attribute, which is selected from others belonging to the same object; as "The very frame of spirit proper for being diverted with the laughable in objects, is so different from that which is necessary for philosophizing on them." Campbell Rhet. I. 2.
The definitive *the* has been classed with *a*, as an article or part of speech, distinct from *this* and *that*, but evidently without good reason. If we attend to the uses of these words, we shall find very little difference between *the* and *this* or *that*. The Saxon definite article *se* is no longer used, but it was also used for the pronoun *he*. The Saxon *the* was our present relative *which*—and the Saxon *tha*, *these*, *that*, *thy*, were used indifferently for the article *the* or a substitute, *he* or *who*—and *the*, in modern English, has the sense of *that* or *this*, as in the phrases, "this sinks the deeper, or rises the higher"—for in the Saxon, *the* was a pronoun, in such phrases; *the bet, co melius, the better—the swithor, the more, that is, that better, that more*. From examining Saxon authors, it appears evident that *the* was originally a pronoun or substitute—and it retains the sense of *that* in most cases. But as *one* has in modern times, gained a use which *an* has not, so *that* and *this*, (the before names they have the sense of *the*, for *the man you saw and that man you saw, are of the same import) are often used as substitutes and for emphasis in cases where *the* cannot be employed. *The* and *that* are the Hebrew intensive particle *at*, which the Greeks formed into *to* and *tauto*, and which the Saxons expressed by *se, so, the, them, tha, thy*, and *that*. In German *the* and *that* are the same—*der, die, das*, in the three genders. In the Celtic also, the article *an* signifies *the* and *that*—nor is there the shadow of a reason for considering the article as a distinct part of speech, either in our own language, or in any other with which I am acquainted. In the Saxon *se, that and them* are classed together, inflected together, and called by the learned Hickes the *article or pronoun demonstrative*.

**Number.**

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

**Rule 1.** When the terminating letter of a name will admit the sound of *s* to coalesce with the name or the last syll-
lable of it, s only is added to form the plural; as sea, seas; hand, hands; pen, pens; grape, grapes; vale, vales; vow, vows.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>life</th>
<th>lives</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>selves</th>
<th>sheaf</th>
<th>sheaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knife</td>
<td>knives</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>halves</td>
<td>shelf</td>
<td>shelves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>wives</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>beeves</td>
<td>wolf</td>
<td>wolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaf</td>
<td>leaves</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>stays</td>
<td>wharf</td>
<td>wharves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calf</td>
<td>calves</td>
<td>loaf</td>
<td>loaves</td>
<td>thief</td>
<td>thieves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change of y into ies to form the plural number, may seem to a foreigner an odd irregularity; but the cause is very obvious. Formerly the singular number of this class of words, ended with is, as, glory, vanity, energy, and the addition of s made the plural, glorys. But whether from caprice, negligence, or a desire to simplify the orthography, the termination ies was laid aside for y in the singular number, while the old plural ies was retained. A strange inconsistency, but by no means the only one which the pro­gress of our language exhibits.
Class 2. The second class consists of words which are used in both numbers, with plurals irregularly formed; as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>hypothesis</td>
<td>hypotheses</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>brothers or brethren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>penny</td>
<td>pennies or pence</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>dies or dice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tooth</td>
<td>teeth</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>focuses or focus</td>
<td>ox</td>
<td>oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>radiuses or radii</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ox</td>
<td>oxen</td>
<td>index</td>
<td>indexes or indices</td>
<td>louse</td>
<td>lice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goose</td>
<td>geese</td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>radiuses or radii</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beau</td>
<td>beaux</td>
<td>calx</td>
<td>calxes or calces</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>emphases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antithesis</td>
<td>antitheses</td>
<td>hypothesis</td>
<td>hypotheses</td>
<td>pennies</td>
<td>pence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

"Vesiculated corallines are found adhering to rocks, shells and sponges." Encyc. art. Corallines.

"Many fetuses are deficient at the extremities." Dar. Zoon. Sect. 1. 3. 9.

* Women, is one of the grossest errors in our language. The true original plural is winnen.
"Five hundred denariuses." Baker's Livy, 4. 491.

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

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


In authorities equally respectable, we find stamens, strata, funguses; and in pursuance of the principle, we may expect to see laminae for lamina; lamels for lamellæ; baryte, for barytes; pyrite for pyrites; strontite for strontiates; stactite, or as the original would rather indicate, stactity, and the plural stactites. These reforms are necessary to enable us to distinguish the singular from the plural number.

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

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

"We are to blame for eating these fish." Anarcharsis 6. 272.
"The fish reposed in seas and crystal floods,
The beasts retired in covert of the woods."

_Cannon, shot and sail are used in a plural sense, as_ One hundred _cannon were landed from the fleet._

_Burchett Naval Hist._ 732.

"Several _shot_ being fired" _Ibm._ 455.

"Several _sail of ships_" _Ibm._ 426.

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

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

We observe this practice in the Saxon Chronicle. "He _heold_ that Archbiscop-rice _18 year._"—p. 59. He held that archbishop-ric _eighteen year._ In that work, _winter_ is used in the same manner; _forty-one winter—p._ 41. Yet _year_ and _winter_ had, in the Saxon, plural terminations.


_Here we see the origin of our _pound._ Originally it was merely _weight—four thousand of gold by weight._ From denoting weight generally, _pomdo_ became the term for a certain division or quantity; retaining however its signification of unity, and becoming an indeclinable in Latin._

_Twenty pound_ then, in strictness, is twenty divisions _by weight;_ or as we say, with a like abbreviation, _twenty weight._ These abbreviations are the wings of Mercury.

_The words horse, foot and infantry, comprehending bo—_
Dieds of soldiers, are used as plural nouns and followed by verbs in the plural. Cavalry is sometimes used in like manner.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annals</th>
<th>drawers</th>
<th>lees</th>
<th>customs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>archives</td>
<td>downs</td>
<td>lungs</td>
<td>shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashes</td>
<td>dregs</td>
<td>matins</td>
<td>scissors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assets</td>
<td>embers</td>
<td>mallows</td>
<td>shambles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betters</td>
<td>entrails</td>
<td>orgies</td>
<td>todings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>fetters</td>
<td>nippers</td>
<td>tongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compasses</td>
<td>filings</td>
<td>pinners or</td>
<td>thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothes</td>
<td>goods</td>
<td>pinchers</td>
<td>vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calends</td>
<td>hatches</td>
<td>pleiads</td>
<td>vituls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breeches</td>
<td>icles</td>
<td>snuffers</td>
<td>victuels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amends</th>
<th>wages</th>
<th>conics</th>
<th>economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aims</td>
<td>billiards</td>
<td>catoptrics</td>
<td>mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bellows</td>
<td>fives</td>
<td>dieoptrics</td>
<td>mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallows</td>
<td>sessions</td>
<td>acoustics</td>
<td>hydraulics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odds</td>
<td>measles</td>
<td>pneumatics</td>
<td>hydrostatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>hysteries</td>
<td>statics</td>
<td>analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pains</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>statistics</td>
<td>politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news</td>
<td>ethics</td>
<td>spherics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riches</td>
<td>optics</td>
<td>tactics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Originally *wage, and really singular.
PRACTICAL GRAMMAR.

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

AUTHORITIES.

With every odd thy prowess I defy. Hoole Tas. 6. 19. 40.
Where the odds is considerable. Camp. Rhet. ch. 5.
The wages of sin is death. Bible.
Much pains has been taken. Enfield Hist. Phil. ch. 2.
Let a gallows be made of fifty cubits high. Bible.
Here he erected a fort and a gallows. Lusiad 1. 134.
The riches we had in England was the slow result of long industry and wisdom, and is to be regained, &c. Davenant. 2. 12.
Politics is the art of producing individual good by general measures. Beddoes' Hygeia. 2. 79.
Politics contains two parts. Locke, vol. 2. 408.
Locke however uses a plural verb with ethics. "The ideas that ethics are conversant about."—B. 4. 12. 8.
Pains, when preceded by much, should always have a singular verb.
Means is so generally used in either number, every means, all means, this means, and these means, that authorities in support of the usage are deemed superfluous.
Gender.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Actress</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Countess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abbot</td>
<td>abbess</td>
<td>deacon</td>
<td>deaconess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adulterer</td>
<td>adultress</td>
<td>duke</td>
<td>duchess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baron</td>
<td>baroness</td>
<td>ambassador</td>
<td>embassadress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefactor</td>
<td>benefactress</td>
<td>emperor</td>
<td>empress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor</td>
<td>governess</td>
<td>tiger</td>
<td>tigress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hero</td>
<td>heroine</td>
<td>songster</td>
<td>songstress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heir</td>
<td>heiress</td>
<td>seamster</td>
<td>seamstress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer</td>
<td>peeress</td>
<td>viscount</td>
<td>viscountess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest</td>
<td>priestess</td>
<td>jew</td>
<td>jewess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet</td>
<td>poëtess</td>
<td>lion</td>
<td>lioness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince</td>
<td>princess</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>mistress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prophet</td>
<td>prophetess</td>
<td>marquis</td>
<td>marchioness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shepherd</td>
<td>shepherdess</td>
<td>patron</td>
<td>patroness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorcerer</td>
<td>sorceress</td>
<td>protector</td>
<td>protectress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>tutoress</td>
<td>executor</td>
<td>executrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor</td>
<td>instructress</td>
<td>testator</td>
<td>testatrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traitor</td>
<td>traitress</td>
<td>elector</td>
<td>electress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This ending, ess, is the Hebrew ess, a female, as or and er are contradictions of vir and wer, a man.
2. In many instances, animals, with which we have most frequent occasions to be conversant, have different words to express the different sexes; as man and woman; brother and sister; uncle and aunt; son and daughter; boy and girl; father and mother; horse and mare; bull and cow.

Man however is a general term for the whole race of mankind; so also, horse comprehends the whole species.

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

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

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

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

* The termination or in Latin, is a contraction of vir, a man; as br or in English is of wer, the same word in Saxon. But in common understanding, the idea of gender is hardly attached to these terminations; for we add er to words to denote an agent, without life, as grater, heater.
and the attribute of imparting, take the masculine gender; those which are remarkable for the more mild and delicate qualities, for beauty and the attribute of producing, become feminine; the sun darts his scorching rays; the moon sheds her paler light.

"Indus or Ganges rolling his broad wave." Akenside.

"There does the soul Consent her soaring fancy to restrain." ibm.

"Now morn her rosy steps in th' eastern clime Advancing—" Milton P. L. b. 5.

"The north east spends his rage." Thompson.

Case.

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

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

When words end in es or ss, the apostrophe is added without s; as on eagles' wings; for righteousness' sake.
Substitutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Unless you was ill." *Boswell’s Life of J. E.* 68.

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

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

"When you was here comforting me." *Pope Let.*

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

"Why was you glad!" *Boswell’s Life of Johnson.* These
He represents the name of a male, and she, that of a female, who is the subject of discourse, but not directly addressed. These are called the third person.

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Plu.</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Plu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>thou</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>thee</td>
<td>you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

"Where was you standing during the transaction?"

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

"Was you acquainted with the defendant at College?" Mr. Dexter. Ibom. p. 60.

"Was you there when the pistol was fired?" Mr. Gore. Ibom. 65.

"Was you in the Office?" Att. Gen. ibom. 68.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Sing.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Plu.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom.</strong></td>
<td>- you</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj.</strong></td>
<td>- you</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom.</strong></td>
<td>- he</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj.</strong></td>
<td>- him*</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom.</strong></td>
<td>- she</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj.</strong></td>
<td>- her</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sing.</strong></td>
<td>- it</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plu.</strong></td>
<td>- it</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom.</strong></td>
<td>- who</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj.</strong></td>
<td>- whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

† That *mine, thine, his, hers, yours, and theirs,* do not constitute a possessive case, is demonstrable: for they are constantly used as the nominatives to verbs and as the objectives after verbs and prepositions, as in the following passages. "Whether it could perform its operations of thinking and memory out of a body organized as ours is."—Locke, b. 2. 27. "In referring our ideas to those of other men, called by the same name, ours may be false."—ibid. ch. 32. 9 and 10.

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

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

"The reason is, that his subject is generally things; theirs, on the contrary, is persons." Camp. Ethic. b. 1. ch. 10.
"Yours of the 26th Oct. I have received, as I have always done yours, with no little satisfaction." — Wycherley to Pope.

"Therefore leave your forests of beards for ours of brutes, called men." — Ibm.

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

"Your letter of the 29th of this month, like the rest of yours—tells me with so much more wit, sense and kindness than mine can express," &c. — Ibm.

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

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

"My sword and yours are kin." — Shakespeare.

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

Should it be said that a noun is understood; I reply, this cannot be true, in regard to the grammatical construction; for supply the noun for which the word is a substitute, and the substitute is dissolved into an attribute of correspondent sense. "Yours of the 26th of October," becomes your letter—"he endeavored to precipitate ours," becomes our ruin. This shows that the words are real substitutes, like others, where it stands for other men or things. Besides, in three passages just quoted, the word yours is joined by a connective to a name in the same case; "to ensure yours and their immortality." "The easiest part of yours and of my design." "My sword and yours are kin." Will any person pretend that the connective here joins different cases?

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

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

* This case does not compare with that of names. We say a "soldier of the king's"—or a soldier of the king's soldiers—but we cannot say, "an acquaintance of your acquaintance."
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In the use of substitutes, it is to be remarked, that I, thou, you, ye and we are generally employed, without an antecedent name. When I, and the name of the person are both employed, as they are in formal writings, oaths and the like, the substitute precedes the name; as "I, Richard Roe, of Boston." In similar language, you and we also precede the name; as "You, John Doe, of New-York." "We, Richard Roe and John Doe, of Philadelphia."

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

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

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

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

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

Since the foregoing note was written, I find this substitute in the Celtic—the oldest language in Europe—In the Galic or Erse, the nominative is co, cita, ciod—pronounced ko or qua—his, kind—qui, qux, quod. It is certain also that this word is the Greek article ο, pronounced with an aspirate. It had its origin in the Hebrew eua. This word furnishes an additional reason for classing the articles and pronouns together: for what in one language is called an article, in another is called a pronoun.
Whoever is often employed as the nominative to two verbs; as "Whoever expects to find in the scriptures a specific direction for every moral doubt that arises, looks for more than he will meet with." Paley, Phil. ch. 4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*It.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Avert what? All that is expressed in the four preceding lines, for all which, *it* is a substitute.
"And how could he do this so effectually, as by performing works, which it utterly exceeded all the strength and ability of men to accomplish." *Porteus. Lect. 5.*

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

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

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

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

There is a sentence in Locke, in which the inceptive, it, is omitted "Whereby comes to pass, that, as long as any uneasiness remains in the mind. *B. 2. ch. 21.* In strictness, this is not a defective sentence, for that may be con-
sidered as the nominative to comes. Whereby that comes to pass which follows. Or the whole subsequent sentence may be considered as the nominative—for all that comes to pass. But the use of the inceptive it is so fully established as the true idiom of the language, that its omission is not to be vindicated.

This and that, these and those.

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

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

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

Pope.

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

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

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

Hooce’s Tasso, b. 20.
"Nor less the rest, the intrepid chief retain'd;  
These urged by threats, and those by force constrain'd."  

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

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

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

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

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

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

This remark, like a considerable part of our grammar rules, is a  
proof that men can easily *imagine* reasons to explain what they do  
not understand. On recurring to ancient writers, it appears that  
the converse of Murray's observation is the truth—that *who* and  
*which* as relatives have, in our language, intruded upon the province  
of the and *that.* In the Saxon, *who* was rarely or never used as a  
relative after an antecedent, but always in the sense of the Latin  
quisquis, or aliquis, whoever or any one; as "*gif hwa eow with­  
stente*"—"if any one shall oppose you"—"*gif hwa this to breketh*  
"*if* (who) any one or whoever breaketh this." *Sax. Ch. 1. 36.*  

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

The Teutonic *that* is the same as the Greek *tauton, taute, tautes,*  
which is of the masculine gender in all cases except the nominative.  
The radical of these words is probably the Hebrew *at,* denoting  
*that* or the *very thing.*
Another very common use of *this* and *that*, is, to represent a sentence or part of a sentence; as

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

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

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

The following sentence will exhibit the true use of *that* as a substitute—"He recited his former calamities; to which was now to be added *that* he was the destroyer of the man who had expiated him. *Beloe’s Herodotus*, Clio. 45.

According to our present grammars, *that* is a conjunction; if so, the preceding verb *was*, has no nominative word. But the sense is, "to which was to be added *that*" which is related in the following words.
The use and importance of this substitute are more clearly manifest, when it denotes purpose or effect; as in this passage "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene." Matt. 2. 23. Here that is equivalent to that purpose or effect.---He came and dwelt in Nazareth, for the purpose expressed in what follows. It and which represent the last clause of the sentence—"He shall be called a Nazarene." The excellence and utility of substitutes and abbreviations are strikingly illustrated by this use of that.

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

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

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

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

"Let me also tell you that, that faith, which proceeds from insufficient or bad principles, is but little better than infidelity." In this passage, the first that is a substitute for the whole subsequent part of the sentence; the second
that is an attribute agreeing with faith—"That faith which proceeds from bad principles is little better than infidelity—let me tell you that." Hence it might be well always to separate the two words by a comma. We now distinguish these words by a stronger emphasis on the last.

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

From these passages and the explanation, we learn that that is a substitute—either for a single word or a sentence; nor has it any other character, except when an attribute. This is much less frequently a substitute for sentences than that; but is used in this character, as well as in that of an attribute; as "Let no prince measure the danger of discontents by this, whether they be just or unjust; for that were to imagin people to be reasonable, who do often spurn at their own good; nor yet by this, whether the griefs whereupon they rise be in fact great or small.

Bacon on Kingdoms.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*ibm.* Chap. 3.

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

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

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

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

What.

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

*Secondly—What* stands for any indefinite idea, as "He cares not *what* he says or does." "*We shall the better know what to undertake.*" *Locke* on *Und.* 1. 6.
Thirdly—What is an attribute, either in the singular or plural number, and denotes something uncertain or indeterminate; as "In what character, Butler was admitted into that lady's service, is unknown."

Johnson's Life of Butler.

"It is not material what names are assigned to them." Camp. Rhet. 1. 1.

"I know not what impressions time may have made upon your person." Life of Comp. Let. 27.

"To see what are the causes of wrong judgment." Locke. 2. 21.

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

"What time the sun withdrew his cheerful light,
And sought the sable caverns of the night." Hoole's Tasso. b. 7.

That is, at the time when or in which.

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

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

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

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

1. As is a nominative; as “We have been accustomed to repose on its veracity with such hume confidence or suppresses curiosity.” Johnson. Life of Cowley.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"From whence might contest spring and mutual rage,
As would the camp in civil broils engage."
Hoole's Tusso. 6. 5.

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

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

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

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

"On his return to Egypt, as I learned from the same authority, he levied a mighty army."
Beloe's Herod. Uterpe.

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

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

Here as is the substitute for, be called prepositive, and is the nominative to may [be called.] They may be called prepositive, which all substantives may be called. At the beginning of the sentence, as is equivalent to that or which—the phrase being an abbreviation.—To explain that which respects the three orders, &c.
"Order and distribution are the life of despatch, so as the
distribution be not too subtil."

Bacon of Despatch.

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

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

4. As is often a substitute for an adjective or an attribute.
"Short as was this proposition of our reasonable demands,
and apparent as it must have been, that we could not re-
cede from it, it was not accepted."

Here as represents the attributes short and apparent, in a manner similar to the
use of which for innocent in a passage before cited—Short, which was—apparent, which it must have been—This is the
precise original signification of as.

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

In a like sense, these words precede the infinitive mode
or radical verb—"Have every thing in readiness; so as to
march at a moment's warning."* The sense is, in that manner or condition that—or to that effect—to march at a moment's warning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the phrase, "if *so be,*" *so* is the nominative to *be*; "*if* *that be,*" Mat. 18. 16. Hosea 8. 1.

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

"And he was astonished at the draught of fishes—and *so* was also James and John." Luke 5. 10. Here *so* is a substitute for *astonished*. It is needless to multiply examples. Any person of observation may, as he reads, find and apply
the definition of so and as. However deflected from the primitive sense these words may appear to be, a close inspection will enable us to discover, in all cases, a near alliance of their signification to the definitive use here explained.

"The tenth part of her riches, whoever pleases may ascertain, and they will not be found so great as has been represented." Belot's Herodotus. Euterpe. 155.

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

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

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

*In the Gothic and Saxon, the pronoun and the adverb were written differently—the pronoun in Gothic was so or sa—and the adverb, swa—in Saxon, the adverb was written in the same manner, and the pronoun se masculine, and so feminine. These words, in the Saxon grammars of Hickes and Lye, are given as the masculine and feminine genders of the article that. In the German, as in English, they are now blended in orthography. It is probable that they all sprung from one radical word, for in these Saxon words, swa, wislice swa—the adverbiaal orthography is given, yet the English is whose or whoever—or literally, so who so—he who that—quires, in which Latin word, the pronoun is also repeated.
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or to the full effect. We now use likewise, for the same purpose, and in origin and effect, this word differs little from also.

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

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

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

Both.

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

"Abraham took sheep and oxen, and gave them unto Abimelech, and both of them made a covenant." Genesis 21. 27.

Here both is the representative of Abraham and Abimelech.

"If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Matt. 15. 14.

"A certain creditor had two debtors—and when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both." Luke 7.

"He will not bear the loss of his rank, because he can bear the loss of his estate; but he will bear both, because he is prepared for both." Being on Exile.
In the last example, *both* represents the parts of the sentence in Italic.

When it represents two attributes, it may and usually does precede them; as "He endeavored to render commerce *both* disadvantageous and infamous." *Mickle*, p. 159.

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

"It is *both* more accurate, and proves no inconsiderable aid to the right understanding of things, to discriminate by different signs such as are truly different." *Campbell's Rhet.* 1. 33.

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

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

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

**Same.**

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

In this ill constructed sentence, [for in opposition to Lowth's opinion, I consider Harris as a most inelegant writer] *same* has reference to all which is predicated of the
future tense—that is, *that it is an object of intellect only,* since we can find no place for its existence anywhere else—The same, all this, is true of the past also.

"For brave and generous ever are the same."  
*Lusiad.* 1.

**Many, few, all, any.**

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

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

"The victor's laurel, as the martyr's crown, The first I hope, nor less the last I prize."  
*Hook's Tasso.* 6. 8.

"The last shall be first, and the first last."  
*Math.* 20. 16.

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

Here both represents the two clauses of the sentence, preceded by that—both of those propositions are surprising. First and last stand in the place of the same clauses.
"Sublimity and vehemence are often confounded, the latter being considered as a species of the former.

Camp. Rhet. 1. 1.

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

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

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

To what antecedent words or clauses, do all these substitutes refer? In the one—and the other what? Doubtless, the antecedents must be the two parts of the sentences, beginning with, by explaining and by proving. That is, in explaining an unknown doctrine, his aim is instruction—in proving a doubted point, his aim is conviction. The predominant quality of the former—former what?
tionably the same sentences are the antecedents to the former and latter. These words cannot refer to information and conviction; for although perspicuity may be predicated of information, yet it cannot be a predominant quality of it; and argument cannot be predicated of conviction. But the whole passage is perplexed and obscure.*

"Leonis refused to go thither with less than the appointed equipment." *Mickle, 1. 181.* Here less supplies the place of equipment, and prevents the necessity of its repetition.

"To the relief of these, Noronha sent some supplies, but while he was preparing to send more, an order from Portugal arrived." *Mickle, 1. 180.*

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

"And the children of Israel did so, and gathered some, more, some less." *Exod. 16. 17.*

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

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

"Was not this love indeed? We men say more, swear more, but indeed Our shews are more than will." *Shakes. Twelfth Night.*

*Such.*

"Jubal was the father of such as dwell in tents." *Gen. 4.*

"Thou shalt provide able men, such as fear God." *Ex. 18.*

*This criticism is the more necessary, as the use of former and latter in our best writers, is indulged to a fault. There are few places in which it is not better to repeat the antecedents than to use them. The injudicious use of these and other substitutes is a great blemish in Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric.*
"Objects of importance must be portrayed by objects of importance; such as have grace, by things graceful."

Camp. Rhet. 1. 2.

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

Self and own.

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

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

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

† In this compound, we have a strong confirmation of what I have alleged respecting the arrangement of you in the singular number, when used of a single person. Self is invariably in the singular—selves in the plural. Now if you is to be classed with plurals in all cases, we must, to be consistent, apply yourselves to a single person. Yet we make the proper distinction—yourself is applied to one person—yourselves to more. But upon the principle of our grammars, that you must always be joined to a verb in the plural, we are under the necessity of saying "You yourself were," when we address a single person—which is false construction. Whatever verb therefore is used with you when applied to an individual, must be considered as a verb in the singular number.
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of one expressed. "He went himself to the minister," carries with it a direct negation that another person went. In negative sentences, it has a different effect. "He did not write the letter himself," implies strongly that he wrote it by an agent, or had an agency in procuring it to be written.

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

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

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

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

"This is an invention of his own."

One, other, another, none.

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

*Another* has sometimes a possessive case; as "the horse is another's," but this form of speech is but little used. *Another* is the Saxon *an*, one, and *other*—*one other*. It is an attribute; but often used as a substitute. "Let *another* praise thee and not thine own mouth." Prov. 27. 2.

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

The cardinal numbers are all used as substitutes, when the things to which they refer are understood by the train
of discourse, and no ambiguity is created by the omission of the name; as "The rest of the people also cast lots, to bring one of ten to dwell in Jerusalem." Nech. 11. 1.

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

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

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

Several.

Several is an attribute, denoting originally one thing severed from others. But this sense seems to be now confined to technical law language; as a "joint and several estate." In common use, it is always plural expressive of an indefinite number, not very large. It is frequently a substitute; as "Several of my unknown correspondents." Spectator. 281.
Some.

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

Each, every, either, neither.

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

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

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

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

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

*Each* is often applied to two only, but its original sense in the Celtic and Saxon, and its present sense is *every one of any number individually considered.* "What or how much each man had that was resident in England." Saxon Chron. 189.
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Either and or denote an alternative; as "I will take either road at your pleasure." That is, I will take one road or the other. In this use, either is an attribute.

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

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

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

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

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

* As in English or is a mere contraction of other; so in Latin, aut is a contraction of alter; and what is equally observable, both are the same word, or from the same radical. Alter, with the a broad, and suppressed, is the Saxon other or outher,
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NOTE....Or, either, nor, and neither are here explained in their true original character; but when they stand for sentences, it is more natural to consider them as connectives, under which head I have arranged them.

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

Hereby, thereby and whereby.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The imperfect degree is formed by adding ish to an attribute; as yellow, yellowish. If the attribute ends in e, this vowel is omitted; as white, whitish.
The comparative degree is formed by adding r to attributes ending with e; as wise, wiser—and by adding er to words ending with a consonant; as cold, colder—or by prefixing more or less; as more just, less noble.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is equally worthy of our notice, that the English language has preserved a few words, in which the qualifiers are annexed to the end of the attribute; as fore-most, hind-most, upper-most, under-most, neither-most, ut-most, utter-most, northern-most, southern-most, eastern-most, western-most.

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

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

These modifying words must have been coeval with the original language, which was the parent of the Greek and Latin, and all the Teutonic dialects; for we see *more or mo* in the Latin *major*, and the French *mais*; and we see *more and most* in the Saxon *mere* and *most*; the German *mehr, meist*, the Dutch *meer* and *meest*.

The Germans and Dutch also use these words to form the comparative and superlative attributes; as gross, grosser, greatest—*ryk, ryper, rykest, rich, richer, richest*.

*More* and the ancient *mo*, are supposed to be derived from the Hebrew *mae*, to dilate or extend. The word *more* is found in all the Celtic and Teutonic dialects. In the Celtic it had the sense of *great*, and was united to names to augment their signification, as in the Irish *fionnhar*, abounding with *winc—fionnhalach, arro-gance*;
A few attributes have different words or irregular terminations for expressing the degrees of comparison: as good, better, best; bad, evil, worse, worst; fore, former, first; little, less or lesser, least; much, more, most; near, nearer, nearest or next; old, older, eldest or eldest; late, later, latest or last.

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

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

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

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

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

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

grance; and probably from continued use, in this manner, it came to express comparison. Most, in the Icelandic, signifies greatest: mikel, meir, mest, great, greater, greatest. Better and best are from the Celtic mat, good: m and b being convertible.
Either is an alternative, as is or, which is now considered merely as a connective.

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

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

Verbs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Own is a corruption of aegenne, or agen, from the Saxon verb again, to possess.
† The common distribution into active, neuter and passive, is very objectionable. Many of our neuter verbs imply action in a pre-eminent degree, as to run, to walk, to fly; and the young learner cannot easily conceive why such verbs are not called active.
1st. A **transitive** verb denotes action or energy, which is exerted upon some object, or in producing some effect. In natural construction, the word expressing the object, follows the verb, without the intervention of any other word, though the order may be sometimes varied. Thus "ridicule provokes anger," is a complete proposition—*ridicule* is the agent or nominative word, which causes the action—*provoke* is the verb, or affirmation of an act—*anger* is the object or effect produced, following the transitive verb *provoke*.

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

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

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

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

To correspond with their nominatives, verbs are used in both numbers, and with the three persons in each. As action and being may be mentioned as present, past and future, verbs have modifications to express time, which are called tenses. And as action and being may be represented in various ways, verbs have various modifications to answer these purposes, called modes or moods. Hence to verbs belong person, number, tense and mode.
The persons, which have been already explained, are, I, thou or you, he, she, it, in the singular number; in the plural, we, ye or you, they. The numbers have been before explained.

**Tenses.**

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

**Present tense, indefinite.**

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

**Present tense, definite.**

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

**Past tense, indefinite.**

This form of the past tense represents action which took place at a given time past, however distant and completely past; as "In six days, *God created* the heavens and the
earth." “Alexander conquered the Persians.” “Scipio was as virtuous as brave.” “The Earl of Chatham was an eloquent statesman.”

*Past tense, definite [imperfect.]*

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

*Perfect tense, indefinite.*

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

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

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

Prior-past tense, indefinite* [pluperfect.]

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

Prior-past, definite.

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

Future tense, indefinite.

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

Future tense, definite.

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

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

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

Prior-future, definite.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Iliad. 5.

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

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

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

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

We have another mode of expression, which does not strictly and positively foretell an action, yet it implies a necessity of performing an act, and clearly indicates that it will take place. For example, "I have to pay a sum of money to-morrow." That is, I am under a present necessity or obligation to do a future act.
The substantive verb followed by a radical verb, forms another idiomatic expression of future time; as "John is to command a regiment." "Eneas went in search of the seat of an empire which was, one day, to command the world." The latter expression is a future past—that is, past as to the narrator; but future as to the event, at the time specified.

Modes.

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

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

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

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

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

*The general use of to for forming the infinitive mode, is of modern date. The Saxons had a distinct termination for the Infinitive verbs; as gisan, to give. But to in Greek had a use nearly similar to its modern use in English.
negatively, as you are not in health. This form is called the Indicative Mode—the declarative would be more appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The other species of verbal or participle is formed from the verb, by adding *d* or *ed*, and in regular verbs, it corresponds exactly with the past time; as *loved, proceeded*. This may be called the verbal of the perfect tense.
This verbal, when its verb is *transitive*, may be joined with the verb *be*, in all its inflections, to form a passive verb, and the verbal, in such combination, is called *passive*. But

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

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

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

**Auxiliars.**

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

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

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

---

*The primitive idea expressed by *may* was power; Sax. *mogan* to be able.*
Can, which is from the same radical as ken and con, to see and know, has now the sense of to be able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That is, as thou lovest plays.

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

Have is also a principal and transitive verb, denoting to possess; but much used as an auxiliar; as "He has lately
been to Hamburg." It is often used to supply the place of a principal verb or verbal, preventing a repetition of it, and the object after it; as "I have not seen Paris, but my brother has"—that is, has seen Paris.

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

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

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

### Conjugation of the Auxiliars.

**MAY.**

**Present Tense.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st. Person, I</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Person, Thou</td>
<td>mayst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thou may</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You may</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mas. He</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut. It</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Past Tense.

I might n
Thou mightest n
You might n
He might n

We might n
Ye might n
You might n
They might n

CAN.

Present Tense.

I can n
Thou canst n
You can n
He can n

We can n
Ye can n
You can n
They can n

Past Tense.

I could n
Thou couldst n
You could n
He could n

We could n
Ye could n
You could n
They could n

SHALL.

Present Tense.

I shall n
Thou shalt n
You shall n
He shall n

We shall n
Ye shall n
You shall n
They shall n

Past Tense.

I should n
Thou shouldst n
You should n
He should n

We should n
Ye should n
You should n
They should n
A PHILOSOPHICAL AND

WILL.

Present Tense.

I will n We will n
Thou wilt n Ye will n
You will n You will n
He will n They will n

Past Tense.

I would n We would n
Thou wouldst n Ye would n
You would n You would n
He would n They would n

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

MUST.

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

Present Tense.

I must n love We must n love
Thou must n love Ye must n love
You must n love You must n love
He must n love They must n love.

Perfect Tense.

I must n have loved We must n have loved
Thou must n have loved Ye must n have loved
You must n have loved You must n have loved
He must n have loved They must n have loved.
DO.

Indicative or Declarative Mode.

Present Tense.

I do not love We do not love
Thou dost not love Ye do not love
You do not love. You do not love
He does or doth not love. They do not love.

Past Tense.

I did not love We did not love
Thou didst not love Ye did not love
You did not love You did not love
He did not love They did not love.

Radical Verb. Verbals or Participles.

To do. Doing, done; having done.

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

HAVE.

Radical Verb, or Infinitive Mode, Present Tense.

To have.

Perfect Tense.

To have had.

Verbal, or Participle of the Present Tense.

Having.

Of the Perfect Tense.

Had.

Compound.

Having had.
A PHILOSOPHICAL AND

Declarative or Indicative Mode.

Present Tense.

| I have n  | We have n |
| Thou hast n  | Ye have n |
| You have n  | You have n |
| He has or hath n  | They have n |

Past Tense.

| I had n  | We had n |
| Thou hadst n  | Ye had n |
| You had n  | You had n |
| He had n  | They had n |

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

Perfect Tense.

| I have n had  | We have n had |
| Thou hast n had  | Ye have n had |
| You have n had  | You have n had |
| He has or hath n had  | They have n had |

Prior-past Tense.

| I had n had  | We had n had |
| Thou hadst n had  | Ye had n had |
| You had n had  | You had n had |
| He had n had  | They had n had |

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

Future Tense.

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

* Hath is used in the solemn style; has in the familiar.
The following form foretells:

I shall have
Thou wilt have
You will have
He will have.

We shall have
Ye will have
You will have
They will have.

The following form promises, commands or determines.

I will have
Thou shalt have
You shall have
He shall have.

We will have
Ye shall have
You shall have
They shall have.

Prior-Future.

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

I shall have had
Thou shalt or wilt have had
You shall or will have had
He shall or will have had.

We shall have had
Ye shall or will have had
You shall or will have had
They shall or will have had.

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

Imperative Mode.

Sing.
Have n or have thou n
Have you n or do n you have
Let me n have
Let him n have

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

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

**Potential Mode.**

Present Tense.

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

- I may or can n have
- Thou mayest or canst n have
- You may or can n have
- He may or can n have
- We may or can n have
- Ye may or can n have
- You may or can n have
- They may or can n have

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

Past Tense.

In this tense, the verb is principal or auxiliary.

- I might n have
- I should n have
- I could n have
- I would n have
- We might n have
- We should n have
- We could n have
- We would n have
- Ye might n have
- Ye should n have
- Ye could n have
- Ye would n have
You might not have
You should not have
You could not have
You would not have
He might not have
He should not have
He could not have
He would not have

Perfect Tense.

In this tense, have is a principal verb only.

I may not have had
Thou mayest not have had
You may not have had
He may not have had
We may not have had
Ye may not have had
You may not have had
They may not have had

Prior-past Tense—the principal verb only.

I might not have had
Thou mightest not have had
You might not have had
He might not have had
We

In the same manner with should, could and would.

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

Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

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

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

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

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

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

**Be.**

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

Radical Verb, or Infinitive, Present Tense.

*To be.*

Perfect Tense.

*To have been.*
A PHILOSOPHICAL, AND
Verbal of the Present Tense.

Being.

Of the Perfect.

Been.

Compound.

Having been.

Declarative or Indicative Mode.

Present Tense.

I am

We are

Thou art

Ye are

You are

He is

She is

It is

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

I be

We be

You be

Ye or you be

They be

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

Past Tense.

I was

We were

Thou wast

Ye were

You were or were

They were

He was

She was

It was

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

Perfect Tense.

I have n been  
Thou hast n been 
You have n been 
He hath or has n been  
We have n been  
Ye have n been  
You have n been  
They have n been

Prior-past Tense.

I had n been  
Thou hadst n been  
You had n been  
He had n been  
We had n been  
Ye had n been  
You had n been  
They had n been

Future Tense.

I shall or will n be  
Thou shalt or wilt n be  
You shall or will n be  
He shall or will n be  
We shall or will n be  
Ye shall or will n be  
You shall or will n be  
They shall or will n be

Prior-future Tense.

I shall n have been  
Thou shalt or wilt n have been  
You shall or will n have been  
He shall or will n have been  
We shall n have been  
Ye shall or will n have been  
You shall or will n have been  
They shall or will n have been

Imperative Mode.

Command 
Exhortation 
Entreaty 

Be n ; be thou n ; do n thou be , or do n be : 
be ye n ; do n you be , or do you n be ; or do n be.

Let me n be , let him n be , let us n be , let them n be.
Potential Mode.

I may or can n be
Thou mayest or canst n be
You may or can n be
He may or can n be

We may or can n be
Ye may or can n be
You may or can n be
They may or can n be

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

Past Tense.

I might n be
Thou mightest n be
You might n be
He might n be

We might n be
Ye might n be
You might n be
They might n be.

In the same manner with could, should and would.

Perfect Tense.

I may or can n have been
Thou mayest or canst n have been
You may or can n have been
He may or can n have been

We may or can n have been
Ye may or can n have been
You may or can n have been
They may or can n have been.

Prior-past Tense.

I might n have been
Thou mightest n have been
You might n have been
He might n have been

We might n have been
Ye might n have been
You might n have been
They might n have been.

In the same manner with could, would and should. There is no future tense in this mode.
Conditional or Subjunctive Mode.

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

Present Tense.

If I am
Thou art
You are
He is
We are
Ye are
You are
They are.

Past Tense.

If I was
Thou wast
You was or were
He was
We were
Ye were
You were
They were

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

If I be
Thou be
You be
He be
We be
Ye be
You be
They be.

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

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

If I were
Thou wert
You was or were
He were
We were
Ye were
You were
They were.
"If I were," supposes I am not; "if I were not," supposes I am.*

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

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

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

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