ably." " I can never think so very mean of him;" " *meanly.*" " He describes this river agreeable to the common reading;" " *agreeably.*" " Agreeable to my promise, I now write:" " *agreeably.*" " Thy exceeding great reward." When united to an adjective, or adverb not ending in *ly*, the word *exceeding* has *ly* added to it: as, " exceedingly dreadful, exceedingly great;" " exceedingly well, exceedingly more active:" but when it is joined to an adverb or adjective, having that termination, the *ly* is omitted: as, " Some men think exceeding clearly, and reason exceeding forcibly:" " She appeared, on this occasion, exceeding lovely." " He acted in this business *bolder* than was expected:" " They behaved the *noblest*, because they were disinterested." They should have been, " *more boldly; most nobly.*"—The adjective pronoun *such* is often misapplied: as, " He was such an extravagant young man, that he spent his whole patrimony in a few years:" it should be, " *so extravagant a young man.*" " I never before saw such large trees:" " *saw trees so large.*" When we refer to the species or nature of a thing, the word *such* is properly applied: as, " Such a temper is seldom found:" but when degree is signified, we use the word *so:* as, " So bad a temper is seldom found."

Adverbs are likewise improperly used as adjectives: as, " The tutor addressed him in terms rather warm, but suitably to his offence;" " *suitable.*" " They were seen wandering about solitarily and distressed;" " *solitary.*" " He lived in a manner agreeably to the dictates of reason and religion;" " *agreeable.*" " The study of syntax should be previously to that of punctuation;" " *previous**."

5. Double comparatives and superlatives should be avoided: such as, " A worser conduct;" " On lesser hopes;" " A more serener temper;" " The most straitest sect;" " A more superior work." They should be, " worse conduct;" " less hopes;" " a more serene temper," " the straitest sect;" " a superior work."

* For the rule to determine whether an adjective or an adverb is to be used, see English Exercises, *Sixteenth*, or any subsequent, edition, page 140

6. Adjectives that have in themselves a superlative signification, do not properly admit of the superlative or comparative form superadded: such as, " Chief, extreme, perfect, right, universal, supreme," &c.; which are sometimes improperly written, " Chiefest, extremest, perfectest, rightest, most universal, most supreme," &c. The following expressions are therefore improper: " He sometimes claims admission to the *chiefest* offices." "The quarrel became *so universal* and national." " A method of attaining the *rightest* and greatest happiness." The phrases, so perfect, so right, so extreme, so universal, &c. are incorrect; because they imply that one thing is less perfect, less extreme, &c. than another, which is not possible.

7. Inaccuracies are often found in the way in which the degrees of comparison are applied and construed. The following are examples of wrong construction in this respect: " This noble nation hath, of all others, admitted fewer corruptions." The word *fewer* is here construed precisely as if it were the superlative. It should be, " This noble nation hath admitted fewer corruptions than any other." We commonly say, " This is the weaker of the two;" or, " The weakest of the two:" but the former is the regular mode of expression, because there are only two things compared. " The vice of covetousness is what enters deepest into the soul of any other." " He celebrates the Church of England as the most perfect of all others." Both these modes of expression are faulty: we should not say, " The best of any man," or, " The best of any other man," for " the best of men." The sentences may be corrected, by substituting the comparative in the room of the superlative. " The vice, &c. is what enters deeper into the soul than any other." " He celebrates, &c. as more perfect than any other." It is also possible to retain the superla-

tive, and render the expression grammatical. "Covetousness, of all vices, enters the deepest into the soul." "He celebrates, &c. as the most perfect of all churches." These sentences contain other errors, against which it is proper to caution the learner. The words *deeper* and *deepest*, being intended for adverbs, should have been *more deeply*, *most deeply*. The phrases *more perfect*, and *most perfect*, are improper; because perfection admits of no degrees of comparison. We may say *nearer* or *nearest* to perfection, or more or less imperfect.

8. In some cases, adjectives should not be separated from their substantives, even by words which modify their meaning, and make but one sense with them: as, "A large enough number surely." It should be, "A number large enough." "The lower sort of people are good enough judges of one not very distant from them."

The adjective is usually placed before its substantive: as, "A *generous* man;" "How *amiable* a woman!" The instances in which it comes after the substantive, are the following.

1st, When something depends upon the adjective; and when it gives a better sound, especially in poetry: as, "A man *generous* to his enemies;" "Feed me with food *convenient* for me;" "A tree three feet *thick*." "A body of troops fifty thousand *strong*;" "The torrent tumbling through rocks *abrupt*."

2d, When the adjective is emphatical: as, "Alexander the *Great*;" "Lewis the *Bold*;" "Goodness *infinite*;" "Wisdom *unsearchable*."

3d, When several adjectives belong to one substantive as, "A man just, wise, and charitable;" "A woman modest, sensible, and virtuous."

4th, When the adjective is preceded by an adverb: as, "A boy regularly studious;" "A girl unaffectedly modest."

5th, When the verb *to be*, in any of its variations, comes between a substantive and an adjective, the adjective may

frequently either precede or follow it: as, "The man is *happy*; or, "*happy* is the man who makes virtue his choice:" "The interview was *delightful*;" or, "*delightful* was the interview."

6th, When the adjective expresses some circumstance of a substantive placed after an active verb: as, "Vanity often renders its possessor *despicable*." In an exclamatory sentence, the adjective generally precedes the substantive; as, "How *despicable* does vanity often render its possessor!"

There is sometimes great beauty, as well as force, in placing the adjective before the verb, and the substantive immediately after it: as, "Great is the Lord! just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints!"

Sometimes the word *all* is emphatically put after a number of particulars comprehended under it. "Ambition, interest, honour, *all* concurred." Sometimes a substantive, which likewise comprehends the preceding particulars, is used in conjunction with this adjective: as, "Royalists, republicans, churchmen, sectaries, courtiers, patriots, *all parties*, concurred in the illusion."

An adjective pronoun, in the plural number, will sometimes properly associate with a singular noun: as, "Our desire, your intention, their resignation." This association applies rather to things of an intellectual nature, than to those which are corporeal. It forms an exception to the general rule.

A substantive with its adjective is reckoned as one compounded word, whence they often take another adjective, and sometimes a third, and so on: as, "An old man; a good old man; a very learned, judicious, good old man."

Though the adjective always relates to a substantive, it is, in many instances, put as if it were absolute; especially where the noun has been mentioned before, or is easily understood, though not expressed: as, "I often survey the green fields, as I am very fond of *green*;" "The wise, the virtuous, the honoured, famed, and great," that is, "persons;" "The twelve," that is, "apostles;" "Have compassion on the *poor*; be feet to the *lame*, and eyes to the *blind*."

Substantives are often used as adjectives. In this case, the word so used is sometimes unconnected with the substantive to which it relates; sometimes connected with it by a hyphen; and sometimes joined to it, so as to make the two words coalesce. The total separation is proper, when either of the two words is long, or when they cannot be fluently pronounced as one word: as, an adjective pronoun, a silver watch, a stone cistern: the hyphen is used, when both the words are short, and are readily pronounced as a single word: as coal-mine, corn-mill, fruit-tree: the words coalesce, when they are readily pronounced together; have a long established association; and are in frequent use: as, honeycomb, gingerbread, inkhorn, Yorkshire.

Sometimes the adjective becomes a substantive, and has another adjective joined to it: as, "The chief good;" "The vast immense of space."

When an adjective has a preposition before it, and the substantive is understood, the words assume the nature of an adverb, and may be considered as an adverbial phrase as, "In general, in particular, in common," &c.; that is, "Generally, particularly, commonly."

Enow was formerly used as the plural of *enough*: but it is now obsolete.

RULE IX.

The article *a* or *an* agrees with nouns in the singular number only, individually or collectively: as, "A christian, an infidel, a score, a thousand."

The definite article *the* may agree with nouns in the singular and plural number: as, "The garden, the houses, the stars."

The articles are often properly omitted: when used, they should be justly applied, according to their distinct nature: as, "Gold is corrupting; the sea is green; a lion is bold."

Exercises, p. 86. Key, p. 49.

It is of the nature of both the articles to determine or limit the thing spoken of. *A* determines it to be one single thing of the kind, leaving it still uncertain which: *the* determines which it is, or, of many, which they are.

The following passage will serve as an example of the different uses of *a* and *the*, and of the force of the substantive without any article. "*Man* was made for society, and ought to extend his good will to all men: but *a man* will naturally entertain a more particular kindness for *the men* with whom he has the most frequent intercourse; and enter into a still closer union with *the man* whose temper and disposition suit best with his own."

As the articles are sometimes misapplied, it may be of some use to exhibit a few instances: "And I persecuted this way unto *the* death." The apostle does not mean any particular sort of death, but death in general: the definite article therefore is improperly used: it ought to be "unto death," without any article.

When he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth;" that is, according to this translation, "into all truth whatsoever, into truth of all kinds;" very different from the meaning of the Evangelist, and from the original, "into all *the* truth;" that is, "into all evangelical truth, all truth necessary for you to know."

"Who breaks a butterfly upon *a* wheel?" it ought to be "*the* wheel," used as an instrument for the particular purpose of torturing criminals. "The Almighty hath given reason to *a* man, to be a light unto him:" it should rather be, "to *man*," in general. "This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is *the* son of Abraham:" it ought to be, "*a* son of Abraham."

These remarks may serve to show the great importance of the proper use of the article, and the excellence of the English language in this respect; which, by means of its two articles, does most precisely determine the extent of signification of common names.

1. A nice distinction of the sense is sometimes made by

the use or omission of the article *a*. If I say; "He behaved with *a* little reverence;" my meaning is positive. If I say, "He behaved with little reverence;" my meaning is negative. And these two are by no means the same, or to be used in the same cases. By the former, I rather praise a person; by the latter, I dispraise him. For the sake of this distinction, which is a very useful one, we may better bear the seeming impropriety of the article *a* before nouns of number. When I say, "There were few men with him;" I speak diminutively, and mean to represent them as inconsiderable: whereas, when I say, "There were *a* few men with him;" I evidently intend to make the most of them.

2. In general, it may be sufficient to prefix the article to the former of two words in the same construction; though the French never fail to repeat it in this case. "There were many hours, both of the night and day, which he could spend, without suspicion, in solitary thought." It might have been "of *the* night and *of the* day." And, for the sake of emphasis, we often repeat the article in a series of epithets. "He hoped that this title would secure him *an* ample and *an* independent authority."

3. In common conversation, and in familiar style, we frequently omit the articles, which might be inserted with propriety in writing, especially in a grave style. "At worst, time might be gained by this expedient." "At *the* worst," would have been better in this place. "Give me here John Baptist's head. There would have been more dignity in saying, "John *the* Baptist's head;" or, "The head of John the Baptist."

The article *the* has sometimes a good effect in distinguishing a person by an epithet. "In the history of Henry the Fourth, by Father Daniel, we are surprised at not finding him *the* great man." "I own I am often surprised that he should have treated so coldly, a man so much *the* gentleman."

This article is often elegantly put, after the manner of the French, for the pronoun possessive: as, "He looks him full in *the* face;" that is, "in *his* face." "In his presence they were to strike *the* forehead on the ground;" that is, "*their foreheads.*"

We sometimes, according to the French manner, repeat the same article, when the adjective, on account of any clause depending upon it, is put after the substantive. "Of all the considerable governments among the Alps, a commonwealth is a constitution, *the* most adapted of any to the poverty of those countries." "With such a specious title as that of blood, which with the multitude is always a claim, *the* strongest, and *the* most easily comprehended." "They are not the men in the nation *the* most difficult to be replaced."

RULE X.

One substantive governs another, signifying a different thing, in the possessive or genitive case: as, "My father's house;" "Man's happiness;" "Virtue's reward."

Exercises, p. 88. Key, p. 51.

When the annexed substantive signifies the same thing as the first, there is no variation of case: as, "George, king of Great Britain, elector of Hanover," &c.; "Pompey contended with Cæsar, the greatest general of his time;" "Religion, the support of adversity, adorns prosperity." Nouns thus circumstanced are said to be *in apposition* to each other. The interposition of a relative and verb will sometimes break the construction: as, "Pompey contended with Cæsar, *who was* the greatest general of his time." Here the word *general* is in the nominative case, governed by note 4, under RULE XI.

The preposition *of* joined to a substantive, is not always equivalent to the possessive case. It is only so, when the expression can be converted into the regular form of the possessive case. We can say, "The reward of virtue" and "Virtue's reward:" but though it is proper to say,

"A crown of gold," we cannot convert the expression into the possessive case, and say, "Gold's crown."

Substantives govern pronouns as well as nouns, in the possessive case: as, "Every tree is known by *its* fruit;" "Goodness brings *its* reward;" "That desk is *mine*."

The genitive *its* is often improperly used for *'tis* or *it is*: as, "Its my book:" instead of "It is my book."

The pronoun *his*, when detached from the noun to which it relates, is to be considered, not as a possessive pronoun, but as the genitive case of the personal pronoun: as, "This composition is *his*." "Whose book is that?" "*His*." If we used the noun itself, we should say, "This composition is John's." "Whose book is that?" "Eliza's." The position will be still more evident, when we consider, that both the pronouns, in the following sentences, must have a similar construction: "Is it *her* or *his* honour that is tarnished?" "It is not *hers*, but *his*."

Sometimes a substantive in the genitive or possessive case stands alone, the latter one by which it is governed being understood: as, "I called at the bookseller's," that is, "at the bookseller's *shop*."

1. When the subject which governs nouns in the possessive case, applies to them *jointly*, the latter only has the sign of the possessive annexed to it: as, "The king and queen's marriage was approved by the nation."—When the subject applies *separately* to them, the sign is affixed to each of them: as, "The parliament's and the king's forces approached each other."—And even when the subject refers *jointly* to the nouns, the sign is often annexed to each, if *several words* come between them: as, "It was my father's and also my brother's house."

2. In poetry, the additional *s* is frequently omitted, but the apostrophe retained, in the same manner as in substantives of the plural number ending in *s*: as, "The wrath of Peleus' son." This is not often allowable in prose; as, "Moses' minister;" "Phinehas' wife;" "Festus came into Felix' room." But in cases which would give too much of the hissing sound, or increase the difficulty of pronunciation, the omission takes place even in prose: as, "For righteousness' sake;" "For conscience' sake."

3. Little explanatory circumstances are particularly awkward between a genitive case, and the word which usually follows it; as, "She began to extol the farmer's, as she called him, excellent understanding." It ought to be, "the excellent understanding of the farmer, as she called him."

4. When a sentence consists of terms signifying a name and an office, or of any expressions by which one part is descriptive or explanatory of the other, it may occasion some doubt to which of them the sign of the genitive case should be annexed; or whether it should be subjoined to them both. Thus, some would say; "I left the parcel at Smith's the bookseller;" others, "at Smith the bookseller's;" The first of these forms is most agreable to the English idiom; and if the addition consist of two or more nouns, the case seems to be less dubious; as, "I left the parcel at Smith's, the bookseller and stationer." But as this subject requires a little further explanation to make it intelligible to the learners, we shall add a few observations tending to unfold its principles.

A phrase in which the words are so connected and dependent, as to admit of no pause before the conclusion, necessarily requires the genitive sign at or near the end of the phrase: as, "Whose prerogative is it? It is the king of Great Britain's;" "That is the duke of Bridgewater's canal;" "The bishop of Landaff's excellent book;" "The lord mayor of London's authority;" "The captain of the guard's house.

When words in apposition follow each other in quick succession, it seems also most agreeable to our idiom, to give the sign of the genitive a similar situation; especially if the noun which governs the genitive be expressed: as, "The emperor Leopold's;" "Dionysius the tyrant's;" "For David

my *servant's* sake;" "Give me John the *Baptist's* head;" "Paul the *apostle's* advice." But when a pause is proper, and the governing noun not expressed; and when the latter part of the sentence is extended; it appears to be requisite that the sign should be applied to the first genitive, and understood to the other: as, "I reside at lord Stormont's, my old patron and benefactor;" "Whose glory did he emulate? He emulated Cæsar's, the greatest general of antiquity." In the following sentences, it would be very awkward to place the sign, either at the end of each of the clauses, or at the end of the latter one alone: "These psalms are David's, the king, priest, and prophet of the Jewish people;" "We staid a month at Lord Lyttleton's, the ornament of his country, and the friend of every virtue." The sign of the genitive case may very properly be understood at the end of these members, an ellipsis at the latter part of sentences being a common construction in our language; as the learner will see by two or three examples: "They wished to submit, but he did not;" that is, "he did not *wish to submit*;" "He said it was their concern, but not his;" that is, "*not his concern*."

If we annex the sign of the genitive to the end of the last clause only, we shall perceive that a resting place is wanted, and that the connecting circumstance is placed too remotely, to be either perspicuous or agreeable: as, "Whose glory did he emulate?" "He emulated Cæsar, the greatest general of *antiquity's*;" "These psalms are David, the king, priest, and prophet of the Jewish *people's*." It is much better to say, "This is *Paul's* advice, the christian hero, and great apostle of the gentiles," than, "This is Paul the christian hero, and great apostle of the *gentiles'* advice." On the other hand, the application of the genitive sign to both or all of the nouns in apposition, would be generally harsh and displeasing, and perhaps in some cases incorrect: as, "The emperor's Leopold's;" "King's George's;" "Charles's the second's;" "The parcel was left at Smith's, the bookseller's and stationer's." The rules which we have endeavoured to elucidate, will prevent the inconvenience of both these modes of expression; and they appear to be simple, perspicuous, and consistent with the idiom of the language.

5. The English genitive has often an unpleasant sound; so that we daily make more use of the participle *of* to express the same relation. There is something awkward in the following sentences, in which this method has not been taken. "The general, in the army's name, published a declaration." "The commons' vote." "The lords' house." "Unless he is very ignorant of the kingdom's condition." It were certainly better to say, "In the name of the army;" "The votes of the commons;" "The house of lords;" "The condition of the kingdom." It is also rather harsh to use two English genitives with the same substantive; as, "Whom he acquainted with the pope's and the king's pleasure." "The pleasure of the pope and the king," would have been better.

We sometimes meet with three substantives dependent on one another, and connected by the preposition *of* applied to each of them: as, "The severity of the distress of the son of the king, touched the nation;" but this mode of expression is not to be recommended. It would be better to say, "The severe distress of the king's son, touched the nation." We have a striking instance of this laborious mode of expression, in the following sentence: "*Of* some *of* the books *of* each *of* these classes *of* literature, a catalogue will be given at the end of the work."

6. In some cases, we use both the genitive termination and the preposition *of*; as, "It is a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton's." Sometimes indeed, unless we throw the sentence into another form, this method is absolutely necessary, in order to distinguish the sense, and to give the idea of property, strictly so called, which is the most important of the relations expressed by the genitive case: for the expressions, "This picture of my friend," and "This picture of my

friend's," suggest very different ideas. The latter only is that of property in the strictest sense. The idea would, doubtless, be conveyed in a better manner, by saying, "This picture belonging to my friend."

When this double genitive, as some grammarians term it, is not necessary to distinguish the sense, and especially in a grave style, it is generally omitted. Except to prevent ambiguity, it seems to be allowable only in cases which suppose the existence of a plurality of subjects of the same kind. In the expressions, "A subject of the emperor's;" "A sentiment of my brother's;" more than one subject, and one sentiment, are supposed to belong to the possessor. But when this plurality is neither intimated, nor necessarily supposed, the double genitive, except as before mentioned, should not be used: as, "This house of the governor is very commodious;" "The crown of the king was stolen;" "That privilege of the scholar was never abused." (See page 56.) But after all that can be said for this double genitive, as it is termed, some grammarians think that it would be better to avoid the use of it altogether, and to give the sentiment another form of expression.

7. When an entire clause of a sentence, beginning with a participle of the present tense, is used as one name, or to express one idea or circumstance, the noun on which it depends may be put in the genitive case; thus, instead of saying, "What is the reason of this person dismissing his servant so hastily?" that is, "What is the reason of this person in dismissing his servant so hastily?" we may say, and perhaps ought to say, "What is the reason of this person's dismissing of his servant so hastily?" Just as we say, "What is the reason of this person's hasty dismission of his servant?" So also, we say, "I remember it being reckoned a great exploit;" or more properly, "I remember its being reckoned," &c. "The following sentence is correct and proper: "Much will depend on the *pupil's composing*, but more on *his reading* frequently." I would not be accurate to say, "Much will depend on the *pupil composing*"

&c. We also properly say, "This will be the effect *of the pupil's composing* frequently;" instead of, "*Of the pupil composing* frequently."

RULE XI.

Active verbs govern the the objective case: as, "Truth ennobles *her*;" "She comforts *me*;" "They support *us*;" "Virtue rewards *her followers*."

Exercises, p. 91. Key, p. 54.

In English, the nominative case, denoting the subject, usually goes before the verb; and the objective case, denoting the object, follows the verb active; and it is the order that determines the case in *nouns;* as, "Alexander conquered the Persians." But the *pronoun* having a proper form for each of those cases, is sometimes, when it is in the objective case, placed before the verb; and, when it is in the nominative case, follows the object and verb; as, "*Whom* ye ignorantly worship, *him* declare I unto you."

This position of the pronoun sometimes occasions its proper case and government to be neglected: as in the following instances: "Who should I esteem more than the wise and good?" "By the character of those who you choose for your friends, your own is likely to be formed." "Those are the persons who he thought true to his interests." "Who should I see the other day but my old friend?" "Whosoever the court favours." In all these places it ought to be *whom*, the relative being governed in the objective case by the verbs "esteem, choose, thought," &c. "He, who under all proper circumstances, has the boldness to speak truth, choose for thy friend;" It should be "*him* who," &c.

Verbs neuter do not act upon, or govern, nouns and pronouns. "He *sleeps;* they *muse*, &c. are not transitive. They are, therefore, not followed by an objective case, specifying the object of an action. But when this case, or an

object of action, comes after such verbs, though it may carry the appearance of being governed by them, it is affected by a preposition or some other word understood: as, "He resided many years (that is, *for* or *during* many years) in that street;" "He rode several miles (that is, *for* or *through* the space of several miles) on that day;" "He lay an hour (that is, *during* an hour) in great torture." In the phrases, "To dream a dream," "To live a virtuous life," "To run a race," "To walk the horse," "To dance the child," the verbs certainly assume a transitive form, and may, in these cases, not improperly, be denominated transitive verbs.

1. Some writers, however, use certain neuter verbs as if they were transitive, putting after them the objective case, agreeably to the French construction of reciprocal verbs; but this custom is so foreign to the idiom of the English tongue, that it ought not to be adopted or imitated. The following are some instances of this practice. "*Repenting* him of his design." "The king soon found reason *to repent* him of his provoking such dangerous enemies." "The popular lords did not fail to *enlarge* themselves on the subject." "The nearer his successes *approached* him to the throne." "Go *flee* thee away into the land of Judah." "I think it by no means a fit and decent thing to *vie* charities," &c. "They have spent their whole time and pains to *agree* the sacred with the profane chronology."

2. Active verbs are sometimes as improperly made neuter; as, "I must *premise* with three circumstances." "Those that think to *ingratiate with* him by caluminiating me."

3. The neuter verb is varied like the active; but, having in some degree the nature of the passive, it admits, in many instances, of the passive form, retaining still the neuter signification, chiefly in such verbs as signify some sort of motion, or change of place or condition: as, "I am come; I was gone; I am grown: I was fallen." The following examples, however, appear to be erroneous, in giving the neuter verbs a passive form, instead of an active one. "The rule of our holy

religion, from which we *are* infinitely *swerved*." "The whole obligation of that law and covenant *was* also *ceased*." "Whose number *was* now *amounted* to three hundred," "This mareschal, upon some discontent, *was entered* into a conspiracy against his master." "At the end of a campaign, when half the men *are deserted* or killed." It should be, "*have* swerved, *had* ceased," &c.

4. The verb *to be*, through all its variations, has the same case after it, as that which next precedes it: "*I* am *he* whom they invited;" "*It* may be (or might have been) *he*, but *it* cannot be (or could not have been) *I*;" "*It* is impossible to be *they*;" "*It* seems to have been *he*, who conducted himself so wisely;" "*It* appeared to be *she* that transacted the business;" "I understood *it* to be *him*;" "I believe *it* to have been *them*;" "We at first took it to be *her*; but were afterward convinced that *it* was not *she*." "He is not the person *who* it seemed he was." "He is really the person *who* he appeared to be." "She is not now the woman *whom* they represented *her* to have been." "*Whom* do you fancy *him* to be?" By these examples, it appears that this substantive verb has no government of case, but serves, in all its forms, as a conductor to the cases; so that the two cases which, in the construction of the sentence, are the *next* before and after it, must always be alike. Perhaps this subject will be more intelligible to the learner, by observing, that the words in the cases preceding and following the verb *to be*, may be said to be *in apposition* to each other. Thus, in the sentence, "I understood it to be him," the words *it* and *him* are in apposition; that is, "they refer to the same thing, and are in the same case."

The following sentences contain deviations from the rule, and exhibit the pronoun in a wrong case: "It might have been *him*, but there is no proof of it; "Though I was blamed, it could not have been *me*;" "I saw one whom I took to be *she*;" "She is the person *who* I understood it to have been:" "*Who* do you think me to be?" "*Whom* do men say that I am?" "And *whom* think ye that I am?"——*See the Octavo Grammar*."

Passive verbs which signify naming, &c. have the same case before and after them: as, "He was called Cæsar, She was named Penelope; Homer is styled the prince of poets; James was created a duke; The general was saluted emperor; The professor was appointed tutor to the prince *."

5. The auxiliary *let* governs the objective case: as, "Let *him* beware;" "Let *us* judge candidly;" "Let *them* not presume," "Let *George* study his lesson."

RULE XII.

One verb governs another that follows it, or depends upon it, in the infinitive mood: as, "Cease *to do* evil; learn *to do* well;" "We should be prepared *to render* an account of our actions."

The preposition *to*, though generally used before the latter verb, is sometimes properly omitted: as, "I heard him say it;" instead of "*to* say it."

Exercises, p. 94. Key, p. 56.

The verbs which have commonly other verbs following them in the infinitive mood, without the sign *to*, are Bid, dare, need, make, see, hear, feel; and also, let, not used as an auxiliary; and perhaps a few others: as, "I bade him do it;" "Ye dare not do it:" "I saw him do it;" "I heard him say it:" "Thou lettest him go."

1. In the following passages, the word *to*, the sign of the infinitive mood, where it is distinguished by Italic characters, is superfluous and improper. "I have observed some satirists *to* use," &c. "To see so many *to* make so little conscience of so great a sin." "It cannot but be a delightful spectacle to God and angels, to see a young person, besieged by powerful temptations on every side, *to* acquit himself gloriously, and resolutely *to* hold out against the most violent assaults; to behold one in the prime and flower of his age, that is courted by pleasures and honours, by the devil, and all the bewitching vanities of the world, *to* reject all these, and *to* cleave steadfastly unto God."

* See the Octavo Grammar, vol. I. p. 271.

2. This mood has also been improperly used in the following places: "I am not like other men, *to* envy the talents I cannot reach." "Grammarians have denied, or at least doubted, them *to be* genuine." "That all our doings may be ordered by thy governance, *to do* always what is righteous in thy sight."

The infinitive is frequently governed by adjectives, substantives, and participles: as, "He is eager to learn;" "She is worthy to be loved;" "They have a desire to improve;" "Endeavouring to persuade."

The infinitive mood has much of the nature of a substantive, expressing the action itself which the verb signifies, as the participle has the nature of an adjective. Thus the infinitive mood does the office of a substantive in different cases: in the nominative; as, "To *play* is pleasant:" in the objective; as, "Boys love to *play*;" "For *to will* is present with me; but *to perform* that which is good, I find not."

The infinitive mood is often made absolute, or used independently on the rest of the sentence, supplying the place of the conjunction *that* with the potential mood: as, "To confess the truth, I was in fault;" "To begin with the first;" "To proceed;" "To conclude;" that is, "That I may confess," &c.

RULE XIII.

In the use of words and phrases which, in point of time, relate to each other, a due regard to that relation should be observed. Instead of saying, "The Lord *hath given*, and the Lord hath taken away;" we should say, "The Lord *gave*, and the Lord *hath taken* away." Instead of, "I *know* the family more than twenty years;" it should be, "I *have known* the family more than twenty years."

Exercises, p. 95. Key, p. 57.

It is not easy to give particular rules, for the management

of the moods and tenses of verbs, with respect to one another, so that they may be proper and consistent. The best rule that can be given, is this very general one, "To observe what the sense necessarily requires." It may, however, be of use to give a few examples of irregular construction. "The last week I intended *to have written*," is a very common phrase; the infinitive being in the past time, as well as the verb which it follows. But it is certainly wrong: for how long soever it now is since I thought of writing, "to write" was then present to me, and must still be considered as present, when I bring back that time, and the thoughts of it. It ought, therefore, to be, "The last week I intended *to write*." The following sentences are also erroneous: "I cannot excuse the remissness of those whose business it should have been, as it certainly was their interest, to *have interposed* their good offices." "There were two circumstances which made it necessary for them to *have lost* no time." "History painters would have found it difficult to *have invented* such a species of beings." They ought to be, "*to interpose, to lose, to invent*." "On the morrow, because he should have known the certainty, wherefore he was accused of the Jews, he loosed him." It ought to be, "because he *would know*," or rather, "*being willing to know*." "The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I *might* receive my sight." "If by any means I *might* attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" "*may*," in both places, would have been better. "From his biblical knowledge, he appears to study the Scriptures with great attention;" "*to have studied*," &c. "I feared that I should have lost it, before I arrived at the city;" "*should lose it*." "I had rather walk;" It should be, "I *would* rather walk." "It would have afforded me no satisfaction, if I could perform it:" it should be, "if I *could have* performed it;" or, "It *would afford* me no satisfaction, if I *could perform* it."

To preserve consistency in the time of verbs, we must recollect that, in the subjunctive mood, the present and imperfect tenses often carry with them a future sense; and that the auxiliaries *should* and *would*, in the imperfect times

are used to express the present and future as well as the past: for which see page 83.

1. It is proper further to observe, that verbs of the infinitive mood in the following form; "to write," "to be writing," and "to be written," always denote something *contemporary with* the time of the governing verb, or *subsequent to it*; but when verbs of that mood are expressed as follows, "To have been writing," "to have written," and "to have been written," they always denote something *antecedent* to the time of the governing verb. This remark is thought to be of importance; for if duly attended to, it will, in most cases, be sufficient to direct us in the relative application of these tenses.

The following sentence is properly and analogically expressed: "I found him better than I expected to find him." "Expected *to have found* him," is irreconcilable alike to grammar and to sense. Indeed, all verbs expressive of hope, desire, intention, or command, must invariably be followed by the present, and not the perfect of the infinitive. Every person would perceive an error in this expression; "It is long since I commanded him *to have done* it:" Yet "expected to *have found*," is no better. It is as clear that the *finding* must be posterior to the expectation, as that the *obedience* must be posterior to the command.

In the sentence which follows, the verb is with propriety put in the perfect tense of the infinitive mood; "It would have afforded me great pleasure, as often as I reflected upon it, *to have been* the messenger of such intelligence." As the message, in this instance, was antecedent to the pleasure, and not contemporary with it, the verb expressive of the message must denote that antecedence, by being in the perfect of the infinitive. If the message and the pleasure had been referred to as contemporary, the subsequent verb would, with equal propriety, have been put in the present of the infinitive: as, "It would have afforded me great pleasure, *to be* the messenger of such intelligence." In the former instance, the phrase in question is equivalent to these

words; "*If I had been* the messenger;" in the latter instance, to this expression; "*Being* the messenger."—For a further discussion of this subject, see the *Twelfth* edition of the Key to the Exercises, p. 60, and the Octavo Grammar, RULE XIII.

It is proper to inform the learner, that, in order to express the past time with the defective verb *ought*, the perfect of the infinitive must always be used: as, "He ought *to have done* it." When we use this verb, this is the only possible way to distinguish the past from the present.

In support of the positions advanced under this rule, we can produce the sentiments of eminent grammarians; amongst whom are Lowth and Campbell. There are, however, some respectable writers, who appear to think, that the governed verb in the infinitive ought to be in the past tense, when the verb which governs it, is in the past time. Though this cannot be admitted, in the instances which are controverted under this rule, or in any instances of a similar nature, yet there can be no doubt that, in many cases, in which the thing referred to preceded the governing verb, it would be proper and allowable. We may say; "From a conversation I once had with him, he *appeared to have studied* Homer with great care and judgment." It would be proper also to say, "From his conversation, he *appears to have studied* Homer with great care and judgment;" "That unhappy man *is supposed to have died* by violence." These examples are not only consistent with our rule, but they confirm and illustrate it. It is the tense of the governing verb only, that marks what is called the absolute time: the tense of the verb governed, marks solely its relative time with respect to the other.

To assert, as some writers do, that verbs in the infinitive mood have no tenses, no relative distinctions of present past, and future, is inconsistent with just grammatical view of the subject. That these verbs associate with verbs in all the tenses, is no proof of their having no peculiar time of their own. Whatever period the governing verb assumes whether present, past, or future, the governed verb in the Infinitive always respects that period, and its time is cal

culated from it. Thus, the time of the infinitive may be before, after, or coincident with, the time of the governing verb, according as the thing signified by the infinitive is supposed to be before, after, or present with, the thing denoted by the governing verb. It is, therefore, with great propriety, that tenses are assigned to verbs of the infinitive mood. The point of time from which they are computed, is of no consequence; since present, past, and future, are completely applicable to them.

We shall conclude our observations under this rule, by remarking, that though it is often proper to use the perfect of the infinitive after the governing verb, yet there are particular cases, in which it would be better to give the expression a different form. Thus, instead of saying, "I wish to have written to him sooner," "I then wished to have written to him sooner," "He will one day wish to have written sooner;" it would be more perspicuous and forcible, as well as more agreeable to the practice of good writers, to say; "I wish that I had written to him sooner," "I then wished that I had written to him sooner," "He will one day wish that he had written sooner." Should the justness of these strictures be admitted, there would still be numerous occasions for the use of the past infinitive; as we may perceive by a few examples. "It would ever afterwards have been a source of pleasure, to have found him wise and virtuous." "To have deferred his repentance longer, would have disqualified him for repenting at all." "They will then see, that to have faithfully performed their duty, would have been their greatest consolation.*"

RULE XIV.

Participles have the same government as the verbs have from which they are derived: as, "I am weary with *hearing him;*" "She is *instructing us;*" "The tutor is *admonishing Charles.*"

Exercises, p. 97. Key, p. 61.

---

* See the Octavo Grammar, pages 275 to 284.

1. Participles are sometimes governed by the article; for the present participle, with the definite article *the* before it, becomes a substantive, and must have the preposition *of* after it: as, "These are the rules of grammar, by the observing of which, you may avoid mistakes." It would not be proper to say, "by the observing which;" nor, "by observing of which;" but the phrase, without either article or preposition, would be right: as, "by observing which." The article *a* or *an*, has the same effect: as, "This was a betraying of the trust reposed in him."

This rule arises from the nature and idiom of our language, and from as plain a principle as any on which it is founded; namely, that a word which has the article before it, and the possessive preposition *of* after it, must be a noun: and, if a noun, it ought to follow the construction of a noun, and not to have the regimen of a verb. It is the participal termination of this sort of words that is apt to deceive us, and make us treat them as if they were of an amphibious species, partly nouns and partly verbs.

The following are a few examples of the violation of this rule. "He was sent to prepare the way by preaching of repentance;" it ought to be, "by *the* preaching of repentance;" or, "by preaching repentance." "By the continual mortifying our corrupt affections;" it should be, "by the continual mortifying *of*," or, "by continually mortifying our corrupt affections." "They laid out themselves towards *the* advancing and promoting the good of it;" "towards advancing and promoting the good." "It is *an* overvaluing ourselves, to reduce every thing to the narrow measure of our capacities;" "it is overvaluing ourselves," or, *an* overvaluing *of* ourselves." "Keeping of one day in seven," &c. it ought to be, "*the* keeping *of* one day;" or, "keeping one day."

A phrase in which the article precedes the present participle, and the possessive preposition follows it, will not, in every instance, convey the same meaning, as would be conveyed, by the participle without the article and preposition. "He expressed the pleasure he had in the hearing of the philosopher," is capable of a different sense from, "He expressed the pleasure he had in hearing the philosopher." When, therefore, we wish, for the sake of harmony or variety, to substitute one of these phraseologies for the other, we should previously consider whether they are perfectly similar in the sentiments they convey.

2. The same observations which have been made respecting the effect of the article and participle, appear to be applicable to the pronoun and participle, when they are similarly associated: as, "Much depends on *their observing of* the rule, and error will be the consequence of *their neglecting of* it," instead of "*their observing* the rule, and *their neglecting* it." We shall perceive this more clearly, if we substitute a noun for the pronoun: as, "Much depends upon *Tyro's observing of* the rule," &c. But, as this construction sounds rather harshly, it would, in general, be better to express the sentiment in the following, or some other form: "Much depends on the *rule's being observed;* and error will be the consequence of *its being neglected;*" or—"on observing the rule; and—of neglecting it." This remark may be applied to several other modes of expression to be found in this work; which, though they are contended for as strictly correct, are not always the most eligible, on account of their unpleasant sound. See pages 56, 77, 171—175.

We sometimes meet with expressions like the following: "*In forming of* his sentences, he was very exact:" "*From calling of* names, he proceeded to blows." But this is incorrect language; for prepositions do not, like articles and pronouns, convert the participle itself into the nature of a substantive; as we have shown above, in the phrase, "By observing which." And yet the participle, with its adjuncts, may be considered as a substantive phrase in the objective case, governed by the preposition or verb, expressed or understood: as, "By *promising much, and performing but little*, we become despicable." "He studied to avoid *expressing himself too severely.*"

3. As the perfect participle and the imperfect tense are sometimes different in their form, care must be taken that they be not indiscriminately used. It is frequently said, "He begun," for "he began;" "he run," for "he ran;" "He drunk," for "he drank;" the participle being here used instead of the imperfect tense: and much more frequently the imperfect tense instead of the participle: as, "I had wrote," for "I had written:" "I was chose," for "I was chosen:" "I have eat," for, "I have eaten." "His words were interwove with sighs;" "were *interwoven*." "He would have spoke;" "*spoken*." "He hath bore witness to his faithful servants;" "*borne*." "By this means he overrun his guide;" "*overran*." "The sun has rose;" "*risen*." "His constitution has been greatly shook, but his mind is too strong to be shook by such causes;" "*shaken*" in both places. "They were verses wrote on glass;" "*written*." "Philosophers have often mistook the source of true happiness:" it ought to be "*mistaken*."

The participle ending in *ed* is often improperly contracted by changing *ed* into *t*; as, "In good behaviour, he is not *surpast* by any pupil of the school." "She was much distrest." They ought to be "*surpassed*," "*distressed*."

RULE XV.

Adverbs, though they have no government of case, tense, etc. require an appropriate situation in the sentence, viz. for the most part, before adjectives, after verbs active or neuter, and frequently between the auxiliary and the verb: as, "He made a *very sensible* discourse; he *spoke unaffectedly* and *forcibly*; and *was attentively heard* by the whole assembly."

Exercises, p. 100. Key, p. 66.

A few instances of erroneous positions of adverbs, may serve to illustrate the rule. "He must not expect to find study agreeable always;" "*always* agreeable." "We always find them ready when we want them;" "we find them *always* ready, &c. "Dissertations on the prophecies which have remarkably been fulfilled;" "which have been *remarkably*." "Instead of looking contemptuously down on the crooked in mind or in body, we should look up thankfully to God, who hath made us better;" "instead of looking down *contemptuously*, &c. we should *thankfully look up*," &c. "If thou art blessed naturally with a good memory, continually exercise it;" "*naturally blessed*," &c. "exercise it *continually*."

Sometimes the adverb is placed with propriety before the verb, or at some distance after it; sometimes between the two auxiliaries; and sometimes after them both; as in the following examples. "Vice *always* creeps by degrees, and *insensibly* twines around us those concealed fetters, by which we are at last *completely* bound." "He encouraged the English barons to carry their opposition *farther*." "They compelled him to declare that he would abjure the realm *for ever*;" instead of, "to carry farther their opposition;" and "to abjure for ever the realm." "He has *generally* been reckoned an honest man." "The book may *always* be had at such a place;" are preferable to "has been generally;" and "may be always." "These rules will be *clearly* understood, after they have been *diligently* studied," in preference to, "These rules will *clearly* be understood, after they have *diligently* been studied."

From the preceding remarks and examples, it appears that no exact and determinate rule can be given for the placing of adverbs, on all occasions. The general rule may be of considerable use; but the easy flow and perspicuity of the phrase, are the things which ought to be chiefly regarded.

The adverb *there* is often used as an expletive, or as a word that adds nothing to the sense; in which case it precedes the verb and the nominative noun: as, "There is a person at the door;" "There are some thieves in the house;" which would be as well, or better, expressed by saying, "A person is at the door;" "Some thieves are in the house." Sometimes, it is made use of to give a small degree of emphasis to the sentence: as, "*There* was a man sent from