

# “Universal Grammar”

*from The Encyclopaedia Britannica, First edition, 1771.*

*(based on the commemorative edition reprinted by Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.)*

## “OF GRAMMAR”

**Grammar is the art of speaking or of writing any language with propriety.**

Grammar considered as an “Art,” necessarily supposes the previous existence of language; and as its design is to teach any language to those who are ignorant of it, it must be adapted to the genius of that particular language of which it treats. -- A just method of grammar therefore, supposing a language introduced by custom, without attempting any alterations in it, furnishes certain observations called rules, to which the methods of speaking used in this language may be reduced; this collection of rules is what is called a grammar of any particular language. For the greater distinctness with regard to these rules, grammarians have usually divided this subject into four distinct heads, “viz.” Orthography, or “the art of combining letters into syllables, and syllables into words;” Etymology, or “the art of deducing one word from another and the various modifications by which the sense of any one word can be diversified;” Syntax, or “what relates to the construction or due disposition of the words of a language into sentences or phrases;” and Prosody, or that which treats of “the quantities and accents of syllables, and the art of making verses.

But grammar considered as a “Science,” views language in itself: neglecting particular modifications, or the analogy which WORDS may bear to EACH OTHER, it examines the analogy and relation between WORDS and THINGS;” distinguishes between those particulars which are “essential” to language, and those which are only “accidental;” and thus furnishes a certain standard by which different languages may be compared, and their several excellencies or defects pointed out. This is what is called Philosophic or Universal Grammar.

### “Of Universal Grammar”

It is not necessary here to inquire how language was originally invented, to trace the various changes it may have undergone, or to examine whether any one language may be considered as the original from which all others have been derived: it is sufficient for our purpose to observe, that all mankind, however diversified in other respects, agree in the common use of language; from which it appears, that language is not merely accidental and arbitrary, but founded in the nature of things, and within the reach of all mankind. It is therefore an object worthy of a philosophic inquiry to discover the foundations upon which this universal fabric has been raised. The design of speech is to publish to others the thoughts and perceptions of our mind. The most acute feelings of man, as well as of every other animal, are expressed by simple inarticulate sounds, which, as a mere sensitive being, man partakes in common with the other animals. But as man is not only endowed with sensation, but with the faculty of reasoning, simple inarticulate sounds are insufficient for expressing all the various modifications of thought, or for communicating to others a chain of argumentation: it was therefore necessary to call in the aid of “articulation;” which by modifying these simple sounds, and by fixing a particular meaning to these modifications, forms the language peculiar to man, and which distinguishes him from all other animals, and enables him to communicate with facility all that diversity of ideas with which his mind is stored. These sounds, thus modified and having a determinate meaning, are called Words; and as all language is composed of significant words variously combined, a knowledge of them is necessarily previous to our acquiring an adequate idea of language.

But, as it is by words that we express the various ideas which occur to the mind, it is necessary to examine how ideas themselves are suggested, before we can ascertain the various classes into which words may be distributed. With this in view, therefore, let us suppose a reasonable being, devoid of every prepossession whatever, placed upon this globe. His attention would, in the first place, be directed to the various objects which he saw existing around him: these he would naturally endeavour to distinguish from one another, and give them names, by means of which the idea of them might be recalled when the objects themselves were absent. This is one copious source of words, and forms a natural class which must be common to every language; and which is distinguished by the name of Noun. And as these nouns are the names of the several substances which exist, they have likewise been called Substantives.

It would likewise be early discovered, that every one of these substances were endowed with certain qualities or attributes, to express which another class of words would be requisite. Thus, "to be weighty," is a quality of matter; "to think," is an attribute of man. Therefore, in every language, words have been invented to express the various qualities of the several objects which exist. These may all be comprehended under the general denomination of *Attributives*.

These two classes of words must comprehend all things that exist: for whatever exists, must of necessity be either a substance, or the attribute of some substance; and hence these two classes must comprehend all those words which are significant of themselves, and may be called *Words Significant of Themselves*. If any other words occur, they can only be significant in so far as they tend to explain or connect the words of the two former classes.

But, although these words form the basis or matter of a language, in the same manner as stones form the matter of a building; yet, as stones cannot be arranged into a regular structure without a cement to bind and connect them, so these original words stand in need of others to connect them, before they can be made to express all the variety of our ideas. Another order of words, therefore, were necessary, which, although not of themselves significant, yet, when joined with others, might acquire a meaning. These form a second general class of words that may be called *Words Not of Themselves Significant*, and which cannot acquire any meaning but so far as they serve either to Explain or Connect the others. Hence, therefore, all words which can possibly be invented, may be divided into two general classes; those that are *Significant of Themselves*, and those that are *Not*. Words which are significant of themselves, are either expressive of the names of substances, and therefore called *Substantives*; or, of qualities, which we call *Attributives*. Words which are not significant of themselves, must acquire a meaning either as defining or connecting others, which we shall arrange under the two classes of *definitives* and *connectives*, each of which shall be examined in their order.

## CHAPTER I: Of SUBSTANTIVES

Substantives may be divided into two classes, "viz." those which are primary, commonly called nouns; and those of a secondary order, which are often substituted for nouns, and are hence called *Pronouns*: each of which we shall consider separately.

### Section I. Of Substantives of the First Order called Nouns

Nouns are "all those words by which objects or substances are denominated, and which distinguish them from one another, by names applicable to each, without marking either quantity, quality, action, or relation." And as all the objects which exist must be either in the same state that they were produced by "nature," or changed from their original state by "art," or "abstracted from substances by the powers of imagination," this naturally suggests a division of nouns into *Natural*, as "man," "vegetable," "tree," &c.; *Artificial*, as "house," "ship," "watch," &c.; or *Abstract*, as "whiteness," "temperance," &c.

But the diversity of objects being so great as to render it impossible for any person to know the distinct names of every individual, therefore it has been found expedient to arrange them under certain general classes, the names of which may be more easily acquired, so that by referring any unknown object to the class to which it belongs, we in some measure supply the want of proper names. Hence, therefore, each of the above species of nouns are divided into those which denote genera, species, and individuals. Thus, in natural substances, “animal,” “vegetable,” and “fossil,” denote genera; “man,” “dog,” “tree,” “metal,” are species; and “Alexander,” “Caesar,” “oak,” “gold,” are individuals. In artificial substances, “edifice” is a genus; “house,” “tower,” “church,” are species; and the “Vatican,” and “Herriot’s hospital,” are individuals. In “abstract” substances, “motion” is a genus; “flight” and “course,” are species; “the flight of Mahomet,” “the course of a greyhound,” are individuals. Each of these general classes might be subdivided into many smaller; but as these lesser divisions can only relate to the particular genius of different languages, it does not fall within our plan to consider them. We therefore proceed to take notice of the accidents which accompany nouns. Of which kind may be reckoned “number” and “gender.”

As nouns are the names of substances, and as there may be many substances of the same kind, therefore nouns must be adapted to express whether there is one or more of those objects which we speak. Nouns, therefore, in every language, admit of certain variation to denote this circumstance, which is called “number.” Thus, in the English language, when we speak of a single place of habitation, we call it a “house;” but if of more, we call them “houses.” In the first of these cases the noun is said to be in the “singular,” and in the last case, the “plural” number: nor does the English, or any other language except the Greek, admit of any other variation but these two: and although the Greek language admits of a particular variation of the noun called the “dual” number, which is a plural limited to two objects; yet this cannot be considered as universal to language; and it is perhaps questionable whether this variation ought to be considered as an elegance or a defect in that language.

But although number be a natural accident of nouns, it can only be considered as essential to those which denote genera or species, as it does not descend to individuals. Thus we say, “animal,” or “animals,” “vegetables,” and “fossils;” as also, “man,” or “men,” “dogs,” “trees,” &c. But we only say, “Xenophon,” “Caesar,” “Rucephalus,” &c. in the singular. Nor do these admit of a plural, excepting when we consider any proper name, as a general appellative under which many others are arranged, when it is no longer the name of an individual, but that of a species, and as such admits of a plural; as the “Alexanders,” the “Ptolemies,” the “Howards,” the “Pelhams,” the “Montagues,” &c. The reason of all which will be obvious, if we consider, that every genus may be found whole and entire in each of its “species;” for “man,” “horse,” and “dog,” are each of them an entire and complete “animal”: and every species may be found whole and entire in each of its individuals; for “Socrates,” “Plato,” and “Xenophon,” are each of them completely and entirely a “man.” Hence it is, that every “genus,” though ONE is multiplied into MANY; and every “species,” though ONE, is also multiplied into MANY, “by reference to those beings which are their subordinates.” But as “no individual has any such subordinates,” it can never in strictness be considered as MANY, and so is truly an INDIVIDUAL as well in “nature” as in “name,” and therefore cannot admit of number.

Besides number, another accident of nouns is “gender,” the nature of which may be thus explained: As nouns are the names of the various objects in nature; and as the distinctions of sex is perceptible among all those objects which are animated; and as those which are inanimate cannot admit of any sex at all; therefore all the beings which can become the objects of our speculation, may be considered as either “males,” or “females,” or such as admit of “no” sex, and therefore may be said to be neuter, or of “neither” sex. Hence, therefore, grammarians have made a threefold distinction of noun, into “masculine genders,” or those which denote “males;” “feminine,” or those which denote “females;” and “neuters,” which denote those substances that admit of no sex. But, although the origin of genders is thus so clear and obvious; yet every language that we know of, except the English, deviates from the order of nature, and often attri-

butes sex to those substances which are totally incapable of any; nay, some languages are so particularly defective in this respect, as to class every object inanimate as well as animate under either the “masculine” or “feminine genders,” as they admit of no gender for those that are of neither sex. This is the case with French, Italian, and Spanish. But the English, strictly following the order of nature, puts every noun which denotes a male animal, and no others, in the “masculine” gender; every name of a female animal, in the “feminine;” and every animal whose sex is not obvious, or known, as well as every inanimate object whatever, in the “neuter” gender. Nor does this rule admit of any exceptions; although poets take the liberty of personifying any objects they think proper, and endow them with whatever sex suits their purpose best; which serves admirably to distinguish between the cool language of philosophy, and the enthusiasm of poetry.

Although “Cases” are not necessary accidents of nouns; yet as they have been often considered as such, it will perhaps be deemed proper to take some notice of them. -- As natural objects remain the same, although viewed from many different points of view, they are not in their own nature altered, although they may be connected with others in many different ways: their names therefore ought to remain unchanged, although their relations to other words may be varied. However, there are certain circumstances in which nouns may be considered with respect to their relation “to,” and connection “with” other words, which occur more frequently than others. Some languages, (particularly the Greek and Latin) express some of these circumstances, by a variation of the original noun, which variations are called CASES. But the English, and almost all the modern languages of Europe, have followed the order of nature, and allow the noun to remain the same, expressing its relation and connection with other words by the help of distinct words called prepositions. -- Which of these methods is best, it is not our present purpose to inquire.

It has been supposed the English nouns admit of one variation which answers to the genitive case of the Latins. -- Thus the word “Alexander” is an English noun in its proper form, and in that case which Latin would be called the “Nominative.” The variation which they called the “Genitive” Case, is expressed in English by adding the preposition “OF” before the noun; thus “OF Alexander.” But the same meaning may be conveyed by the word “Alexander’s;” for the meaning is the same if I say the house “of Alexander;” or “Alexander’s house.” This, therefore, has been called a true inflection of the original noun. However, although this opinion has been adopted by all grammarians, it appears to have been adopted without sufficient examination, as will be evident from the following considerations.

There are certain circumstances in which this supposed genitive cannot be substituted instead of the other: for I may say, I speak “OF Alexander,” I write “OF Caesar,” I think “OF Pompey;” but I cannot say, I speak “Alexander’s,” I write “Caesar’s,” or I think “Pompey’s.” Hence these two are not in all cases synonymous terms; and therefore one of them must be considered as only accidentally coinciding with the other in particular circumstances.

Again, every one of these supposed genitives can with propriety assume all the various signs of the different “cases” in the English language: for we may say simply, as in the nominative case, “Alexander’s house;” but we can also say, “OF Alexander’s house,” “TO, WITH, FROM, IN, BY, or FOR Alexander’s house,” &c. If this then be a real genitive, it requires the sign of the genitive, as well as of the other cases, to explain it; which would be an absurdity too great to be admitted. -- But it may be asked, if these are not genitives, to what class of words can they be referred? In answer to this, it has been already observed, that the variety of substances is so great, that it is impossible for any person to know the names of every one of them; and therefore they have been arranged under the several orders of genera and species. We now further observe, that as the individuals are so exceedingly numerous, it would be impossible even to invent proper names for each, and far less would it be possible to make these names be known to every person who might accidentally see them: therefore when we want to ascertain any individual object, and

distinguish it from all the other individuals of the same species, we are obliged to have recourse to particular epithets, or definitives, to ascertain that individual. -- Thus, I see a particular house which I want to distinguish from other houses; this has no particular name of its own; I must therefore ascertain it in the best manner I can; and as the shortest is always the best, we most naturally denominate it from its owner or possessor if we know him, the therefore call it "Alexander's," "James's," or "John's" house. -- Here then, we see, that the words "Alexander's," "James's," and "John's," do not stand as nouns, but as "articles" or "definitives" serving to ascertain and point out the individuality of the noun with which they are joined, and are much nearer allied to adjectives than to substantives. These, therefore, like other articles, do not alter the case of the noun; so that the term "Alexander's house," is as much the proper name of a particular house, as "Alexander" or "James" are the proper names of particular men, and of consequence may be varied through the different cases as well as the other. -- It is surprising, that this idea never occurred to grammarians; for "St. Peter's" at Rome, and "St. Paul's" at London, are as truly the proper names of these two noble edifices, as the "Rotunda" or the "Circus" are the proper names of two other structures. -- We may therefore safely conclude, that the English language admits of no cases at all, and that the only essential accidents of nouns are gender and number.

## Section II. Of SUBSTANTIVES of the Second order, called PRONOUNS

All conversation passes between individuals. When these individuals are unknown to each other, how shall the one speaker address the other, when he knows not his name; or how explain himself by his own name, of which the other is wholly ignorant? This might perhaps have been at first effected by pointing; but as this method behooved to be extremely inconvenient and defective, it was necessary that a particular class of words should be invented for this purpose; and as these words always supply the place of a noun, they have been called PRONOUNS; -- the nature of which may be explained as follows.

Suppose the parties conversing to be wholly unacquainted, and the subject of the conversation to be the speaker himself: here, to supply the place of pointing, the inventors of language have furnished the speaker with the pronoun I, "I write," "I desire;" and as the speaker is always the principal with respect to his own discourse, they have therefore called this "the pronoun of the FIRST person."

Again, suppose the subject of the conversation to be the party addressed: here, for similar reasons, they invented the pronoun THOU, "THOU writest," "THOU walkest;" and as the party addressed is next in dignity to the speaker, or at least comes next with reference to the discourse, they therefore called this "the pronoun of the SECOND person." But as the subject of the conversation may be some third object different from either the speaker or the party addressed, another pronoun was necessary; and as this object might be either a "male" or a "female," or a "neuter," it was necessary to have one pronoun for each of the genders. HE for the "masculine," SHE for the "feminine," and IT for the neuter: and this, in distinction to the former, was called "the pronoun of the THIRD person." -- Hence the distribution of pronouns into "persons."

We have already seen that nouns admit of number; pronouns, which are their substitutes, likewise admit of number. There may be many speakers of the same sentiment, as well as one who including himself speaks the same sentiment with MANY; speech may likewise be addressed to MANY at a time as well as to ONE; and the subject of the discourse may likewise be MANY; therefore the pronoun of every one of the "persons" must admit of number, to express this singularity or plurality. Hence, therefore, the pronoun of the first person I, has the plural WE; that of the second person THOU, has the plural YOU; and that of the third person HE, SHE, or IT, has the plural THEY, which is equally applied to all the three genders.

With regard to gender, we do not find in any language that the pronouns of the "First" or "Second" per-

forms admit of any distinction in this respect: nor was it necessary that they should: as the speaker and party addressed are usually present with one another, this distinction is generally obvious from dress and external appearance. But this is not the case with regard to the pronoun of the Third person; of whose character and distinctions we often know no more than what we learn from the discourse itself; and hence it is, that in almost all languages the pronoun of the third person admits of genders, as we have already seen the English admits of the triple distinction of masculine, feminine, and neuter. -- The utility of which threefold distinction will be best shewn by an example.

Supposing there was no such distinction, and that we should read in any history HE CAUSED HIM to destroy HIM, and were told that the pronoun which is here thrice repeated stood each time for something different; that is to say, for a man, for a woman, and for a city, whose names were Alexander, Thais, and Persepolis. Taking the pronoun thus divested of its genders, it does not appear which of the three was destroyed, which the destroyer, or which the cause that moved to the destruction. But there is no ambiguity when we hear the genders distinguished; and when, instead of the ambiguous sentence, "he" caused "him" to destroy "him," we are told with the proper distinctions that SHE caused HIM to destroy IT. Then we know with certainty, that the promoter was the "woman," that her instrument was the "hero," and that the subject of her cruelty was the unfortunate "city" -- From this example we would be surprised how the Italian, French and Spanish could express themselves with precision or elegance, with no more than two variations of this person.

From the same causes as a distinction of gender is unnecessary in the pronouns of the first and second persons, we see the reason why a single pronoun to each person, an I for the first, and a THOU for the second, are sufficient for all the purposes of language, as these are always supposed present and obvious. But it is not so with respect to the third person, as the various relations of different objects made it necessary to have not "one," but "many;" such as HE, SHE, IT, THIS, THAT, OTHER, SOME, ALL, ANY, &c.

Although we have said that there is only one pronoun for each of the first and second persons, yet the English reader may perhaps be puzzled with finding two distinct words applied to each; I and ME, for the first person; THOU and THEE, for the second. The learned reader will at once see that these two words ME and THEE are equivalent to the "accusative" case of the Latin pronoun: but, in order to make the meaning of this as plain as possible without embarrassing ourselves about unnecessary terms, we shall only observe, no effect can be produced without a cause, and no action can be performed without producing some effect. The same person may in different circumstances be either the active and efficient cause "of," or the passive subject who suffers "by" an action: some languages have therefore formed different words to express the same object in these different circumstances. Thus in the Latin sentences, "Brutus amavit Cassium," Brutus loved Cassius; and "Cassius amavit Brutum," Cassius loved Brutus; the word "Brutus" in the first, and "Cassius" in the second, is the form which the noun assumes when it is used as the efficient cause; and "Brutum" and "Cassium" the forms which the same nouns assume when they are represented as the passive subjects. This last then was what was called the "accusative" case of the noun, and the first was called the "nominative." We have already seen that the English noun admits of no cases, the active subjects always preceding the verb, and the passive following it, as is plain from the above sentences, where "Brutus" and "Cassius" remain changed in both situations; and the same might be observed of all other modern languages yet the English and all modern languages admit of a different word to express the different state of the pronouns.

Thus, we say, "I esteem THEE," "I admire HIM," "I love HER": in all of which sentences, I, the pronoun of the first person, is the "active," and THEE of the second person, and HE and HER of the third, are the "passive" subjects, and are therefore expressed by the words THEE, HIM, and HER. But if the case be reversed, and the pronoun of the first person becomes the passive subject, and the others the active, they assume a different form; thus, "THOU esteemest," "HE admires," "SHE loves" -- ME. Hence, therefore,

it appears that we have two distinct words for each of these pronouns to express the different states in which they may be represented, exactly analogous to the nominative and accusative cases of the Romans -- Whether these are to be admitted as cases of our pronouns, or whether they may not rather be considered as distinct words formed for that particular purpose, is of little consequence for us to inquire; as, in whatever light they may be considered, this variation cannot be looked upon as an essential part of language, but only as a particular refinement, invented to prevent the disagreeable repetition of the pronoun, which behooved frequently to have happened without this contrivance. This seems to be the only reason why pronouns have been endowed with this variety, and not nouns. For as nouns are in themselves greatly diversified, the sameness of sounds does not here so often occur as it would have done in the pronouns, where the same I, THOU, HE, SHE, or IT, answers for the name of every object which occurs in nature; but, by this diversity in the form of the words, this circumstance is in some measure obviated. And it is probably for the same reason, that the plural of each of these pronouns is so very different from the singular. Thus, from I of the first person is formed WE in the plural, and from ME the plural US; from THOU and THEE the plurals YE and YOU; from HE, SHE, -- HIM, HER, and IT, the plurals THEY, and THEM. In all of which there is not the least resemblance between the singular and plural of any one word; and, except in HE and HIM, THEY and THEM, there is not any similarity between what may by some be thought to be the different "cases" of the same word.

We have seen that the same object may sometimes be the cause of an action, and sometimes the object which suffers by it. We now observe, that the same object may sometimes be, with regard to the same action, both the active cause and passive subject; as when we say, "Brutus killed himself." In which case it is evident, that Brutus was both the cause that produced, and the object that suffered by the action; the pronoun "himself" being put for his name; for, were it not for the sameness of the sound, and the ambiguity which would be occasioned by it, we might surely say, "Brutus killed Brutus." It was therefore necessary to have a particular pronoun for the passive subject, in all those cases where the same object was the agent; and on this account the word SELF has been invented, having the plural SELVES. This pronoun therefore, which serves on all occasions to represent the action as returning upon the agent that produced it, may be called the reciprocal pronoun; which has this peculiarity, that it can never stand by itself, but must always have the assistance of the pronoun in whose place it is substituted, as, MYSELF, THYSELF, HIMSELF, HERSELF, ITSELF, with their plurals. But although this seems to have been the original use of this pronoun; yet, in the English language, its use has been extended further; and, from its always having a reference to the agent of any action, it has been employed to denote that agent by way of emphasis, as performing the action without the aid or assistance of any other; as, "he himself went." And from this circumstance it has been further extended to denote any object as performing or suffering any thing which we would not naturally have expected from its known character or nature; as in this sentence: "The most daring of mankind are sometimes startled before they venture upon the commission of any extraordinary crime; even Caesar HIMSELF felt the utmost perturbation of mind before he dared to pass the Rubicon." These are all that can be properly called "personal pronouns;" but there are others which are derived from them, called "possessive pronouns," as, MY, THY, MINE, HIS, HERS ITS, &c. the nature of which it will be necessary here to explain. We have already shewn how nouns, when they came to denote possession, were no longer to be considered as nouns, but rather as definitives or articles; so the pronouns which we here consider, being the real substitutes or "nominal" articles, ought also to be considered as a distinct class of pronominal articles; for as these never, in any case, can be substituted for a noun, they cannot be considered as pronouns.

Grammarians have been led into the mistake of placing them under this head, because they are the substitutes of these words, which, although they assume the appearance of nouns, only perform the part of definitives. Thus we have seen, that when we say, "Alexander's house;" the word "Alexander's" can only be considered as a definitive: and, in the same manner, if Alexander was the speaker, he might say, "MY house;" if the party addressed, it should be "THY house;" or in any third person, "HIS," and in the same

manner "HER or ITS house." In all which cases this possessive pronoun is substituted for that word which only serves to define and ascertain the identity of the noun, and not for the noun itself, which must always be either expressed or understood. Hence the reason which one pronoun becomes the substitute of this noun and its proper definitive, whether that definitive appears in the form of a noun or pronoun: for I can say, "Alexander's house' is more elegant than 'Mary's," or "his house' is more elegant than 'hers,' although IT neither is so commodious nor agreeable to live in." In which example it is plain, that the words "his" and "hers" are strictly the substitutes only of "Alexander's" and "Mary's," and nothing more; whereas the pronoun IT is the substitute of the whole noun with its definitive "Alexander's house." The other class of pronouns possessive, MINE, THINE, &c. as they do not so much serve to distinguish individuals, as to ascertain the property of the thing spoken of, which may, in a certain sense, be considered as an attribute thereof, are more nearly allied to attributives, and have therefore by some been called adjectives. And it must be acknowledged, that these two classes of words are so nearly allied to one another, that it is difficult to ascertain, in all cases, the precise boundary between them.

Besides these, there are other words which sometimes assume the province of pronouns, and are generally considered as belonging to this class, although in many cases improperly; such as THIS, THAT, ANY, SOME, THESE, THOSE, ALL, and some others; which may be called "improper" pronouns. To distinguish when they may be considered as pronouns, we may observe, that when they stand by themselves, and supply the place of a noun, as when we say, "THIS is virtue," "give me THAT," they are pronouns. But when they are associated to some noun, as when we say, "THIS HABIT is virtue," or "THAT MAN defrauded me;" then, as they do not supply "the place" of a noun, but only serve to "ascertain" one, they fall rather under the aspects of "definitives," or "articles." And indeed it must be confessed, that these, as well as the possessive pronouns, are more properly adapted to define and ascertain individuals among nouns, than to supply their place; and therefore are oftener to be considered as articles than as pronouns. The best rule to distinguish when they are to be considered as the one or the other, is this. The genuine PRONOUN "always stands by itself, assuming the power of a NOUN, and supplying its place."

The genuine ARTICLE "never stands by itself, but appears at all times associated to something else," requiring a noun for its support, as much as "attributives" or "adjectives."

Suppose I say, "LIGHT is a body;" "LIGHT moves with great celerity;" these would apparently be two distinct sentences. And if, instead of the second LIGHT, I were to place the prepositive pronoun IT, and say "LIGHT is a body, IT moves with great celerity;" the sentences would still be distinct, and two. But if I add a "connective" (as for example AND) saying, "LIGHT is a body, AND IT moves with great celerity;" I then, by connection, make the two into "one." Now it is "in the united powers of a connective and another pronoun," that we may see the force and character of the pronoun here treated of. For if, instead of the words AND IT, we substitute THAT or WHICH; saying, "LIGHT is a body WHICH moves with great celerity;" the sentence still retains its "unity," and becomes, if possible, more compact than before. We may therefore call this pronoun the SUBJUNCTIVE; because it cannot introduce an original sentence, but only serves to "subjoin one to some other which is previous."

The application of this "subjunctive," like the other pronouns, is universal. It may be the substitute of all kinds of substantives, natural, artificial, or abstract; general, special, or particular: for we may say, "THE man who," "THE ship which," "ALEXANDER who," "virtue which," &c. Nay, it may even be the substitute of all the other pronouns and is therefore of course expressive of all the three persons. Thus we say, "I WHO now write;" "THOU WHO now readest;" "HE WHO now heareth," &c. And thus the SUBJUNCTIVE is truly a "pronoun" from its "substitutions;" there being no substantive existing in whose place it may not stand. At the same time it is essentially distinguished from the other pronouns by this particular, that it is not only a "substitute," but likewise a "connective."

As to the accidents of this pronoun: From its performing the part of a connective, it of course follows, that neither "gender" nor "number" can be considered as essential to it; because these are always expressed in the preceding parts of the sentence to which it refers; nor do we in fact find, that this pronoun, at least in modern languages, admits of any distinction to denote "number," although the English language admits of one variation for the genders, as we employ WHO for the "masculine" and "feminine," and WHICH for the "neuter" gender, thus: "The man," or "the woman WHO went to Rome;" "the TREE which stands on yonder plain," &c. It likewise admits of a variation similar to that of the accusative case; at least when applied to males or females. For when the object which it represents is the efficient cause of action, it is WHO; as, "the man WHO fell," &c.; but when it is the passive subject, it then, in certain circumstances, takes the form of WHOM; as, "the man of WHOM I speak;" although this is not universal; as we likewise say, "the man WHO was beaten." But the neuter admits of no such distinctions, as we equally say, "the tree WHICH fell," or "the tree of WHICH I spoke." But both of these admit of a variation to denote possession or qualities, which is the word WHOSE for all genders. Thus, we say, "Socrates WHOSE only study was virtue;" "Elizabeth WHOSE reign was glorious."

To conclude: We have seen that substantives are either "primary" or "secondary;" or, in other words, NOUNS or PRONOUNS. The NOUNS denote substances, either "natural," "artificial," or "abstract;" and these either "general," "special," or "particular." The PRONOUN, their substitutes, are either "prepositive" or "subjunctive": the PREPOSITIVE is distinguished into three orders, called the "first," the "second," and the "third" persons: the SUBJUNCTIVE includes the powers of all the three, having "superadded," as of its own, the peculiar force of a connective.

## CHAPTER II: Of ATTRIBUTIVES

As all attributives must either be expressive of the attributes of SUBSTANCES, or of other ATTRIBUTES, we divide this class into two kinds; calling those of the first kind ATTRIBUTIVES of the FIRST ORDER; and those of the second kind, ATTRIBUTIVES of the SECOND ORDER.

### Section I. Attributives "of the First Order"

Attributives are all those "principal" words that denote "attributes" considered as attributes. Such, for example, are the words "black," "white," "great," "little," "wise," "eloquent," "to write," "to walk," "to speak," &c. all of which are the "attributes of substances." Thus "black" is an attribute of "jett," "white" of "snow;" -- "wise" and "eloquent," as also, "to write" and "speak," are the attributes of "men."

In examining the different attributes of substances, we readily perceive that some of them have their essence in motion; such are, "to walk," "to fly," "to strike," "to live," &c. Others have it in the privation of motion; as, "to stop," "to rest," "to cease," "to die," &c. And others have it in subjects that have "nothing to do" with either motion or its privation; such are the attributes of "great" and "little," "wise" and "foolish," "white" and "black," and, in a word, the several "quantities" and "qualities" of all things. This therefore furnishes a natural division of attributives of this order; and grammarians have called all those, whose essence consists in motion or its privation, VERBS; and all the others have been called ADJECTIVES; each of which we shall consider separately.

#### i. Of VERBS

Verbs are all those principal words which denote attributes, whose essence consists in "motion," or "energies," (for we chuse to make use of this last term, as it implies the exertions of the mind as well as those of the body), or their privation. This order of attributives differs from the other called "adjectives;" not only in the particular above-mentioned, but also because adjectives denote only qualities or quantities, which do not admit of any change of state; whereas the verbal attributives may be considered as in sev-

eral different states, and therefore admit of several variations in the term employed to express these. It may, in the first place, be considered as a simple attribute or energy, without particularizing any circumstance relating to the state it may be in; as in the word to WRITE. Or, in the second place, as these are all attributes which denote motions or energies, they may be represented as in the state of actual motion or exertion; as in the word WRITING. Or, lastly, the motion or energy may be finished, and its effect completed; as in the word WRITTEN. Hence, therefore, every verb admits of a threefold variation in every language, in each of which languages they are distinguished by some particular names. Our grammarians have given the name of INFINITIVE MODE to the original verb itself, and the other two variations of it are both distinguished by the name of PARTICIPLES; that variation which exhibits the verb in its state of energy being called the PARTICIPLE PRESENT or ACTIVE, and the other variation is called the PARTICIPLE PERFECT or PAST.

These variations of the verb are founded in the nature of things, and therefore must be found in every language under some form or other. As to the other supposed variations of verbs relating to person, number, time, &c. the slightest reflection on this subject will shew, that a verb, considered as a simple attributive, can admit of none of these affections, but must for ever remain the same at all times and in all situations whatever; for who does not see, that the attribute “to write” is the same whether it is possessed by “you,” by “me,” or by any number of different persons? Nor does this attribute suffer any change, whether it is represented as having been exerted a “thousand years ago,” or at “this present moment,” or at “any other” alignable period of duration; but, like every other attribute, it must remain for ever the same. For however “substances” may vary with time, and be incessantly changing; yet “attributes” of every sort are altogether beyond its power. And we must easily perceive, that the attribute which is expressed by the word GOOD, is the same now as it was at the creation, or will be while the world exists. And in the same manner, “to walk,” “to write,” “to fly,” denote attributes, which must each of them preserve their own particular nature during all the successive ages of time. Hence therefore we see, that the verbal attribute must for ever remain in that state, or modification, in which it is at first represented.

Nor can it suffer any change, however different the circumstances may be in which it can be applied in language. All, therefore, that can be said of these several variations with which grammarians have usually endowed verbs, is this, That, as an attributive, it hath such an intimate connection with a substantive, as necessarily to be united with one, before it can make a principal figure in language: And as that union may be represented as taking place at different times, and under different circumstances, the inventors of some languages have contrived to express these different connections by a single word, instead of doing it by different words, as the thing in itself would naturally require; in the same manner as those who use the short-hand method of writing, make a single character express a whole word, or sentence: And as it was most natural for the contrivers of these words to derive them from the verb itself of which they are compounded, they have each of them become a “real” variation of the original “word” which expresses the verbal attribute; and, from thus being a variation of the verbal “word,” they have at last come to be considered as an “essential” variation of the “verb itself,” which has occasioned those contradictory definitions, and that confusion of ideas which we meet with among all writers on this subject. But as we here consider language as in itself without regarding the particular forms under which it may appear, we must reject all those variations of “persons,” “numbers,” “modes,” and “tenses,” which the verb itself has usually been supposed to undergo; and consider them, not as essential variations of the verb itself, but as variations produced in language by the combination of the verb with other parts of speech; and therefore relating to “syntax,” and of course belonging to those grammatical disquisitions alone which treat of the peculiarities of any particular language. But as these variations have been so universally considered as essential parts of the verb itself, and as the terms which this division of the verb have introduced into grammar are so frequently to be met with, it will be necessary to explain in some measure the meaning of these several terms.

In the natural world, no attribute can possibly exist without a substance to which it belongs, nor any substance without possessing certain attributes. So necessary and intimate is the connection between these, that it is as impossible to separate them, as to create or annihilate the several substances that possess these attributes. But although we are thus circumscribed as to our bodily powers, the mind admits not of such limitation; but can with the utmost facility separate every quality from every object whatever, and consider them apart; as, "colour" without "superficies," "superficies" without "solidity," or "weight" without "matter," &c. and, when thus separated, apply them to what objects, and in what manner, it pleases. In this manner the mind abstracts those attributes which denote "motions" or "energies" from their "agents" or "energizers," in the same way as it abstracts "qualities" from their "substances." And it is these energies thus abstracted, which form that species of words called "verbs;" in the same manner as those attributes which denote "quantities" and "qualities" abstracted from their necessary substances, form "adjectives." Thus, the term "to walk," denotes a particular "energy" as considered perfectly apart from every "energizer," in the same manner as the word "good" denotes a certain "quality" without regard to any particular "substance."

Here we discover a most essential difference between the order of nature, and that representation of it which man makes by means of words. For in NATURE, every quality must at all times be united with some substance, nor can ever be exhibited separate from it; but in LANGUAGE, every attributive, if it be considered at all, must be separated from the object to which it naturally belongs. Hence we see the reason why, in language, every "energy" and energizer, not only "may" be considered separately, but "must" for ever remain separate, unless they be united by some other power than what is necessarily their own. For the attribute "to write," can no more be united to "man" its proper energizer, than a motion could commence without a cause; and till this attribute is united to its proper energizer, it must remain in a great measure dead and inefficacious in language. -- To communicate life and energy, therefore, to this inert attribute, it must be united to its proper energizer; which can only be effected by the help of an assertion of the speaker himself; which may be considered as the same with regard to language, as life is in the natural world.

It is evident that, by the assistance of an assertion, the speaker is enabled to write any energy to any particular energizer, and thus, without making any change upon the attribute itself, represent a variety of changes produced upon other bodies by its means. -- Thus, if I say, "I write," what do I more than assert that I myself am possessed of that particular attribute denoted by the verb "to write"? If I say, "You write," or "He writes," what do I more than assert that another person is possessed of that particular attribute or energy? -- If I say "He DID write," I only assert that the same attribute was possessed at another time, by the same person, as before. Hence therefore, by the help of this assertion of the speaker, we are enabled to join this particular attribute to many different energizers, as well as to represent these different combinations as occurring at many different times; so that the same attribute may thus be made to appear under a great many different circumstances, and exhibit a great variety of changes upon other objects, although itself remains unchanged; the several variations which we perceive, only relating to the objects with which it is combined, or the means by which that union is effected. -- In the same manner it often happens, that any object in nature, a house for example, may appear extremely different when viewed from different situations.

From the intimate connection that takes place between the energy, the energizer, the assertion, and time, these several accessories have been considered as essential parts of the verb; and therefore some grammarians have defined a verb to be "A word denoting an energy, with time, and an assertion." But if we were thus to confound things with those which may necessarily accompany them, we could never arrive at a clear perception of any subject whatever. But not to enter into the arguments that might be produced to shew that impropriety of this definition, we shall only observe, that by the universal acknowledgment of all grammarians this cannot be just. For they unanimously agree, that the "infinitive mode" is not only

“a part” of every verb, but the “most essential part;” as it forms the root from which all the other parts are derived. But as this mode neither denotes either time or an assertion, it is evident that these, even by their own acknowledgment, can be at best but accessories, and not essential parts of the verb.

From these arguments, therefore, we must conclude, that the verb itself admits of no other variations but those already taken notice of; -- that before it can produce any active effect in language, like every other attribute, it must be united to some proper energizer; -- that this union in language can never be effected but by means of an exertion of the vital powers of the speaker, whereby he either publishes his perception thereof, or his will that it should be; -- and that this union may be represented as taking place at all the different times that can be assigned. These, therefore, are each of them necessary accompaniments of a verb, but each of them separate and distinct in their own nature, not only from this verb, but from one another; and it becomes an essential part of the syntax of every language, to consider the various ways in which these can be combined and affect one another. -- Nay, so intimate has this connection been thought to be by some, that the contrivers of certain languages have arranged them under particular classes, for the sake of distinctness and precision. -- The form which a verb assumed, when thus varied in all the ways that their particular language would admit of, was called the CONJUGATION of the verb; the several parts of which may be understood from the following sketch.

When the verb is considered under the compound form of which we now speak, it can admit of variations chiefly in three aspects. For, first, supposing the “attribute,” the “energizer,” and the “time” when that attribute was exerted by the energizer, to be the same; a variation may be occasioned by a change being produced in the “perception” or “volition” of the speaker, (which, for brevity, we will call the “assertion,”) as in these examples: “I write,” SCRIBO; “I may write,” SCRIBAM; “do you write,” SCRIBE. The variations produced by this means have been called MODES.

Secondly, Supposing the “attribute,” the “energizer,” and the “assertion,” to be the same; a change may be produced in the “time,” as in these examples: “I do write,” SCRIBO; “I did write,” SCRIPSI; “I shall write,” SCRIBAM, &c. The variations produced from this cause have been called TENSES. And, thirdly, supposing the “attribute,” the “time,” and the “assertion,” to remain unchanged, there may be a difference in the “energizer;” and this likewise admits of a division: for as the energizer may be only “one” or more persons, it must have a variation into “singular” and “plural” on these accounts; as in these examples: “I write,” SCRIBO; “thou writest,” SCRIBAS; “he writes,” SCRIBAT; and in the plural, “we write,” SCRIBAMUS; “ye write,” SCRIBATIS; “they write,” SCRIBANT. The variations produced from this cause have been called PERSON and NUMBER. -- These are all the variations which have been made in the Latin or Greek languages; and therefore our grammarians, who have adopted every idea they have of grammar from these languages, mention no more: but it was not necessary that they should have stopt here, for an attribute is surely as susceptible of the distinction of sex as of person, so that they might have had a variation for “Gender” also; and instead of having one word SCRIBAT to answer for all the three genders, “he,” “she,” or “it wrote,” they might have had three different words. -- The composers of the Hebrew language have adopted this plan, and admit of two variations on this account; and the Russian language admits of a like variation in their verb for these genders; as in this example: ON ZOHELAL, “he has done;” ONA ZOHELALA, “she has done,” &c. But as the two languages above mentioned do not admit of this distinction, therefore all the variations that our verbs are said to admit of are MODES, which include within them TENSES, which include under them PERSONS, under which head is included NUMBER; and these are all the parts into which a CONJUGATION has been divided. -- As to what concerns the nature and lesser distinctions of each of these, the following general remarks may be sufficient.

With regard to MODES; as this relates solely to the “perception” or “volition” of the speaker, it necessarily follows, that there ought to be a distinct and particular MODE for each diversity that there can be in his manner of perceiving or willing any thing whatever, the principal of which are the following.

If we simply declare that we perceive any object, or that such a thing is or will be, without any limitation or contingency, it forms what has been called the DECLARATIVE or INDICATIVE MODE; as, "I write" -- Again, if we simply represent it to be within our "power," or to depend upon our choice, it forms two other modes, which may be called the POTENTIAL, as, "I can write": or the ELECTIVE, as, "I may write" -- In the same manner, if the speaker represents himself, or any other object, as "determined" to perform any action, or as "compelled" to it, or as it is his "duty" to perform it; these form so many distinct modes, which may be called the DETERMINATIVE, as, "I will write;" the COMPULSIVE, as, "I must write;" and OBLIGATIVE, as, "I should write." But although each of these represents the speaker as perceiving the agent under a different light with respect to the action; yet as all of them, except the indicative, agree in this, that however much they may represent it as the "duty" or "inclination," &c. of the agent to perform any action with which they are associated, yet as they are still of the nature of contingents which may never take effect, they are frequently subjoined to any other verb; therefore the Latins have comprehended all of these under one mode, which they have called the SUBJUNCTIVE. We only take notice of the time circumstances here, to shew, that however naturally "sentences" may be distinguished into modes, according to the different situation of the speaker; yet as the whole order of the variation of words in the conjugation of a verb is merely arbitrary, those who invent them may arrange them into what order they please, and call them by what names they may think most proper. But however they may vary the name or external arrangement, this does not affect the things themselves. For by whatever name the "mode" may be known which comprehends the words expressive of these several meanings, the sentences formed by these will be either "potential," "obligative," "compulsive," &c. as above explained.

All these modes above mentioned only relate to the different "perceptions" of the speaker. But as man is not only endowed with the powers of "perception," but those of "volition" also, he must have words to express these; which forms another order of modes. As he is not only dependent himself, but has others depending upon him, he may "commend," "intreat," "beg," "pray," "with," "inquire." -- Hence, therefore, so many different orders of modes, the IMPERATIVE, REQUISITIVE, PRECATIVE, OPTATIVE, INTERROGATIVE, &c. to which may be added to VOCATIVE. But although each of these display a distinct affection of the speaker, yet grammarians have allotted only one variation of their verb for all of these purposes, called the IMPERATIVE MODE; all the other volitions being expressed by this, or some other modes, by the help of particular contrivances, which are different in different languages.

With regard to that variation of the verb which relates to "time," called TENSES: As an action or event may be represented as happening at any assignable period of time, it is necessary to divide that duration into certain parts, that we may be able to represent the different relations which events bear to one another with respect to this particular. The first and most obvious division of time is into "present," "past," and "future." But we may go farther still in our divisions of time. For as time past and future may be infinitely extended, we may in "universal time past" assume "many particular times past," and in "universal time future," "many particular times future," some more, some less remote, and corresponding to each other under different relations. Even "present time," however, in strict physical truth, it may be incapable of it, is by the power of the imagination brought to admit of these differences, and as necessarily implies "some degree of extension," as every given line however minute: And hence it is not sufficient for language to denote INDEFINITELY mere "past," "present," or "future" times; but on many occasions to DEFINE with more precision what "kind" of "past," "present," or "future" is meant.

Tenses, therefore, or those variations of a verb which denote a difference of "time" only, may be all divided into PRESENT, PAST, and FUTURE; each of which may be subdivided into DEFINITE and INDEFINITE. The "definite tenses" are those where the particular instant of time, whether present, past, or future, is pointed out. The "indefinite" are those where past, present, or future time is indicated in general, without confining it to a particular instant in either of these cases. These have been distinguished among

grammarians by the name of AORISTS. -- Thus when Milton makes Adam say,

Millions of spiritual creatures WALK the earth,

Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep,

the verb WALK means not that they were walking at that instant only when Adam spoke, but “indefinitely” in any instant whatever. So likewise, when the same author calls hypocrisy,

--- the only evil which WALKS

Invisible except to God alone.

the verb WALKS has the like aoristical signification. “He WENT,” “he FELL,” are “aorists” of the past time in general. So likewise in the legislative sentences, “thou shalt not kill,” “thou shalt not steal,” &c. the same aoristical meaning is perceived, as the prohibition does not relate to any “particular time future,” but is extended indefinitely to EVERY time future.

But it is not sufficient for a language to denote time in this indefinite manner: it is necessary likewise that it should be capable of specifying any particular instant of time in an exact and definite manner. Thus, if, instead of the word WALK in the first sentence above quoted, we were to put ARE WALKING, it brings down the verb to denote a particular time, and specifies that these “spiritual creatures” are, at that very “instant” in which Adam speaks, walking upon the earth unseen. In like manner, in the second sentence, if the word WALKS were changed to IS WALKING it denotes, that hypocrisy, at that “particular instant” in which the sentence was pronounced, was walking invisible upon the earth. And in the same manner, WAS WALKING, or WILL BE WALKING, each of them denote, that these energies “were” or “will be” exerted at a particular specified time. These, therefore, form so many distinct definite tenses, under whatever technical name these may be known.

Here then we see the use of that distinction of the different states of the verb, into the “verb properly so called,” and “participles.” For as the verb itself exhibits the word as altogether “indefinite;” when this is joined to its proper energizer, it forms all these INDEFINITE TENSES which our language requires. Thus, “I write,” “I did write,” “I will write,” “I may write,” “I can write,” &c. each of them, although they represent the attribute as united to the energizer in some “past,” “present,” or “future” time, do not specify any particular instant, and are therefore so many aorists or indefinite tenses. Whereas in the “participle” the attribute is represented as in a state of exertion, it necessarily follows, that if it be ever united to its energizer, it must point out the particular instant when that union took effect, and of consequence form as great a variety of DEFINITE TENSES as the verb forms of indefinite. Thus, “I am writing,” necessarily implies that I am actually exerting this particular energy at the VERY INSTANT that I declare it. So likewise if I say “I was writing,” it indicates, that at one PARTICULAR INSTANT of past duration, to which this has a reference, I was actually employed in that particular occupation. This instant is generally fixed by some collateral circumstance; as, “upon the twentieth day of August last, at 12 o’clock, I was writing;” or, “when the thunder broke upon the tower in my neighbourhood, I was writing,” &c. And the same may be said of future time; as, “to morrow at ten o’clock, I shall be writing,” &c. in all of which cases it is obvious, that a particular “now” or “instant” is pointed out, in which the attribute is represented as united to its proper energizer.

We might here proceed to shew the various times that each of these different states of the verb might be made to indicate; the number of “tenses” that each mode admitted of; the several changes that might be produced by joining the “participle perfect” with any object; which cannot be here called the energizer,

but the “subject;” for as the energy is by this participle represented as compleated, if it has any connection with any persona, as the attribute cannot be affected by any energizer after it is compleated, it must of necessity affect the person, instead of being affected by it; and hence it is that the several variations produced by this participle perfect have been called the PASSIVE VOICE of the verb. But as all these particulars only relate to the construction of one particular language, it would lead us a great deal too far from the particular subject of which this article treats. We shall therefore only observe, that besides the above variations of the verb, which the Greeks and Romans have thought proper to make, the terms of which we have adopted; there are many others that they might with equal propriety have made, but which they rather chose to express by the help of other words called “adverbs.” But some other language have gone further in this respect, and endowed their verbal word with several variations to express several other circumstances than they do. This is particularly the case with the Hebrew language, which, besides the variation for gender above mentioned, has allotted certain other variations of its verb to express several other circumstances. Thus, PAKAD in that language signifies “be visited;” PAKEDA, “she visited,” &c. PIKKED, “he visited diligently;” HEPHKED, “he made him visit;” and HETHPEKED, “he visited himself.” In this manner is every verb in that language varied; and each of these different conjugations of the verb admits of a particular variation for the passive of each -- Hence, therefore, the conjugation of a verb in that language admits of a great many variations which neither the Greeks nor Romans were acquainted with: for besides the distinctions of “modes,” “tenses,” “persons,” and “number,” they have divided their verb into so many distinct divisions to answer for these distinctions above mentioned, which they have denominated KAL, PIHEL, HIPHIL, and HITHPAHEL, with their passives NIPHAL, PUHAL, and HOPHAL; each of which admits of variations through all the “modes,” “tenses,” “persons,” “numbers,” and “genders” which any of their verbs admit of.

The only use which we meant to make of these observations on the Hebrew verbs is this: That as the authors, who have formed their idea of grammar from the forms which the several parts of speech admit of in the Greek and Latin languages, have supposed that every variation which these languages admitted of was a natural and necessary part of language; and that therefore every language which did not admit of the same number of variations, with theirs in every part of speech, was in so far defective and incomplete. So for the same reason, an author who had formed his idea of grammar upon the model of the Hebrew tongue, would as naturally suppose, that the several variations which the verb admitted of in his own favorite language, were essential and necessary; and that, of consequence, every language which did not admit of as many variations was imperfect and incomplete. But to any one who considers this matter with attention, it will appear, that there could be no end to these unnecessary discussions and groundless claims of fancied superiority: for if compound words have such an advantage over simple, the Chinese language, in which we are told almost every sentence has a particular compound character to express it, must be by far the most perfect in the world; but so far is this from being the case, that every one allows it to be the most imperfect and incomplete. The only method, therefore, which remains for us to consider this subject is, to disregard every particular form of language, and consider the words in themselves, as divested of every extraneous circumstance, and observe what variations they necessarily require, allowing every particular language to compound these with one another in what manner they shall think most proper. It is in this manner we have considered the verbal attributives, and endeavoured to disentangle them from these unnecessary fetters with which they have been loaded, and restore them to their own original freedom.

Besides the variations above mentioned, verbs have been distinguished from one another in a different manner; the names and nature of which may be thus explained.

We have already seen, that all verbs, as they denote “energies,” necessarily have reference to certain “energizing substances.” For, how could there be such energies as “to love,” “to fly,” “to wound”? &c. were there not such beings as “men,” “birds,” “swords,” &c. Farther, every energy not only requires an energizer, but is

necessarily conversant about some subject. For example, if we say, "Brutus loves," we must needs supply -- "loves Cato," "Cassius," or some one. And thus it is, that every energy is necessarily situated between two substantives, an energizer which is "active," and a subject which is "passive." If the energizer leads the sentence, the energy has been said to follow its character, and becomes what we call a VERB ACTIVE: thus we say, BRUTUS AMAT, "Brutus loves." On the contrary, if the passive subject be principal, it is said to follow the character of this too, and becomes what we call a VERB PASSIVE: thus we say, PORTIA AMATUR, "Portia is loved." But in some verbs it happens, that the energy "always keeps within the energizer," and never passes out to any extraneous subject. Thus, when we say, "Caesar walketh," Caesar sitteth," it is impossible that the energy "should pass out," because both the "energizer" and the "passive subject" are united in the "same person." For what is the cause of this walking or sitting? it is the "will" and "vital powers" belonging to "Caesar." This species of verbs have been by grammarians distinguished by the name of VERBS NEUTER, as if they were void both of "action" and "passion," when perhaps they may be rather said to imply both. It is in this manner, that verbs have been distinguished into the three classes of "active," "passive," and "neuter." These, however, might with more propriety be divided into two classes, which might be called verbs TRANSITIVE, and NOT TRANSITIVE; the first class including all those verbs which are usually called "active," with the "passives" belonging to them; for it is evident, that these passives are not verbs themselves, but a variation only of a verb; and the second class including those verbs commonly called "neuter."

Some languages, as the Greek and French, have another class of verbs, which are called by the first VERBS MIDDLE, and by the last RECIPROCAL VERBS; which are employed to denote that state of any transitive verb, when the energizer himself becomes the subject; as thus, "Brutus killed himself," &c. But as these only express a slight variation of an accompaniment of a verb, they have no claim to be considered as a distinct species.

## ii. Of ADJECTIVES

Adjectives are all those words which denote attributes whose essence does not consist in motion or its privation: or, in other words, they are those words which denote the attributes of quantity, quality, and relation; such as, "many," "few," "great" and "little," "black" and "white," "good" and "bad," "double," "treble," "quadruple," &c.

As these attributes admit of no change of state, nor can be affected by the variations of time, or any other accident, but are in their own nature perfectly fixed and invariable, the words which express them ought to be in all situations and on all occasions the same. For as the qualities "good" or "bad," "black" or "white," admit of no change in their own nature, whether they be applied to a "man," to a "woman," to "many," or to "few;" neither ought the word which expresses any one of these attributes in strictness to admit of any alteration, whether it be joined to one or other of these substantives. So that although in some languages, from the particular construction of the other parts of speech, it has been found necessary to endow their adjectives with the threefold distinction of "gender," "number," and "case;" yet this must only be considered as an accidental variation occasioned by particular circumstances, and not in the least essential to language, but rather a deviation from the order of nature, which would require them to be kept invariably the same in all cases. This order, the English language (which in this and almost every other case is more strictly conformable to the nature of things than any other language we are acquainted with) most strictly observes; as we say equally, "a good man," or "a good woman," "a good house;" or "good men," "good houses," &c.

It has probably been from observing, that the adjectives in some particular languages are endowed with variations conformable to the "gender," "number," and "case" of their substantives, that grammarians have been led into the strange absurdity of ranging them with nouns, and separating them from verbs; though

with respect to verbs they are perfectly homogeneous, and with respect to nouns they are quite contrary. Adjectives are homogeneous with respect to verbs, as both sorts denote "attributes;" they are heterogeneous with respect to nouns, as NEVER PROPERLY DENOTING SUBSTANCES.

Besides original adjectives, there is another class which are formed from substantives. Thus when we say, "the party of Pompey," "the style of Cicero," "the philosophy of Socrates;" in these cases, the party, the style, and philosophy spoken of, receive a stamp and character from the persons they respect, and actually pass into attributives, and as such assume the form of "adjectives." And hence we say "the Pompeian party," "the Ciceronian style," and "the Socratic philosophy." In like manner, for a trumpet of brass, we say, "a brazen trumpet;" for a crown of gold, "a golden crown," &c. Even pronominal substantives admit the like mutation; as, instead of saying the book "of me," "of thee," or "of him," we say, "my" book, "thy" book, "his" book, &c. Yet it must be acknowledged, that these, as they often serve rather to define a noun than to denote any quality appertaining it, they partake more of the nature of "articles" than "adjectives;" so that it is in many cases difficult to ascertain exactly to which class they are to be referred. But of this we have already taken particular notice, p. 713 & 716.

The nature of these variations of adjectives which have been called "degrees of comparison," will be more properly explained under the following section.

## Section II. Of Attributives of the Second Order, called ADVERBS

As the attributives hitherto mentioned denote the "attributes" of "substances," so there is an inferior class of them which denote the "attributes" only of "attributes." To explain these by examples of either kind: when we say, "Cicero' and 'Pliny' were both of them 'eloquent;' 'Statius' and 'Virgil,' both of them 'wrote;'" in these instances, the attributes "eloquent" and "wrote," are immediately referable to the substantives "Cicero," "Virgil," &c.: As, therefore, denoting the "attributes of substances," we call them ATTRIBUTIVES OF THE FIRST ORDER. But when we say, "'Pliny' was 'moderately' eloquent, but 'Cicero exceedingly' eloquent; 'Statius' wrote 'indifferently,' but 'Virgil' wrote 'admirably':" in these instances, the attributives "moderately," "exceedingly," "indifferently," and "admirably," are not referable to "substantives," but to "other attributes;" that is, to the words "eloquent" and "wrote": As, therefore, denoting "attributes of attributes," we call them ATTRIBUTIVES OF THE SECOND ORDER. These have been, by grammarians, called ADVERBS. And indeed, if we take the word VERB in its most comprehensive signification, as including all the words which denote the attributes of substances, (which was the sense in which Aristotle and many of the most ancient grammarians employed it) we shall find the name ADVERB to be a very just appellation, as denoting a "part of speech the natural appendage of verbs." So great is this dependence in grammatical syntax, that an adverb can no more subsist without its "verb," than a "verb" can subsist without its "substantive."

Among the attributes of substances are reckoned quantities and qualities. Thus we say, "a white garment," "a high mountain," &c. Now some of these quantities and qualities are capable of "intension" and "remission." Thus we say, "a garment EXCEEDINGLY white," "a mountain TOLERABLY or MODERATELY high." Hence, then, one copious source of secondary attributives, or adverbs, to denote these two, that is "intension" and "remission," such as, "greatly," "vastly," "extremely," "sufficiently," "moderately," "tolerably," "indifferently," &c.

But where there are different intensions of the same attribute, they may be "compared" together: thus, if the garment A be "EXCEEDINGLY white," and the garment B be "MODERATELY white," we may say, the garment A is "MORE white than the garment B." In these instances, the adverb MORE not only denotes intension, but "relative intension." Nay, we stop not here, as we not only denote intension "merely relative," but "relative intension than which there is none greater." Thus we not only say, the "mountain A is

MORE high than the mountain B," but that "it is the MOST high of all mountains." Even "verbs," properly so called, as they admit of "simple intensions," so they admit also of these "comparative ones." Thus, in the following example, "Fame he LOVETH MORE than riches, but virtue of all things he LOVETH MOST;" the words MORE and MOST denote the different "comparative intensions" of the verbal attribute "loveth."

Hence the rise of COMPARISON of adjectives, and of its different "degrees," which cannot well be more than the two species above-mentioned; one to denote "simple excess," and one to denote "superlative." Were we indeed to introduce more degrees than these, we ought perhaps to introduce "infinite," which is absurd. For why stop at a limited number, when in all subjects susceptible of intension the intermediate excesses are in a manner infinite? There are infinite degrees of "more white," between the "first simple white," and the superlative "whitest;" and the same may be said of "more great," "more strong," "more minute," &c. The doctrine of grammarians about three such degrees of comparison, which they call the "positive," the "comparative," and the "superlative," must be absurd; both because in their positive there is no comparison at all, and because their superlative is a comparative as much as their comparative itself. Examples to evince this may be met with every where; "Socrates was the MOST WISE of all the Athenians;" "Homer was the MOST SUBLIME of all poets," &c.

The authors of language have in some instances contrived a way to retrench these comparative adverbs, by expressing their force by an inflection of the primary attributive. Thus, instead of "more fair," they say, FAIRER; instead of "most fair," FAIREST: and the same method of composition takes place both in the Greek and Latin languages; with this difference however between the genius of these languages and ours, that we are at liberty to form the comparison, either in the one method or the other: but in these languages, the comparison is almost never formed by the assistance of the adverb, but always by the inflection of the adjective; and hence this inflection is always considered by them as a necessary accident of the adjective. But this method of expressing the power of the adverb has reached no farther than to adjectives or to their participles, which were so nearly allied to adjectives. Verbs were perhaps thought to be too much diversified, to admit of more variations without perplexity.

Some qualities admit of comparison, others admit of none: such, for example, are those which denote "that quality of bodies arising from their figure;" as, when we say, a "circular" table, a "quadrangular" court, a "conical" piece of metal, &c. The reason is, that a million of things participating the same figure, participate it "equally" if they do it at all. To say, therefore, that while A and B are both quadrangular, that A is more or less quadrangular than B, is absurd. The same holds in all attributives denoting "definite quantities" of whatever nature. For, as there can be no "comparison" without "intension" or "remission," and as there can be no intension and remission in things "always definite," therefore these attributives can admit of no comparison. By the same method of reasoning, we discover the cause why "no substantive is susceptible of these degrees of comparison." A "mountain" cannot be said MORE TO BE OR TO EXIST than a "mole-hill;" nor the "lion" A cannot be "more a lion" than the lion B: but the "more" or "less" must be sought for in their quantities or qualities; a mountain is "more bulky" than a molehill, and the lion A is "more fierce" than the lion B; the excess being always derived from their attributes.

Of the adverbs or secondary qualities already mentioned, those denoting intension and remission may be called adverbs of QUANTITY CONTINUOUS; "once," "twice," "thrice," &c. are adverbs of QUANTITY DISCRETE; "more" and "most," "less" and "least," to which may be added "equally," "proportionally," &c. are adverbs of RELATION. There are others of QUALITY; as when we say, "HONESTLY industrious," "PRUDENTLY brave," "they fought BRAVELY," "he painted FINELY," &c.

The adverbs hitherto mentioned, are common TO VERBS OF EVERY SPECIES; but there are some which are confined to "verbs" properly so called, that is to say, to such as denote "motions" or "energies"

with their “privations.” All motion and rest imply “time” and “place” as a kind of necessary coincidence. Hence, if we would express the “place” or “time” of either, we must needs have recourse to adverbs formed for this purpose; of PLACE, as when we say “the flood THERE,” “he went HENCE,” “he travelled FAR,” &c. or of TIME, as when we say, “he stood THEN,” “he went AFTERWARD,” “he travelled FORMERLY,” &c. Should it be asked, Why “adverbs of time,” when verbs have “tenses”? The answer is, though tenses may be sufficient to denote the greater distinctions of time, yet to denote them all by tenses would be a perplexity without end. What a variety of forms would be necessary to denote “yesterday,” “to day,” “to-morrow,” “formerly,” “just now,” “now,” “immediately,” “presently,” “soon,” “hereafter”? &c.

To these adverbs just mentioned may be added those which denote the “intensions and remissions peculiar to MOTION,” such as “speedily,” “hastily,” “swiftly,” “slowly,” &c.; as also adverbs of “place” made out of “prepositions,” such as “upward” and “downward,” from “up” and “down.” In some instances the preposition suffers no change, but becomes an adverb by nothing more than its application: as when we say, “he rides ABOUT,” “he was NEAR falling,” &c.

There are likewise adverbs of INTERROGATION; such as, “where,” “whence,” “wither,” “how” &c. of which there is this remarkable, that when they lose their “interrogative power,” they assume that of a “relative,” so as to represent the “relative” or “subjunctive pronoun;” as in this doggerel translation of a line from Virgil,

And corn doth grow WHERE Troy town stood;

that is to say, “corn groweth in that place IN WHICH Troy stood,” the power of the relative being implied in the adverb. It is in like manner, that the “relative pronoun” becomes an “interrogative;” as in this line from Milton,

WHO first seduc’d them to that foul revolt?

The reason of this is as follows: the “pronoun” and “adverbs” here mentioned are all, in their original character, RELATIVES. Even when they become interrogatives, they lose not this character, but are still relatives as much as ever: the difference is, that WITHOUT an interrogation they have reference to a subject which is antecedent, “definite,” and “known;” WITH an interrogation, to a subject which is “subsequent,” “indefinite,” and “unknown,” and which it is expected the answer should express and ascertain. “WHO first seduc’d them?” The question itself supposes a seducer, to which, though “unknown,” the pronoun “who” has a reference -- “Th’ infernal serpent.” Here, in the answer, we have the subject, which was “indefinite,” ascertained; so that we see WHO, in the interrogation, is as much a “relative” as if it had been said originally, without any interrogation at all, “It was the infernal serpent WHO first seduced them”: and thus interrogatives and relatives mutually pass into one another.

Having thus considered all those parts of speech which ARE SIGNIFICANT OF THEMSELVES, we proceed to those AUXILIARY PARTS, which are only SIGNIFICANT WHEN ASSOCIATED WITH OTHERS, which we have already said are either DEFINITIVES or CONNECTIVES. Of which in their order.

### CHAPTER III: Concerning DEFINITIVES commonly called ARTICLES

The knowledge of man is at best but limited and confined. Although we have invented words to denominate almost all the substances which exist, yet as it is impossible for any person to be acquainted with all of these, it was necessary to fall upon some contrivance in language to obviate the difficulties which would arise from this cause. With this view, we have already seen, that substances have been divided into general classes, each of which includes under it several lesser subdivisions; the names of which general

classes, being but few, may be more easily retained, as “animal,” “edifice,” “motion,” &c. for by referring the several objects that we may accidentally see, and with which we are unacquainted, to the several classes to which they may belong, we are in some measure enabled to communicate our ideas without the knowledge of the particular names. But as this particular object must in some manner be distinguished from others of the same class to which it belongs, a particular class of words was found necessary to define and ascertain these individuals, which has given rise to this order of words which we now treat, and which we have called “definitives,” because they serve to “define and ascertain any particular object, so as to separate it from the general class to which it does belong, and of course, denote its individuality.” The principal of these definitives have been usually called ARTICLES, the nature of which may be explained as follows.

Supposing I see an object with which I am totally unacquainted, having a head and limbs, and appearing to possess the powers of self motion and sensation. If I know it not as an individual, I refer it to its proper species, and call it “a dog,” “a horse,” “a lion,” or the like; and if none of the names of any species with which I am acquainted fit it, I refer it to the genus, and call it “an animal.”

But this is not enough. The object at which we are looking, and want to distinguish, is perhaps an individual. -- Of what kind? “Known” or “unknown”? Seen now “for the first time,” or “seen before” and now remembered? It is here we shall discover the use of the two articles A and THE; for the article A respects our “primary” perception, and denotes individuals as “unknown;” whereas THE respects our “secondary” perception, and denotes individuals as “known.” To explain this by an example, I see an object pass by which I never saw till then: What do I say? “There goes A beggar with A long beard.” The man departs, and returns a week after: What do I then say? “There goes THE beggar with THE long beard.” Here the article only is changed, the rest remains unaltered. Yet mark the force of this apparently minute change. The individual once vague is now recognized as “something known,” and that merely by the efficacy of this latter article, which tacitly insinuates a kind of previous acquaintance, by referring a present perception to a like perception already past. Hence therefore we see, that although the articles A and THE are both of them “definitives,” as they circumscribe the latitude of genera and species, by reducing them, for the most part, to denote individuals; yet they differ in this respect, that the article A leaves the individual itself unascertained, but the article THE ascertains the individual also, and is for that reason the more accurate definitive of the two. They differ likewise in this respect, that as the article A serves only to separate one particular object from the general class to which it belongs, it cannot be applied to plurals. But as the article THE serves to define objects, or refer to them as already known, without relation to number, or any other circumstances, it is applicable to both numbers indiscriminately, as well as nouns of every “gender,” without suffering any sort of change; for it is evident, that no variation of the nature of the noun can make any difference in those words which serve to define or denote a certain reference to them. So that although we find some modern languages which admit of a variation of their article, which relates to the gender of the noun with which it is associated, yet this cannot be considered as essential to this species of words: and so far is this from being an improvement to the language, that it only serves to perplex and confuse, as it always presents a particular idea of sex, where in many cases it is not in the least necessary.

Of all the parts of speech which may be considered as essential to language, there is none in which we find so many languages defective as in this. For we know of no language, except our own, which has the particular article A; and the Latin language has no word of the same import with the word THE. The reason of which deficiency is, that as other parts of speech may be so easily converted from their original meaning, and be made to assume the character of definitives, they have made some of these perform both of these offices; and as the article A only separates a particular object, and is therefore so nearly allied to a numeral, many languages, as the French, Italian, Spanish, and German, have made the numeral word ONE supply its office, while others, as the Greek, have denoted this particular object by a mere

negation of the other article; and as the article THE agrees with pronouns in this respect, that they both denote reference, the Latins made their pronoun, by a forced periphrasis, supply the place of this. But all of these methods of supplying the want of the genuine article are defective, as will appear more particularly by and by. As articles are by their nature definitives, it follows of course, that they cannot be united with such words as are in their own nature as definite as they may be; nor with such words which, being indefinite, cannot properly be made otherwise: but only with those words which, tho' indefinite, are yet capable, through the article, of becoming definite. Hence we see the reason why it is absurd to say THE I or THE THOU, because nothing can make these pronouns more "definite" than they are; and the same may be said of proper names. Neither can we say THE BOTH, because these words are in their own nature each of them perfectly defined. Thus, if it be said, "I have read BOTH poets," this plainly indicates "a definite pair," of whom some mention has been made already. On the contrary, if it be said, "I have read TWO poets," this may mean "any pair" out of all that ever existed. And hence this numeral, being in this sense "indefinite," (as indeed are all others as well as itself,) is forced "to assume the article" whenever it would become "definite." Hence also it is, that as TWO, when taken alone, has reference to some "primary" and "indefinite" perception, while the article THE has reference to some perception "secondary" and "definite," it is bad language to say TWO THE MEN, as this would be "blending of incompatibles," that is to say, of "a defined substantive" with an "undefined attributive." On the contrary, to say BOTH THE MEN, is good and allowable; because the substantive cannot possibly be less apt, by being defined, to coalesce with an attributive which is defined as well as itself. So likewise it is correct to say, THE TWO MEN; because here the article, being placed at the beginning, "extends its power" as well through substantive as attributive, and equally tends to "define" them both.

As some of the words above admit of no article, because they are by nature as definite as may be; so there are others which admit it not, because they are not to be defined at all. Of this sort are all INTERROGATIVES. If we question about substances, we cannot say THE WHO IS THIS; but WHO IS THIS? And the same as to "qualities," and both kinds of "quantities": for we say, without an article, WHAT SORT OF, HOW MANY, HOW GREAT? The reason is, the article THE respects beings "about which we are ignorant;" for as to what we know, interrogation is superfluous. In a word, the "natural associators with articles" are ALL THOSE COMMON APPELLATIVES WHICH DENOTE THE SEVERAL GENERA AND SPECIES OF BEINGS. It is these, which, by assuming a different article, serve either to explain an individual upon its first being perceived, or else to indicate, upon its return, a recognition or repeated knowledge.

But although proper names do not admit of the article, being in their own nature "definite;" yet as these often fall into "homonymic," that is, different persons often go by the same name, it is necessary to distinguish these from one another, to prevent the ambiguity that this would occasion. For this purpose we are obliged to have recourse to "adjectives" or "epithets." For example, there were two "Grecian chiefs" who bore the name of "Ajax;" and was it not without reason that "Mnestheus" uses epithets, when his intention was to distinguish the one from the other: "If both Ajaxes" cannot be spared, (says he) "at least let mighty Telamonian Ajax come." But as epithets are in their own nature perfectly indefinite, seeing the same adjective may be applied to infinite subjects, it is necessary to define these when we want to apply them to any particular object; so that it is necessary to endow these with an article, that they may have a "reference to some single person only." And thus it is we say, "Trypho THE grammarian," "Appolodorus THE Cyrenian," &c. It is with reason, therefore, that the article is here also added, as it brings the adjectives to an individuality as precise as the proper name. Even common appellatives, by the help of an article, come to have the force of proper names, without the assistance of any epithet whatever. Thus, in English, "city" is a name common to many places, and "speaker" a name common to many men. Yet if we prefix the article, THE CITY means our metropolis; and THE SPEAKER, a high officer in the British parliament. And hence, by an easy transition, the article, from denoting "reference," comes to denote "eminence" also; that is to say, from implying an "ordinary" pre-acquainted, to presume a kind of general and universal notoriety. Thus, among the Greeks, THE POET meant Homer, and THE STAGYRITE meant

Aristotle; not but that there were many poets besides Homer, and many stagyrites besides Aristotle, but none equally illustrious.

The articles already mentioned are those strictly so called; but, besides these, there are the PRONOMINAL ARTICLES, such as “this,” “that,” “any,” “some,” “all,” “other,” “none,” &c. Of these we have already spoken in the chapter upon pronouns, where we have shewn when they may be taken as pronouns, and when as articles. Yet, in truth, if the essence of an article be to “define” and “ascertain,” they are much more strictly articles than any thing else, and ought to be considered as such in universal grammar. Thus, when we say, “THIS picture I approve, but THAT I dislike;” what do we perform by the help of these definitives, but bring down the common appellatives to denote individuals? So when we say, “SOME men are virtuous, but ALL men are mortal;” what is the natural effect of the ALL and SOME, but to define that “universality” and “particularity” which would remain indefinite were we to take them away? The same is evident in such sentences as these; “SOME substances have sensation, OTHERS want it; choose ANY WAY of acting, and SOME men will find fault, &c.” For here, SOME, OTHER, and ANY, serve all of them to “define” different parts of a given whole; SOME, to denote a “definite part;” ANY, to denote an “indefinite;” and OTHER, to denote the “remaining part,” when a part has been already assumed. Even the attributive pronouns, “my,” “thy,” “his,” “hers,” &c. are, in strictness, more properly articles than any thing else, seeing each of them serves only to define and ascertain the individual object to which they are applied. As when we say, “MY house is less commodious than YOURS; HER form is more elegant than HIS, &c.” For in these examples what do the words MY and YOURS do, but ascertain two individual “forms,” which are compared with one another? In the same manner we have already seen nouns sometimes lay aside their own proper character, and become definitives, as in the words ALEXANDER’S, CAESAR’S, POMPEY’S, &c. which may be said to form so many NOMINAL ARTICLES. But of these we have spoken so fully in the chapter of nouns, that it is unnecessary to say more of them in this place.

Before we leave this subject, we shall produce one example to shew the utility of this species of words; which, although of themselves insignificant, and seemingly of small importance; yet, when properly applied, serve to make a few general terms be sufficient for the accurate expression of a great variety of particulars, and thus makes language capable of expressing things “infinite,” without wandering into infinitude itself. -- To explain this, let the general term be MAN, which I have occasion to employ for the denoting of some particular. Let it be required to express this particular, as Unknown, I say, “A man”: -- Known, I say, “THE man”: -- Definite, “A CERTAIN man”: -- Indefinite, “ANY man”: -- Present and near, “THIS man”: -- Present and distant, “THAT man”: -- Like to some other, “SUCH a man”: -- Different from some other, “ANOTHER man”: -- An indefinite multitude, “MANY men”: -- A definite multitude, “A THOUSAND men”: -- The ones of a multitude, taken throughout; “EVERY man”: -- The same ones, taken with distinction, “EACH man”: -- Taken in order, “FIRST man, SECOND man, &c.”: -- The whole multitude of particulars taken collectively; “ALL men”: -- The negation of that multitude, “NO man”: -- A number of particulars present, and at some distance, “THESE men”: -- At a greater distance, or opposed to others, “THOSE men”: -- A number present and near, “THESE men”: -- A number of individuals different from another number, “OTHER men”: -- A great number of individuals taken collectively, “MANY men”: -- A small number, “FEW men”: -- A proportionally greater number, “MORE men”: -- Smaller number, “FEWER men”: -- And so on we might go almost to infinitude. But not to dwell longer upon this article we shall only remark, that “minute changes in PRINCIPLES, lead to mighty changes in EFFECTS;” so that PRINCIPLES are well entitled to regard, however trivial they may appear.

#### CHAPTER IV: Of CONNECTIVES

CONNECTIVES, according as they connect either sentences or words, are called by the different names of CONJUNCTIONS, or PREPOSITIONS. Of these names, that of the “preposition” is taken from a mere accident, as it commonly stands in connection before the part which it connects. The “conjunction,” as is

evident, has reference to its essential character. We shall treat of these two separately.

## Section I. Of CONJUNCTIONS

A CONJUNCTION is “a part of speech void of signification itself, but so formed as to help signification, by making TWO or more significant sentences to be ONE significant sentence.” As, therefore, it is the ESSENCE of a conjunction to connect sentences; at the same time that they do this, they must either “connect” their meaning or “not.” For example, let us take these two sentences, “Rome was enslaved,” -- “Caesar was ambitious,” and connect them together by the conjunction BECAUSE; “Rome was enslaved, BECAUSE Caesar was ambitious.” Here the meaning, as well as the sentences, appear to be connected. But if I say, “manners must be reformed, OR liberty will be lost;” here the conjunction OR, though it join the sentences, yet, as to their respective meanings, is a perfect DISJUNCTIVE.” And thus it appears, that though all conjunctions conjoin sentences, yet, with respect to the sense, some are CONJUNCTIVE, others are DISJUNCTIVE.

Those “conjunctions which conjoin both sentences and their meanings” are either COPULATIVES or CONTINUATIVES. The principle copulative in English is AND. The continuatives are much more numerous; IF, BECAUSE, THEREFORE, WHEREFORE, HENCE, THAT, &c. The difference between these is this: The “copulative” does no more than barely “couple” sentences, and is therefore applicable to all subjects whose natures are “not incompatible”: “Continuatives,” on the contrary, by a more intimate connection, consolidate sentences “into one continuous whole;” and are therefore applicable only to subjects which have an “essential coincidence”: For example, it is no way improper to say, “Lysippus was a statuary, AND Priscian a grammarian;” “the sun shineth, AND the sky is clear;” because these are things that may co-exist, and yet imply no absurdity. But it would be absurd to say, “Lysippus was a statuary, BECAUSE Priscian was a grammarian;” though not to say, “the sun shineth BECAUSE the sky is clear.” The reason is, with respect to the first, the “co-incidence” is merely “accidental”: with respect to the last, it is “essential,” and founded in nature.

As to the “continuatives,” they are SUPPOSITIVE, such as “if;” or POSITIVE, such as “because,” “therefore,” “as,” &c. Take examples of each: -- “You will live happily IF you live honestly”: “You live happily BECAUSE you live honestly”: -- “You live honestly, THEREFORE you live happily.” The difference between these “continuatives” is this: The “suppositives” denote “connection,” but do not assert actual existence; the “positives” imply both the “one” and the “other.”

These “possessives” above-mentioned are either CAUSAL, such as “because,” “since,” “as,” &c. or COLLECTIVE, such as “therefore,” “wherefore,” &c. The difference between which is this: The “causals” subjoin “causes” to “effects;” “the sun is in eclipse BECAUSE the moon intervenes”: The “collectives” subjoin “effects” to “causes;” “the moon intervenes, THEREFORE the sun is in eclipse.” We therefore use “causals” in those instances where the “effect” being conspicuous we seek for its “cause;” and “collectives,” in demonstrations and science, properly so called, where the “cause” being first known, by its help we discern “effects.”

All these “continuatives” are resolvable into “copulatives”: For, instead of saying, “BECAUSE it is day, it is light;” we may say, “It is day, AND it is light.” Instead of “IF it is day, it is light;” we may say, “It is at the same time necessary to be day, AND to be light.” The reason is, That the power of the copulative extends to all connections, as well to the “essential” as to the “causal.” Hence the continuative may be resolved into a “copulative and something more;” that is to say, into a “copulative” implying an “essential” coincidence in the subjects conjoined.

As to “causal conjunctions,” we may further observe, that there is no one of the four species of causes

which they are not capable of denoting, For example,

the MATERIAL cause: "The trumpet sounds, BECAUSE it is made of metal."

The FORMAL: "The trumpet sounds, BECAUSE it is long and hollow."

The EFFICIENT: The trumpet sounds, BECAUSE an artist blows it."

The FINAL: "The trumpet sounds, THAT it may rouse our courage."

It is worth observing, that the three first causes are expressed by the strongest affirmation; because, if the "effect" actually be, that must be also. But this is not the case with respect to the last, which is only affirmed as a thing that "may" happen. The reason is, That however this may be the end which set the artist first to work, it may still be beyond his power to obtain, and which, like all other contingents, may either happen or not. Hence also it is connected by a particular conjunction, THAT, absolutely confined to this "cause."

We now come to the DISJUNCTIVE CONJUNCTIONS; a species of words which bear this contrary name, because, while they "DISJOIN the sense," they "CONJOIN the sentences."

With respect to these, we may observe, that as there is a principle of UNION diffused through all things by which THIS WHOLE is kept together and preserved from dissipation; so there is, in like manner, a principle of DIVERSITY diffused through all, the source of "distinction," of "number," and of "order." Now, it is to express in some degree the "modifications of this diversity," that DISJUNCTIVE CONJUNCTIONS seem at first to have been invented.

Of these "disjunctives," some are SIMPLE, some ADVERSATIVE. "Simple," as when we say "EITHER it is day, OR it is night;" "adversative," as when we say "It is not day, BUT it is night." The difference between these is, that the "simple" do no more than merely disjoin; the "adversative" disjoin with a concomitant "opposition." Add to this, that the adversative are definite; the simple indefinite. Thus, when we say, "the number three is not an even number, BUT an odd;" we not only disjoin two opposite attributes, but we "definitely" affirm one, and deny the other. But when we say, "the number of the stars is EITHER even OR odd;" though we assert one attribute "to be" and the other "not to be," yet the alternative is notwithstanding left "indefinite."

As to "adversative disjunctives," it has been already said, that they imply OPPOSITION. Now, there can be no opposition of the SAME attribute in the SAME subject; as when we say, "Nereus was beautiful": but the opposition must be either of the SAME attribute in different subjects, as when we say, "Brutus was a patriot, BUT Caesar was not;" or of DIFFERENT attributes in the SAME subject, as when we say, "Gorgius was a sophist, BUT not a philosopher;" or of DIFFERENT attributes in DIFFERENT subjects, as when we say, "Plato was a philosopher, BUT Hippias was a sophist." The conjunctions used for all these purposes may be called "absolute" adversatives.

But there are "other" adversatives besides these; as when we say, "Nereus was more beautiful THAN Achilles;" -- "Virgil was AS great a poet AS Cicero was an orator." The character of these latter is, that they go farther than the former, by marking not only "opposition," but that "equality" or "excess" which arises from the comparison of subjects; and therefore they may be called "adversatives of comparison."

Besides the adversatives here mentioned, there are two other species, of which the most eminent are UNLESS and ALTHOUGH: For example, "Troy will be taken, UNLESS the Palladium be preserved;" "Troy will be taken, ALTHOUGH Hector defend it." The nature of these adversatives may be thus explained.

As every event is naturally allied to its cause, so, by parity of reason, it is opposed to its preventive; and as every cause is either “adequate” or “inadequate,” (inadequate, when it endeavours, without being effectual), so in like manner is every preventive. Now, “adequate” preventives are expressed by such adversatives -- as UNLESS: “Troy will be taken, UNLESS the Palladium be preserved;” that is, that this alone is sufficient to prevent it. The “inadequate” are expressed by such adversatives as ALTHOUGH: “Troy will be taken, ALTHOUGH Hector defend it;” that is, Hector’s defense will prove ineffectual. These may be called adversatives ADEQUATE and INADEQUATE.

Before we leave this subject, we may observe that the words “when” and “where,” and all others of the same nature, such as “whence,” “whether,” “whenever,” “wherever,” etc. may be called ADVERBIAL conjunctions; because they participate the nature both of adverbs and conjunctions; of “conjunctions,” as they “conjoin” sentences; of “adverbs,” as they denote the attributes either of “time” or “place.” And these “adverbial” conjunctions (contrary to the character of “accessory” words, which have strictly no signification but when associated with other words) have a kind of obscure signification when taken alone, by denoting these attributives of time and place. And hence it is, that they appear in grammar like “zoo-phytes” in nature, a kind of middle beings, of amphibious character, which, by sharing the attributes of the higher and the lower, conduce to link the whole together.

## Section II. Of those Connectives, called PREPOSITIONS

“A PREPOSITION is a part of speech devoid itself of signification, but so formed as to unite two words that are significant and that refuse to coalesce of themselves.” This connective power (which relates to words only, and not to sentences) will be better understood by the following observations.

Some things naturally coalesce and unite of themselves, while others refuse to do so without help, and as it were by compulsion. For example, all quantities and qualities coalesce immediately with their substances: thus it is we say, “a fierce lion,” “a vast mountain,” &c. In like manner actions coalesce with their agents, and passions with their patients: thus it is we say, “Alexander conquers,” “Darius is conquered.” Nay, as every energy is a kind of medium between its agent and patient, the whole three, agent, energy, and patient, coalesce with the same facility; as when we say, “Alexander conquers Darius.” Farther than this, as the greatest part of attributives themselves may be characterized, as when we say of such attributives as “ran,” “beautiful,” “learned,” &c. “he ran ‘swiftly,’” “she was ‘very’ beautiful,” “he was ‘moderately’ learned” &c. these must readily coalesce with the attributes which they thus characterize. From all which it appears, that “those parts of speech unite of themselves in grammar whose original archetypes unite of themselves in nature.” Hence, therefore, it is, that although substances naturally coincide with their attributes, yet they absolutely refuse doing so one with another: and hence those known maxims in physics, that “body is impenetrable,” that “two bodies cannot possess the same place,” &c.

From these principles it follows, that when we form a sentence, the substance without difficulty coincides with the verb, from the natural coincidence of substance with energy; “the SUN WARMETH;” so likewise the energy with the subject on which it operates; “WARMETH the EARTH”: so likewise both substance and energy with their proper attributes; “the SPLENDID SUN GENIALLY WARMETH the FERTILE EARTH.” But suppose we are to add other substantives, as for instance, “air,” or “beams;” how could these coincide, or under what character be introduced? not either as the “energizer” of the verb, nor as “the subject on which it operates;” for both of these places are already filled up, the first by the word SUN, and the last by the substance EARTH: not as “attributes” to these last, or to any other thing; for attributes by nature they neither “are” nor “can be made.” Here, then, we perceive the rise and use of prepositions: by these we connect those substantives to sentences, which, at the time, are unable to “coalesce of themselves.” Let us assume, for instance, a pair of these connectives, THROUGH and WITH, and mark their effect upon the substances here mentioned; “the splendid sun WITH his beams genially warmeth

THROUGH the air the fertile earth”: the sentence, as before, remains entire and one; the substantives required are both introduced, and not a word which was there before is displaced from its proper station.

It must be here observed, that “most” if not “all” prepositions seem originally formed to denote the relations of “place;” because this is that grand relation which bodies or natural substances maintain at all times to one another, whether they are contiguous or remote, whether in motion or at rest: thus we have prepositions to denote the “continuous relation of body;” as when we say, “Caius walked WITH a staff;” “the statue stood UPON a pedestal;” “the river ran OVER a precipice”: others for the “detached relation;” as when we say, “he is going TO Italy;” “the sun is risen ABOVE the hills;” “these figs came FROM Turkey”: So as to “motion” and “rest;” only with this difference, that here the preposition varies its character with the verb: thus if we say, “that lamp hangs FROM the ceiling,” the preposition FROM assumes the character of “quiescence”: but if we say, “that lamp is falling FROM the ceiling,” the preposition assumes a character of “motion.” So in Milton;

-----To support uneasy steps

OVER the burning marl-----

Again,

-----He with looks of cordial love

Hung OVER her enamour’d.-----

In the first of these examples, OVER denotes “motion,” and in the last it denotes “rest.”

But though the original use of prepositions was to denote the relations of “place,” they could not be confined to this office only; but by degrees extended themselves to subjects “incorporeal,” and came to denote relations as well “intellectual” as “local.” Thus because, in “place,” he who is “above” has commonly the advantage of him who is “below,” we transfer OVER and UNDER to “dominion” and “obedience”: of a king we say, “he ruled OVER his people;” of a common soldier, “he served UNDER such a general”: so too we say, “WITH thought;” “WITHOUT attention;” “thinking OVER a subject;” “UNDER anxiety;” “FROM fear;” “OUT OF love;” “THROUGH jealousy,” &c. All which instances, with many of the like kind, shew, that the “first words” of men, like their “first ideas,” had an immediate reference to “sensible objects;” and that, in after days, when they began to discern with their “intellect,” they took these words which they found already made, and transferred them, by “metaphor,” to “intellectual conception.” There is indeed no method to express new ideas, but either by “metaphor” or by “coining new words;” both which have been practiced by philosophers, according to the nature and exigency of the occasion.

In the foregoing use of prepositions, we have seen how they are employed by way of “juxta-position;” that is to say, where they are prefixed to a word without becoming a part of it: but they may be also used by way of “composition;” that is, they may be prefixed to a word so as to become a part of it: thus, to “UNDERstand, to FOREtell, To OVERact, to UNDERvalue, to OUTgo,” &c. are so many distinct words formed by prepositions joined intimately with some other word: in all which cases, the prepositions commonly transfuse something of their own meaning into the word with which they are compounded; and this imparted meaning in most instances, will be found resolvable into some of the relations of “place,” as used either in its “proper” or “metaphorical” acceptation.

Besides the above parts of speech, there is another, which cannot be comprehended under any of the foregoing classes, called INTERJECTIONS: of this kind are the words, “AH!” “ALAS!” “FIE!” &c. This spe-

cies of words coincide with no part of speech, but are either uttered alone, or else thrown into a sentence, without altering its form either in syntax or signification. It may be therefore objected, that as we say, that all language is divided into the several parts above enumerated, and this class cannot be comprehended in any of these divisions; of course, the analysis that we have made cannot be just, because it does not comprehend the whole.

To this objection it may be answered, that the language of which we have been treating, is that which has been formed by mutual compact, for the purposes of reasoning and speculation; that besides this artificial language, man, like every other sensitive animal, is endowed with a natural language, by which he can express any strong sensation. This language does not owe its characteristic expression to the arbitrary form of articulation; but derives its whole force from the tone of voice, and modification of countenance and gesture: and of consequence these tones and gestures express the same meaning without any relation to the articulation which they may assume, and are therefore universally understood by all mankind. Now, "interjection" is the name by which we distinguish these natural expressions: these cannot be properly called words, or parts of speech; but certain adventitious sounds, or voices of nature, expressing those passions and natural emotions which spontaneously arise in the mind upon the view or narrative of interesting events. We must, therefore, still conclude, that all language properly so called is composed of "words," all of which may be arranged into the several classes above mentioned: and as a recapitulation of the whole that we have said, we subjoin the following table, which presents at one view the several classes and subdivisions of words.