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I. PROBLEM

Traditional English grammar has been taught in schools for some time. Some linguists have claimed that eighteenth-century grammarians are responsible for setting up this traditional standard. They also have claimed that Latin was used as the basis or standard for these English grammars. Charles Fries, a structural linguist states:

There was a want for an academy in English starting with the seventeenth century, but instead of such an academy recognized for the purpose of providing a definite standard of correctness for the English language there were published in the second and third quarters of the eighteenth century an increasing number of English grammars whose authors set out to do for language those very things which it was hoped an academy would accomplish. The standard of correctness and propriety furnished by these grammarians was not based upon usage, for the grammarians insisted that "even our most approved authors offended against every part of grammar," but it was a standard based upon Latin syntax and "reasons" expressed in arbitrary rules.¹

Fries also says:

Our common school grammars even yet rest in large measure upon the eighteenth century ideal . . . ²

Fries categorizes grammars of the eighteenth century as guides for foreigners, Latin students, and people wishing to learn correct English. One grammar was written in Latin aimed at foreigners, who might wish to learn to read English. A number of grammar books were introductions to Latin grammar, thus enabling the pupil to learn Latin more easily.

Another group of grammars was meant to teach English people correct English. But, he concludes that all three groups had "common reasons for keeping to the old apparatus"

¹Charles E. Bennett, A Latin Grammar (Boston and Chicago: Allyn and Bacon, 1895), p. 236.

²Ibid., p. 151.
because of the "fear of introductory innovations and the desire to lay a "good foundation" for Latin while teaching English.  

Fries quotes a section from the preface of Buchanan's grammar of 1767 as an expression of the use of Latin rules:

"Considering the many grammatical Impropieties to be found in our best Writers, such as Swift, Addison, Pope, etc., a Systematical English Syntax is not beneath the Notice of the Learned themselves. Should it be urged, that in the Time of these Writers, English was but a very little subjected to Grammar, that they had scarcely a single Rule to direct them, a question readily occurs. Had they not the Rules of Latin Syntax to direct them?"  

Samuel R. Levin, in discussing the comparison between traditional and structural grammar mentions "the fallacy represented by the grammar of English . . . derived from the grammar of another language (Latin)."  

The purpose of this paper is to prove or disprove that the eighteenth-century English grammar was affected by Latin rules, as has been claimed by the above structural linguists and others.

II. METHOD

The texts used for comparison in this project were, A Short Introduction to English Grammar, by B. P. Lowth, 1763, and a standard Latin grammar, A Latin Grammar by Charles E. Bennett, 1895. The nineteenth-century English grammar used as a comparison to the eighteenth-century English grammar was An Analytical and Practical Grammar of the English Language by Reverend Peter Bullions, D. D., 1854.  

Since structural grammar is the most complete modern description of the English language, a structural linguistics text was used to locate English expressions inaccurately defined by the eighteenth-century English grammars. Since Nelson Francis's

---

3Ibid., p. 225.  
6This is the first widely circulated English grammar for school children.  
7Standard Latin text recommended by Mr. Kasparek, Associate Professor of Latin at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.  
8This text represented the typical nineteenth-century grammar.
is a standard structural grammar text, it was used in this project.9

III. COMPARISON OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH
    GRAMMAR WITH STANDARD LATIN TEXT

Francis's definition of grammar is:

the branch of linguistics which deals with the organization of morphemic units into meaningful combinations larger than words.10

The eighteenth-century English grammar definition is similar. However, no mention is made of a smaller unit, the "morpheme" which may or may not be a word.

Grammar is the art of rightly expressing11 our thoughts by words. Grammar treats of sentences, and the several parts of which they are compounded.12

The nineteenth-century English grammar text defines grammar as the "art of speaking and writing the English language with propriety."13 Therefore, a moral judgment has been included--"propriety." Also, the structural grammar does not mention using grammar for the improvement of speaking.14

The division of the parts of speech used in the eighteenth-century English grammar were almost the same or similar in many ways to those used in the Latin grammar text. In fact, the Latin book mentioned on one of the introductory pages that

The Parts of Speech in Latin are the same as in English, viz. Nouns, Adjectives, Pronouns, Verbs, Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions, and Interjections, but the Latin has no article.15

In considering the noun as the first part of speech to be


10Ibid., p. 223.

11The long s will be used throughout the remainder of the paper for this source.


14Francis, op. cit., p. 225.

15Bennett, op. cit., p. 10.
examined, the structuralists define a noun by five criteria:

1. noun-determiners
2. Inflections: plural (-es) and possessive ('s).
3. Derivational suffixes—added either to base of a word belonging to other parts of speech. E.g., -age, -ance, -ce, etc.
4. Position in relation to other identified parts of speech.
5. Superfixes (or stress patterns)\textsuperscript{16}

The traditional definition of a noun in the eighteenth-century English grammar was:

A Substantive, or Noun, is the name of a thing; of whatever we conceive in any way to subsist or of which we have any notion, Substantives are of two sorts; Proper and Common Names.\textsuperscript{17}

The definition given of a noun in the nineteenth-century English grammar was the same as the eighteenth-century definition: "A noun is the name of a person, place, or thing."\textsuperscript{18}

The Latin text defined a noun as follows:

A noun is the name of a person, place, thing, or quality, as Caesar, Roma, penna (feather), virtus (courage). Nouns are either Proper or Common.\textsuperscript{19}

Thus, it can be seen that the eighteenth-century definition is the same as the Latin definition of a noun. And, the nineteenth-century definition has the exact wording.

In Francis the number (Latin term) of a noun is considered one of the five criteria for determining a noun: "Nouns have two inflections, the plural (-es; allomorphs, -s/ -z/ and -iz) and the possessive (sometimes called the genitive) (-'s; allomorphs, -s/ -z/ -iz/ ø)."\textsuperscript{20}

In the eighteenth-century English grammar the noun is made Plural, for the most part, by adding to it "s" or "es" where it is necessary for the pronunciation, as "king," "kings," "fox," "foxes."\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{16} Francis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 237.
\textsuperscript{17} Lowth, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 21, 22.
\textsuperscript{18} Bullions, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{19} Bennett, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{20} Francis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 238.
\textsuperscript{21} Lowth, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23.
The Latin source mentions that Latin has two numbers—the Singular and Plural. The Singular denotes one object; the plural, more than one.22

Consequently, it is apparent that the traditional and Latin definitions of "number" coincide and take no cognizance of pronunciation or variation of inflection.

Structural grammar does not consider gender as such, but determines it by substitute groups.

1. he—they; man, father, etc.
2. she—they; woman, mother.
3. it—they; house, tree, etc.
4. he/she—they; parent, child.
5. he/it—they; bull, ram, tomcat.
6. she/it—they; cow, ewe, ship.
7. he/she/it—they.
8. it/they—they.
9. he/she/they/-they (or no plural), somebody, someone.
10. it (no plural) dirt, mathematics.
11. they (no singular) pants, scissors, clothes.23

Consequently there are eleven gender groups.

The eighteenth-century English grammar treats of gender:

The English Language, with singular propriety, following nature alone applies the distinction of Masculine and Feminine only to the names of animals; all the rest are Neuter; except by poetical or rhetorical fiction.24

The Latin source says:

There are three Genders—Masculine, Feminine, and Neuter. Gender in Latin is either natural or grammatical. The gender ... is natural when it is based upon sex. Grammatical gender is determined not by sex, but by the general significance of the word, or the ending of its Nominative Singular.25

Again, the English traditionalists coincide with the Latin grammarians.

Francis mentions two cases, the "common" and the possessive (genitive).26 The genitive appears by inflection and position.

---

22 Bennett, op. cit., p. 11.
23 Francis, op. cit., p. 250.
25 Bennett, op. cit., p. 10.
26 Not always the genitive.
The "common" or uninflected form of the singular appears everywhere else. 27

The eighteenth-century English grammar mentions:

Nominative: Subject, Predicate adjective, Predicate noun.
Objective: Direct Object, Infinitive as Direct Object.
Possessive: the thing to which the other belongs is placed first with the preposition of before it. 28

And, the Latin source mentions the Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accusative, and Ablative cases. The traditionally defined English Nominative case corresponds to the Latin Nominative case. The traditional English Possessive corresponds to the Latin Genitive case, and the traditional English Objective case relates to the Dative, Accusative, and Ablative cases. 29

The construction in which the Latin Vocative case is used resembles in meaning the "calls" referred to by Francis. The "call addresses a person simply by names or titles, like 'Johnny or 'Mister Chairman.'" 30

Thus, after considering the different aspects of a noun, the similarity can be seen between the eighteenth-century English grammar and the Latin text. The two sources are alike in definition and in description of number. Gender is alike in both, with the exception that the English does not have endings signifying different genders. They have corresponding cases, although the names differ.

Francis defines a pronoun as:

a subgroup of nouns: I, we, you, he, she, it, they and who. They have inflectional variants, but not the (-es) plural and the ('s) possessive of other nouns. They have the forms which are called the objective (or accusative) and the first and second possessive.

They are also classified by person:

first person: speaker; second person: person spoken to; third person: excluding speaker and person spoken to. 31

27Francis, op. cit., p. 239.
29Bennett, op. cit., p. 17.
30Francis, op. cit., p. 376.
31Ibid., p. 244.
Francis mentions that they function as "noun-substitutes." They can substitute for all other nouns, in all structures, according to "patterns" which provide important classification for nouns. He mentions that they resemble function words in having little or no lexical meaning of their own, being dependent for their meaning on the "linguistic or nonlinguistic context" in which they occur. 32

Francis identifies other words, classified structurally as "function nouns." they have the following characteristics:

a. They are morphemically identical or closely related to certain noun determiners.
b. They are unchanging in form, showing neither of the characteristic noun inflections (-es), (-s).
c. They have no noun-marking derivational suffixes.
d. They may appear in most of the structural positions usually occupied by nouns.

GROUP MORPHEMICALLY IDENTICAL WITH NOUN-DETERMINERS:
all enough much
any his several
both more some

MORPHEMIC VARIANTS OF NOUN-DETERMINERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun-determiner</th>
<th>Function Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td>hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERMEDIATE POSITION BETWEEN FULL NOUNS AND FUNCTION NOUNS:

MORPHEMICALLY IDENTICAL WITH CERTAIN NOUN-DETERMINERS, AND LIKE NOUNS HAVING ONE OR ANOTHER OF THE FORMAL NOUN-MARKERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>few</th>
<th>neither</th>
<th>this/these</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>many</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>that/those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most</td>
<td>each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some other words that are "morphemically identical" with noun-determiners may also appear as nouns. They are one, other, and numbers from two to ninety-nine. 33 All have inflectional (-es) and appear with any noun-determiner; one

32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., p. 246.
and other can take the possessive inflection ('-s').

Francis also mentions that compounds of personal pronouns with -self, -selves are pronouns. Two of these, himself and themselves are formed on the objective case form. Myself, yourself, ourselves, yourselves, use the first possessive. Herself has a stem that could be either, while itself uses the subjective form as stem.

Other pronouns included by Francis are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>anybody</th>
<th>everyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>somebody</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobody</td>
<td>anyone</td>
<td>everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>everybody</td>
<td>no one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first column are full nouns, the second "defective nouns," and the third only take possessive inflections.

The eighteenth-century English grammar says that person, number, gender, and case are to be considered in the pronoun. The pronoun was defined as "standing instead of the noun."

The same source mentions that:

Thy, My, Her, Our, Yours, Their, are Pronounal adjectives:
but His (that is, He's) Her's, Our's, Your's, Their's have evidently the Form of the Possessive Case and by Analogy, Mine, Thine, may be esteemed of the same rank.

"Definitive, relative, and distributive" pronouns were listed as follows:

This, that, other, any, some, one, none: these are Definitive, because they define and limit the extent of the Common Name, or General Term, to which they either refer, or are joined.

Who, which, that, are called Relatives, because they more directly refer to some Substantive going before, which therefore is called the Antecedent. They also connect the following part of the sentence with the foregoing.

34 Ibid., p. 249.
35 Ibid., p. 244.
36 Ibid., p. 245.
37 Lowth, op. cit., p. 30.
38 Ibid., p. 31.
39 Ibid., p. 36.
Each, every, either, are called Distributives because they denote the persons, or things, that make up a number, as taken separately or singly. 40

Bennett defines a pronoun as a "word that indicates something without meaning it. He classifies the pronoun into "Personal, Reflexive, Possessive, Demonstrative, Intensive, Relative, Interrogative, and Indefinite." 41

He gives examples of each type of pronoun mentioned. The personal pronouns "correspond to the English, I, you, he, she, it, etc." The reflexive pronouns "refer to the subject of the sentence or clause in which they stand; like myself, yourself, in 'I see myself.'" Possessive pronouns are strictly adjectives of the First and Second Declensions, and are inflected as such. They are: First Person--my, our Second Person--thy, your; Third Person: his, her, its, their. Demonstrative pronouns point out an object as here or there, or as previously mentioned. They are: this(where I am), that(where you are), that (something distinct from the speaker), and the same.

The intensive pronoun "corresponds to the English myself, etc. in 'I, myself, he, himself.'" The relative pronoun is "who." The interrogative pronouns are "who? (substantive) and what? what kind of (adjective)." The indefinite pronouns "have the general force of some one, any one." 42

Therefore, the Latin and the eighteenth-century English sources agree upon some aspects of the pronoun. They have similar definitions. They both mention pronominal adjectives. Each listed possessive pronouns. And, they both used the same words in lists of demonstrative pronouns.

Francis defines verbs according to five criteria. They are as follows:

1. Verbs are a class of lexical words marked by their use of form inflections (-s), (-ed1), (-ed2) and (ing1), by their appearance in verb-phrases with certain auxiliaries, such as can, must, is, has, please, about (to),

40 Ibid.
41 Bennett, op. cit., p. 48.
42 Ibid., pp. 48-53.
keep (on); by a small group of derivational offices, such as (en-) and (-ate); by certain positions relative to clearly marked nouns and occasionally by the superfix (~').

2. Most auxiliaries may build complex combinations with other auxiliaries making a very large repertory of verb phrases.

3. Auxiliaries may appear as function verbs standing in place of a full verb-phrase, when the full verb has been expressly stated or strongly implied in the immediate linguistic context of the nonlinguistic context.

4. The verb do in its various inflectional and phrasal forms may appear as a substitute for a full verb which has appeared in the immediate linguistic context. It is only the verb-substitute.

5. Separable verbs, made up of a full verb followed by an adverb-like form, may appear with their two parts together or separated by intervening words.43

Lowth defines a verb as a "word which signifies to be, to do, or to suffer."44

The Latin source does not define a verb, but merely states:
A finite verb agrees with its subject in Number and Person. Verbs have Voice, Tense, Number, Mood, and Person.45

Thus, the English traditional grammar describes a verb according to meaning while the Latin describes the verb according to form.

Francis mentions that all verbs except a few auxiliaries have two tenses, the "common tense (usually called the present)" and the "past (or preterit) tense."46 Only these two tenses have morphemic changes of verb. Aspect, phase, and mode change by auxiliary.

Both the eighteenth-century and nineteenth-century English grammars and the Latin grammar catalog six tenses. Lowth combines the inchoative aspect with tense when he lists:

| Present Imperfect: "I am (now) loving." |
| Present Perfect: "I have (now) loved." |
| Past Imperfect: "I was (then) loving." |
| Past Perfect: "I had (then) loved." |
| Future Imperfect: "I shall (then) be loving." |
| Future Perfect: "I shall (then) have loved." |

43Francis, op. cit., p. 252.
44Lowth, op. cit., p. 43.
45Bennett, op. cit., p. 165.
46Francis, op. cit., p. 332.
47Lowth, op. cit., p. 45.
The nineteenth-century English grammar also lists six tenses without using the inchoative aspect of the verb.

Present: "I love"
Present Perfect: "I have loved"
Past: "I loved"
Past Perfect: "I had loved"
Future: "I will love"
Future Perfect: "I shall have loved." 48

Bennett lists six tenses for Latin as:

Present: "amō"
Imperfect: "amabam"
Future: "amābo"
Perfect: "amāvī"
Pluperfect: "amāveram"
Future Perfect: "amāverā" 49

Therefore, Latin does have six tenses by changing the form of the Latin verb. Although English has only two tenses by form change, the eighteenth and nineteenth-century English grammars have adopted the Latin terms and have classified forms requiring auxiliaries as pure tenses according to Latin categories.

The English structural source considered "person" as a "distinction" of the verb. Francis explains that:

All English verbs except the modal auxiliaries (can, may, shall, will, must, dare, need) have two persons which can be called common and third singular. Verb forms consisting of base form plus (-s) inflection are in the third-singular person; all others (except certain forms of be) are in the common person. The distribution of these two forms is governed by a type of correlation with the subject which grammarians call concord. Concord may be defined as the complementary distribution of linguistic forms having the same syntactic function in systematic correlation with other formally distinct forms with which they are syntactically linked. 50

"Person" was explained by Lowth as the "signification of the verb" to which "is superadded the designation of Person which it corresponds with the several Personal Pronouns." 51

He also lists three singular and three plural persons with morphemic changes in their endings:

48 Bullions, op. cit., pp. 71, 72, 73.
49 Bennett, op. cit., p. 58.
50 Francis, op. cit., p. 330.
51 Lowth, op. cit., p. 45.
The nineteenth-century English grammar is also concerned with person. This source mentions that

the verb has three Persons, called the first, second, and third. The first asserts of the person speaking; the second of the person spoken to; and the third, of the person or thing spoken of.

The subject of the verb, in the first person singular, is always I; in the plural, we; in the second singular, thou; in the plural ye or you; in the third person, the subject is the name of any person or thing spoken of, or a pronoun of the third person in its stead;55

A paradigm was also later given in the text:

1. I love.
2. Thou lovest.
3. He loves (or loveth).

1. We love.
2. You love.
3. They love.56

Bennett also considers three persons of the verb:

"First, Second, and Third." He expresses these persons in the singular and plural morphemically.

The Personal Endings of the Verb are—

Singular
1. -o; -m; -i (Perf. Indicative)
2. -s; -sti (perf. Indicative)
3. -t;

Plural
1. -mus
2. -tis; istis (perf. Indicative)
3. -nt; -erunt (Perf. Indicative)57

Therefore, the eighteenth-century English grammar is like the Latin source. Both speak of three singular and plural persons. Also, the eighteenth-century source has the morphemic changes of the verb endings, which are rarely used in the eighteenth-century. However, the nineteenth-century English

52 Rarely used in eighteenth-century usage.
53 Ibid.
54 Lowth, op. cit., p. 46.
55 Bullions, op. cit., p. 78.
56 Ibid., p. 85.
57 Bennett, op. cit., p. 54.
grammar also coincides with the Latin verb in person and morphemic changes in the verb endings. The morphemic changes of the verb endings in the nineteenth century should have disappeared by this time. Thus, it seems the nineteenth-century English grammar has gone against custom in order to express the morphemic change in ending as the Latin.

Francis considers another characteristic of the verb, "number," in his definition of "person."

Verb forms consisting of base form + {-s} inflections are in the third-singular person; all others (except certain forms of be) are in the common person.

The seven types of subjects correlating with third-singular verbs may be illustrated as follows:

(1) The man walks; the sun sets; snow falls.
(2) he feels; she speaks; it comes (but note exception in "watch it come")
(3) this looks good; that goes here.
(4) the tall man in the car drives; that in the dish tastes good.
(5) here seems like a good place; eating candy causes tooth decay.
(6) what I want costs money; how it not there remains a mystery.
(7) either his mistakes or his bad luck keeps him poor; peace and quiet seems (or seem) unattainable.

All other kinds of subjects correlate with the common form of the verb. Chief of these are nouns for which they can be substituted; the pronouns, I, you, we, they, me, him, her, us, them; the function nouns these and those; structures of coordination with coordinators and, both . . . and, and the like; a few special included clauses. Some examples:

dogs bark
I
you
we
they

(watch) me

him

her

us

them

They walk

One verb, be, whether as full verb or as auxiliary, has an additional form, the first-singular am, which correlates with the subject, I and a common person form are, which is different from the base be.58

number is mentioned by Lowth as it "corresponds with the number of the noun, Singular or Plural." He explains:

The Verb in some parts of it varies its endings to express or agree with, different persons of the same number as "I love, Thou lovest, he loveth or loves."

So also to express different numbers of the same person; as "Thou lovest, ye love; me loveth; they love."

Bennett simply mentions that verbs have two numbers--Singular and Plural."60

Thus, the eighteenth-century English grammar is the same as the Latin regarding the singular and plural of the verb.

"Verbs," Francis says,"have two voices--active and passive." Only verbs that have the structure, "He ________ the dog" can have passive forms. The "statal passive" has some form of the auxiliary be with the past participle of the verb. The "actional passive" has some form of rot with the past-participle. He gives examples of the types of "voice forms."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>be-PASSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he kills</td>
<td>he is killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set PASSIVE</td>
<td>he gets killed 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above are the only types where the passive can occur.

The eighteenth-century English grammar defines voice of the verb as active and passive. The first section deals with transitive verbs in active and passive.

There are three kinds of Verbs; Active, Passive and Neuter Verbs. A Verb Active expresses Action, and necessarily implies an agent, and an object acted upon; as to love; "I love Thomas."

A Verb Passive expresses a Passion, or a Suffering, or the receiving of an Action; and necessarily implies an Object acted upon; as, to be loved; "Thomas is loved by me."

The next section involves intransitive verbs.

A Verb Neuter expresses Being, or a state or condition of being; when the Agent and the Object acted upon coincide.

59 Lowth, op. cit., pp. 45, 46.
60 Bennett, op. cit., p. 165.
61 Francis, op. cit. p. 334.
and the event is properly neither action nor passion, but rather something between both; as I am, I sleep, I walk.62

Bennett simply classifies a verb as having "two voices--Active and Passive." Later, in the "inflection" section of the book, he expresses the active and passive voices in paradigms, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive Voice</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amor (I am loved)</td>
<td>amāmur (We are loved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amāris (You are loved)</td>
<td>amāmini (You are loved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amātur (He is loved)</td>
<td>amāntur (They are loved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Voice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amā (I love)</td>
<td>amāmus (We love)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amās (You love)</td>
<td>amātis (You love)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amānt (He loves)</td>
<td>amānt (They love)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Latin and the eighteenth-century English grammar mention the existence of active and passive voices. The eighteenth-century defines notionally whereas Latin lists forms. However, the eighteenth-century source includes the Neuter Verb, which must be included under the Latin's active voice.

Francis uses the term, "mood" but refers to "mode." He explains:

English verbs have a variety of modes .... The modes can be classified on the basis of form into two groups: (1) those formed by the modal auxiliaries with the base form of the verb and (2) those formed by certain other auxiliaries with the infinitive (to + the base form of the verb). The modal auxiliaries are can, may, shall, will, must, dare, need, do.64

Francis considers the form of what traditionalists call the imperative mood not as a mode but as a form of a "request sentence." Francis defines "request sentences."

Request situation-sentences usually consist of one of the following structures, often with the /31#/ or /231#/ intonation pattern that characterizes statements.65

62Lowth, op. cit., p. 43.
63Bennett, op. cit., pp. 53, 60.
64Lowth, op. cit., p. 334.
65Francis, op. cit., p. 382.
The verb is in "base form or a verb-phrase whose first auxiliary is in base form."66

The eighteenth-century English grammar also refers to the "mode" of the verb. Lowth defines "mode" as the manner of representing the Being, Action, or Passion. When it is simply declared, or a question is asked concerning it, it is called the Indicative mode; as "I love, lovest thou;" when it is hidden, it is called the Imperative; as "love thou:" (like Francis's request sentence) when it is subjoined as the end or design, or mentioned under a condition, a supposition, or the like, for the most part depending on some other Verb, and having a conjunction before it, it is called the Subjunctive; as, "if I love; if thou love" when it is barely expressed without any limitation of person or number, it is called the Infinitive; as "to love."67

However, the nineteenth-century source categorizes and defines the "moods" of English.

The moods in English are five; namely the Indicative, Potential, Subjunctive, Imperative and Infinitive. The Indicative mood declares the fact expressed by the verb, simply and without limitation; as "He is," "He loves." The Potential mood declares, not the fact expressed by the verb, but only its possibility, or the liberty, power, will, or obligation, of the subject with respect to it. The Subjunctive mood represents the fact expressed by the verb, not as factual, but as conditional, desirable, contingent; The Imperative mood commands, exhorts, entreats, or permits; The Infinitive mood expresses the meaning of the verb in a general manner, without any distinction of person or number.68

This nineteenth-century interpretation of "mood" seems to coincide almost directly with the Latin grammar; both classify the subjunctive with the same terms.

The Indicative is used for the statement of facts, the supposition of facts, inquiry after facts. The Subjunctive is used in Independent Sentences to express something (1) As willed, (2) As desired, (3) Conceived as possible. The Potential Subjunctive expresses a possibility. The Imperative is used in commands, admonitions, and entreaties.

66Ibid.
67Lowth, op. cit., p. 47.
68Bullions, op. cit., p. 68.
The **Infinitive** may be used either as Subject or Object.\(^6\)

George Krapp, the author of a book on the growth of Modern English claims:

Practically, the only construction in Modern English in which the subjunctive is in living, natural, use, is in the condition contrary to fact, "If I were you, I shouldn't do it."\(^7\)

David Conlin, another structuralist, agrees with Krapp on this observation regarding the subjunctive's usage today:

In modern usage . . . the subjunctive mode has tended to merge into or give way to the indicative, and has virtually disappeared as a change in verb form (except in the verb to be and in the omission of the s inflection in the third-person singular of other verbs.) The following are examples:

"If I were you, I would take the make-up exam."

"If English were a highly-inflected language, we would find a high degree of correspondence between form and function."

"I move that the meeting be adjourned."

"I suggest that he telephone ahead for a reservation."

"Standard English requires that the verb agree with the subject."\(^7\)

Still another view of the subjunctive is voiced by Otto Jesperson in his book, *A Modern English Grammar On Historical Principles*. Jesperson states:

Though it may be objected that actually the indicative is encroaching upon the sphere of the subjunctive, still the means to express the special attitude of mind generally connected with use of the subjunctive is not now the indicative as such, but generally a combination of a modal verb, without any distinction between indicative and subjunctive, and an infinitive (may go, should go, etc.)\(^7\)

---

69 Bennett, op. cit., pp. 176, 178, 180.


Lowth considers a verb in the subjunctive mood—
when it is subjoined as the end or design, or mentioned
under a condition or supposition, or the like, for the
most part depending on some other verb and having a
conjunction before it, . . . as, "if I love; if thou love;" 73
"May, might, could, would, should" are some of the words
Lowth considers as forming the subjunctive. 74
He also mentions in regard to the subjunctive that:
in English the several expressions of Conditional will,
Possibility, Liberty, Obligation, etc. belong to the
Indicative Mode: it is their Conditionality, their being
subsequent and depending upon something preceding, that
determines them to the Subjunctive. 75

In contrast to the limited usage mentioned in regard
to the subjunctive in English, its usage in Latin, according
to Bennett, is widely applied. He summarizes the use of
the subjunctive as:
The subjunctive is used in independent sentences to
express something—
(1.) As willed—Volitive Subjunctive
(2.) As desired—Optative Subjunctive
(3.) Conceived as possible—Potential Subjunctive
The Subjunctive mood is used in dependent clauses—
clauses of purpose, characteristic, result, causal, temporal,
substantive clauses developed from the volitive, optative.
The Subjunctive is used in indirect question—substan-
tive clauses used after verbs of asking, inquiring, telling,
and the like. 76

Therefore, the eighteenth-century English grammar includes
Indicative, Imperative, Subjunctive, and Infinitive as moods.
The Latin source considers Indicative, Subjunctive, Potential,
and Imperative as moods.

There is a difference between the eighteenth-century
English grammar and the Latin regarding the subjunctive.
The eighteenth-century source limits its usage of the subjunc-
tive verb to dependent clauses depending on will or supposi-
tion. However, the Latin uses the subjunctive in both inde-
pendent and dependent clauses to express many different intentions.

73Lowth, op. cit., p. 47.
74Ibid., p. 58.
75Ibid., p. 48.
76Bennett, op. cit., p. 176.
Francis also considered the infinitive of the verb. He defines this verbal construction.

The combination to + base form of the verb, which we have treated as a special structure, the infinitive can quite legitimately be treated as a prepositional phrase with verb as object. There is no basic structural difference between a place to live, a place for living, and a place for life. On the other hand, nothing seems to be gained by deporting from the traditional concept of the infinitive.77

However, the infinitive can take on modal meaning. Francis mentioned that the auxiliaries are divided into groups, those with the auxiliaries appearing with the infinitive form of the verb, which consists of the function word to and the base form. They are:

- have, has, had/ am, is, are, was, were
- ought / get/ gets/ got
- used / am/ is/ are/ was/ were

The infinitive is also used in "syntactic structures," according to Francis. One of them is the infinitive functioning as subject. Two examples of the structure are:

- "to err is human"
- "to work in New York is my ambition"79

Francis says that the infinitive can function as a "structure of complementation" also. One example he gives is "[to run] errands."80

The infinitive may also be used in other "syntactic structures." It can function as a "subjective complement" as in "his wish is [to die]." Also, it can serve as a direct object as, "they want [to go]."81

The eighteenth-century source treats the syntactic use of the infinitive in a similar manner. Lowth mentions that the infinitive is governed by verbs, nouns, or adjectives;

77 Francis, op. cit., p. 310.
78 ibid., p. 257.
79 ibid., p. 340.
80 ibid., p. 342.
81 ibid., pp. 346, 348.
"I desire to learn. "A desire to learn," "Anxious to learn." The infinitive is a sort of verbal noun, and has the construction of both a noun and a verb. As a noun the infinitive may be: 1. the subject of a verb, as "To play is pleasant" 2. The object of a verb; "Boys love to play." 3. The predicate nominative after a copulative verb, as "He is to be married." 4. In apposition with another noun, as "Spare, spare your friends the task, to read, to nod, to scoff, to condemn." 5. The object of a preposition, as "about to depart."82

The Latin source also mentions that the infinitive "partakes of the nature of the Verb, on the one hand, and of the Noun or Adjective, on the other." He defines them more thoroughly.

As Verbs
a.) They may be limited by adverbs;
   b.) They admit an object
   c.) They have the properties of voice and tense

As Nouns or Adjectives
a.) They are declined
   b.) They take Noun or Adjective constructions.83

Thus, the Latin source and the eighteenth-century English grammar both admit that the infinitive is a form of the verb and that it can function as nouns or adjectives.

Another form of the verb which is termed "gerund" by Lowth and Bennett is commented upon by J. L. Armstrong in an article concerning the use of the gerund. He says:

The name "Gerund" was borrowed from Latin grammar, and has for a long time been in use in English . . . . 84

Francis does not use the term, gerund, but he does discuss the form of this construction. He mentions that in the example, "driving a car" driving is clearly a verb marked by its complement, a car. Francis also mentions that "ambiguity" sometimes results "when the lexical meaning of the words involved permit . . . interpretation without incongruity, as in a dancing girl." If the stress is put on dancing, as such,

82Lowth, op. cit., p. 177.
83Bennett, op. cit., p. 212.
the word becomes a particle in relation to girl. However, if the stress is put on girl, dancing becomes a verbal, that is, the girl is in the state of dancing. 85

Francis points out that:

Prepositional phrases that modify nouns may have other parts of speech besides nouns as objects. For instance, the object may be a verb or a verb-headed structure of modification, as in: "a way/ of doing." 86

Lowth merely states regarding the gerund:

The participle with a Preposition before it, and still retaining its Government, answers to what is called in Latin the Gerund: "Happiness is to be attained by avoiding evil and by doing good . . . ." 87

No mention is made about the function of the gerund in the sentence.

However, Bennett goes into detail regarding the construction of the gerund in its respective cases.

1. Genitive. The Genitive of the Gerund is used—
   a. With nouns, as Objective or Appositional Genitives, "cupiditas dominandi: desire of ruling"
      "ars scribendi: the art of writing"
   b. With Adjectives as "cupidus audiendi, desirous of hearing."
   c. With causâ, gratia, as—"discendi causâ, for the sake of learning."

2. Dative. The Dative of the Gerund is used
   a. With adjectives as, "aqua utilis est bibendo, water is useful for drinking."
   b. With verbs (rarely) as—"ad sui scribendo, I was present at the writing."

3. Accusative. The Accusative of the Gerund is used only with Prepositions, chiefly ad and in to denote purposes as—"homo ad arendum natus est: man is born for action (doing)."

4. Ablative. The Ablative of the Gerund is used—
   a. Without a preposition, as an Ablative of means, etc.: "mens discendo altur et comitando: the mind is nourished by learning and reflection (thinking)"

85Francis, op. cit., p. 304.
86Ibid., p. 305.
87Lowth, op. cit., p. 121.
5. As a rule only the Genitive of the Gerund and the ablative (without a preposition) admit a direct Object. 88

After considering all the classifications of the verb—definition, voice, tense, number, person, mood, infinitive and gerund, many definite similarities between the eighteenth-century grammar interpretation of the verb and the Latin grammar are apparent. Since the Latin source did not define the verb directly, the eighteenth-century English grammar does not agree with it. However, the two sources definitely agreed regarding tense, number, and person of the verb.

There also was some disagreement between the two sources on voice, mood, infinitive and gerund of the verb. Lowth included a neuter intransitive while Bennett only mentioned acquisitive voice. The terms of the mood were the same for Latin and eighteenth-century English, but there was a dissimilarity between the two sources regarding the subjunctive mood. Lowth limited his usage of the subjunctive in English, whereas it was applied in many constructions in the Latin. There appeared little difference between the Latin and English sources regarding the infinitive; however, they both used the infinitive in similar constructions—a verbal used as a noun or an adjective. In regard to the gerund, both the Latin and English sources were similar with the exception of the Latin being more extensive in usage.

Francis classifies another part of speech, the adverb, according to five criteria. He, also, gave an example of the place the adverb holds in the sentence—"The man told (us) his story hopefully, eagerly, etc." The five criteria are:

1. Adverbs are a class of lexical words identified by their ability to appear in utterance-final position following a noun or nouns functioning as complement.

2. Adverbs may be classified in eight group or form-classes on the basis of their morphemic structure. The two largest groups are those formed from derived and base adjectives, by the addition of (-ly).

3. A few adverbs, mostly those identical with adjectives ("flat adverbs") use the inflectional suffixes (-er) (-est) to form comparative and superlative degrees.

---

4. Like adjectives, adverbs appear with function words called qualifiers. The qualifiers that may appear with adverbs are the same ones that appear with adjectives, with some exceptions and with variation in distribution.

5. In addition to the phrases this way and that way there are four adverb-substitutes, then, there, thus, and so. These form the basis for a threefold classification of adverbs into a then-group, a there-group, and a thus/so group. Some adverbs are outside this classification, which is important for its relation to word order. 69

Lowth describes adverbs as "added to Verbs and Adjectives to denote some modification or circumstance of an action or quality." He also states:

In English they admit of no Variation, except some few of them, which have the degrees of Comparison. (The formation of Adverbs in general with the comparative and Superlative Terminations seem to be improper; at least it now has become obsolete). 90

From the above it is evident that Lowth does recognize flat adverbs. But, he does not recognize that all adverbs can be compared.

Bennett does not define the adverb as extensively as the eighteenth-century English source. He merely says:

Adverbs are considered particles: Particles are four Parts of Speech that do not admit of inflection, viz. Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions, Interjections. 71

Although Bennett does not define the function of the adverb, his classification of a particle as not being inflected coincides with Lowth's definition when he mentions the adverb having no variation.

Adjectives are identified by three criteria, according to Francis:

1. Adjectives are a class of lexical words identified by their ability to fill the position between noun-determiner and noun and the position after a linking verb and a qualifier, such as very, rather, and quite. E.g., "the ... man seems very ..."

2. Virtually all adjectives fall into one of two groups: base adjectives and derived adjectives.

3. Qualifiers are a list of function words indicating the degree to which the meaning of the adjective

69 Francis, op. cit., p. 288.
70 Lowth, op. cit., p. 35.
71 Bennett, op. cit., p. 106.
they appear with is applicable.\textsuperscript{92}

Lowth defines an adjective as a "word joined to a Substantive to express its quality." He also points out that an adjective does not vary its "Gender, number, or Case."\textsuperscript{93}

Bennett describes an adjective as a word "denoting quality." Adjectives are declined like nouns and are in two classes—"Adjectives of the First and Second Declensions and Adjectives of the Third Declension."\textsuperscript{94}

Francis mentions the degree of adjectives in regard to base adjectives. He talks of the endings as identifying markers to determine the part of speech.

Base adjectives take the inflectional suffixes (-er) and (-est) to form the comparative and superlative degrees. These suffixes are seldom sufficient by themselves to identify adjectives since the principal allomorph of (-er) is phonemically identical with the noun-forming derivational suffix (-er) (spelled variously -er, -or, -ar, -our) and the principal allomorph of (-est) may, in some dialects, be phonemically identical with the noun-forming derivational suffix (-ist).\textsuperscript{95}

He also mentions the comparison of "derived" adjectives.

... we may mention that more and most commonly appear only with derived adjectives, since base adjectives use the inflected forms for the comparative and superlative.\textsuperscript{96}

Lowth considers comparison of the adjective as part of its variation.

When a Quality is simply expressed, without any relation to the same in a different degree, it is called the Positive, as wise, or great. When it is expressed with augmentation, or with reference to a less degree of the same, it is called the Comparative, as wiser, greater. When it is expressed as being in highest degree of all, it is called the Superlative, or wisest, greatest.\textsuperscript{97}

Lowth fails to mention comparison with qualifiers.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{92} Francis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 280.
  \item \textsuperscript{93} Lowth, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 40.
  \item \textsuperscript{94} Bennett, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34.
  \item \textsuperscript{95} Francis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 270.
  \item \textsuperscript{96} Ibid., p. 278.
  \item \textsuperscript{97} Lowth, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 40.
\end{itemize}
Some are prefixed to Verbs: "outgo," "overcome," "undervalue." 101

Bennett again mentions the particle since he classifies a preposition under this heading. Particles are words that do not have any inflection. He points out that prepositions were originally adverbs, that many still retain their adverbial meaning; "as post, afterwards; ante, previously; contra, on the other hand, etc." 102

A comparison between the Latin source and the eighteenth-century English source is difficult when the Latin definition of the preposition is so limited. However, both seem to use the same construction, the preposition related to another word rather than the preposition relating words to each other.

Francis considers interjections as a group of function words, classified under "Miscellaneous." They are termed "attention claimers," e.g. "hey, oh, etc." 103

He also considers this type of word as a sentence.

As with greetings and calls, each language, dialect, and individual speaker has a repertory of stereotyped exclamations, of which the following are typical: well, ouch, heck, hell, dickens, for heavens, goodness, gosh, gods, sake. 104

The eighteenth-century English source considers interjections as "Natural Sounds to express the affection of the speaker." The term, interjection, is used because it is "thrown in" [Latin meaning] between the parts of a sentence without making any other "alteration" in it. This source also discusses the function of Q placed before a noun.

The Interjection placed before a Substantive expresses more strongly an address made to that person or thing; as it marks in Latin what is called the Vocative Case. 105

101 Lowth, op. cit., pp. 265, 324.
102 Bennett, op. cit., p. 106.
103 Francis, op. cit., p. 428.
104 Ibid., p. 376.
105 Lowth, op. cit., p. 100.
Deu...t's mention of the degree of adjectives coincides with Lowth's, although he does not explicate the comparisons or give examples. He states that "there are three degrees of Comparison—the Positive, the Comparative, and the Superlative." 98

Lowth's definition of the adjective was similar to Bennett's definition, which was very brief. And, the two sources seemed to be similar concerning the comparison of the adjective, both employing the same terms.

Prepositions, another part of speech, make up a large group of "function" words, according to Francis. Some of them occur more frequently than others. They are divided into three groups on the basis of their "morphemic structure." These groups consist of "simple, compound, and phrasal" prepositions. Simple prepositions have one base, e. g. after, from, or through. An example of a compound preposition would be across from. And, an example of a phrasal preposition would be in regard to, by means of. 99

Francis also mentions other functions of the preposition. Prepositions [sic] can be a part of a "separable verb." The first of the two parts is a form that also appears as an independent verb; the second is a form that also appears as an adverb or as a function word of the class called prepositions, and sometimes as a prefix as well. E. g., "take over," "throw up," "make up."

Prepositions may function as heads of structures of modification; when they do, the modifiers are either qualifiers, adverbs, or certain nouns: "very like a whale" "A bit under the weather" "slightly off with." 100

Lowth defines prepositions as words that "are commonly put before the words to which they are applied." These words "serve to connect" words with one another, and to show the relation between them. Other aspects of the preposition were:

Most prepositions originally denote the relation of place and have been thence transferred to denote by similitude other relations. Thus, "out," "in," "through," "under," "by," "to," "from," "of," etc.

98 Bennett, op. cit., p. 40.
99Francis, op. cit., p. 306.
100Ibid., p. 265.
sed, (but), merely denotes opposition; verum (but) is stronger than sed, but less frequently used; autem, (but on the other hand) however, marks a transition.

Illative Conjunctions represent the statement which they introduce as following from or as in conformity with what has proceeded, e.g., itaque and so, accordingly; ergo = therefore, accordingly; igitur = therefore, accordingly; Causal Conjunctions denote cause or give an explanation. They = nam, namque, enim, eterim — "for." 109

It can be seen that there is a basis for comparison between the Latin and eighteenth-century English grammar regarding the conjunction. Mainly, they both used the same terms, "Conjunctive" and "Disjunctive," in describing the conjunction. However, the Latin grammar was much more extensive in its classification of the conjunction. Both can be used to join sentences. But, the eighteenth-century source did not mention the joining of words or phrases.

Simple sentences are considered by Francis as:

as much of the uninterrupted utterance of a single speaker as is included either between the beginning of the utterance and the pause which ends a sentence—final contour or between such pauses. 110

Lowth defines simple sentences as "consisting of words; Words, of one or more Syllables; Syllables, of one or more Letters." 111 He also points out regarding a simple sentence that:

The principal parts of a simple sentence are the Agent, the Attribute, and the Object. The Agent is the thing chiefly spoken of; the Attribute is the thing or action affirmed or denied of it; and, the Object is the thing affected by such action. 112

Bennett describes a simple sentence as containing but one Subject and one Predicate. Thus, puer libros legit, "the boy reads books" is a simple sentence. 113

109 Bennett, op. cit., p. 225.
110 Francis, op. cit., p. 372.
111 Lowth, op. cit., p. 2.
112 Ibid., p. 100.
113 Bennett, op. cit., p. 199.
The eighteenth-century English source uses other terms to describe the subject and predicate to express the same idea as Bennett; the nineteenth-century English grammar uses the same terms.

A simple sentence or proposition consists of two parts—the subject and the predicate. The subject is that of which something is affirmed. The predicate is that which is affirmed of the subject.\textsuperscript{114}

Consequently, although the eighteenth-century source implies almost the same definition as the Latin source, with the exception of requiring an object, the nineteenth-century source is closer to the Latin definition, using the same terms. This might substantiate the idea that the nineteenth-century English grammar was more affected by the Latin rules than was the eighteenth-century English grammar.

Lowth does not discuss the syntactic varieties of sentence structures, such as compound, complex, and compound-complex. However, the nineteenth-century source considers the structures of the compound, complex, and compound-complex, without assigning names to the complex and compound-complex sentences. The compound sentence is named and discussed in the first section.

A compound sentence consists of two or more simple sentences or propositions connected together; as, "If time is money, wasting it must be prodigality." The propositions which make up a compound sentence are called members or clauses. In the preceding compound sentence, the members are "Time is money," [sic] and "wasting it must be prodigality."\textsuperscript{115}

The next section is concerned with the complex sentence.

The clauses of a . . . sentence are either independent or dependent; sometimes are called co-ordinate and subordinate. An independent clause is one that makes complete sense by itself. Thus, "We left when the sun set," "We left" is an independent clause; it does not make complete sense unless joined with the other clause.\textsuperscript{116}

Finally, the compound-complex sentence is discussed.

\textsuperscript{114}Bullions, op. cit., p. 124.
\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., p. 131.
\textsuperscript{116}Ibid.
The clause on which another depends is called the leading subject; and its predicate, the leading predicate. But, this leading clause itself may be dependent on another which is a leading clause. (E.g., "When I was a child, I thought as child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.") 117

Bennett discusses compound sentences as such. However, he considers the complex sentence a compound sentence. He makes no mention of the term, complex, although he discusses the structure. In the first section below Bennett discusses the definition and structure of a compound sentence.

Sentences containing . . . more [subjects and predicates] are called compound sentences. The different members of a compound sentence are called Clauses. 118

Next, Bennett discusses the complex sentence without using the term, but giving an English example.

. . . a clause dependent upon another is called Subordinate. Thus, in puer libros legit quos pater scribit, "the boy reads the books which his father writes," the second clause is Subordinate to the first. 119

Simple, complex, and compound sentences fall into Francis's syntactic structures. The simple sentence is a structure of "predication;" it frequently contains a subject and predicate. The complex sentence is a structure of "modification" This sentence has a "head" with its modifiers. The compound sentence is considered a structure of "coordination" since a "coordinator" connects two separate sentences, which are "equivalent grammatical units." Finally, the compound-complex sentence is considered as a structure of "coordination" and "modification." 120

Sentences have been classified by traditionalists as declarative, imperative, interrogative and exclamatory. Francis's structures of "sentence final contours" are similar

117 Ibid., pp. 131, 132, 133.
118 Bennett, op. cit., p. 119.
119 Ibid.
120 Francis, op. cit., pp. 292-96.
to the declarative and exclamatory sentences of the traditionalists. His "interrogative and narrative-interrogative statuses of the verb" correspond to the traditionalists' interrogative sentence. Francis describes "request sentences" instead of the traditionalists' imperative sentences.121

Lowth makes no mention of the classification of a simple sentence. But, the nineteenth-century English grammar classifies sentences according to four different kinds, based on meaning. They are:

1. Declaratory, or such as declare a thing, as "God is love."
2. Interrogatory, or such as asks a question; "Lovest thou me?"
3. Imperative; or such as express a command, as, "Lazarus, come forth."
4. Exclamatory, or such as contain an exclamation, as "Behold how he loved him!"122

Bennett classifies sentences in the same manner as the nineteenth-century grammar. They are categorized as follows:

1. Declarative, which state something, as--puer scribit, "the boy is writing."
2. Interrogative, which ask a question, as--quid puer scribit, "what is the boy writing?"
3. Exclamatory, which are in the form of an exclamation; as--quot libris scribit, "how many books he writes!"
4. Imperative, which express a command or an admonition, as,--scribe, "write!"123

The comparison between sources regarding the classification of sentences according to structure and meaning seems to suggest that the nineteenth-century English grammar is closer to the Latin than the eighteenth-century English grammar. No mention is made by the eighteenth-century source about the classification of sentences according to compound, complex, etc. However, the nineteenth-century source agreed with the Latin. Both of these sources discussed the dependent and independent clauses. They also considered structures of compound and complex sentences. The eighteenth-century English grammar does not

121Ibid., pp. 372-84.
122Bullions, op. cit., p. 124.
123Bennett, op. cit., p. 117.
mention the classification of sentences according to meaning. But, the nineteenth-century English grammar and the Latin both use the same terms and express the same meaning when discussing declarative, imperative, interrogative, and exclamatory.

IV. CONCLUSION

The comparison between an eighteenth-century English grammar and a standard Latin grammar provides evidence that the eighteenth-century English grammar was affected by Latin rules. In some instances the Latin was adopted directly into the English grammar. The noun, verb, pronoun, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, interjection were all affected by Latin rules in some way. The definition, number, and gender of the noun were almost the same as the Latin. The names of the cases were not the same, but the corresponding cases in English coincided with the Latin.

Tense, number, person, and gerund of the verb in the English source were almost the same as the Latin. However, the definition of the verb was not the same as the Latin source.

The eighteenth-century English pronoun was similar to the Latin. Both had similar definitions; both mentioned the "Pronominal adjectives." Also, both sources considered possessive and demonstrative or definitive pronouns.

Both the eighteenth-century English grammar and Latin used similar definitions in describing the adjective. And, they were alike regarding the comparison of the adjective, both using the same terms.

The definition of the eighteenth-century English grammar and the Latin grammar defined the adverb similarly. Both mentioned that there was no variation.

Both the eighteenth-century English grammar and the Latin grammar agreed that the preposition related words to each other.

The eighteenth-century source and the Latin both mentioned that conjunctions join sentences. They both used the terms, "conjunctive" and "disjunctive in relating kinds of conjunctions.
Interjection is a Latin term used by the eighteenth-century English grammar and the Latin grammar. Both sources mentioned that the interjection expresses emotion.

The eighteenth-century English grammar coincided or was similar to the Latin in all parts of speech. However, in a few cases the nineteenth-century English source was closer to the Latin. The nineteenth-century definition of a noun, the infinitive definition, the definition of moods and especially the subjunctive coincided more closely to Latin than the eighteenth-century English grammar.

The nineteenth-century English grammar was apparently more affected by the Latin rules regarding sentences than the eighteenth-century English grammar. Although the eighteenth-century source defines the simple sentence as the same idea of the Latin sentence, it does not use the same terms of the Latin, as did the nineteenth-century grammar. Also, in this same definition, an object is required, whereas none is mentioned in the nineteenth-century English source or the Latin grammar. The eighteenth-century source did not classify sentences by meaning, but the nineteenth-century source uses the same terms as the Latin. Neither does the eighteenth-century source mention the structure of the compound and complex sentences. However, the nineteenth-century source discusses the structure of the compound and complex sentences, mentioning clauses as did the Latin grammar.

Since the specific parts of speech and certain aspects of the sentence of the eighteenth century follow the Latin rules so closely, it appears that this grammar was affected by Latin. However, the nineteenth-century English grammar seems to be more affected by the Latin than the eighteenth-century English grammar regarding the definition and classification of sentences and certain aspects of the verb, especially the subjunctive.
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