

secondary consideration, such things instead of being considered as childish, employ the pen of men of erudition. That this sapient innovator, whose coinage of new words &c. establishes my assertion, has attempted, as appears by his own words, which are as follows, "I have endeavoured," (he ought to have added, "in vain, for I have not the abilities,") "to correct the errors of a grammarian in the last Herald," to correct the childish question, as he has called it, is manifest; and not being able to accomplish the attempt, published his *celebrious production* against it. And that too, Mr. Editor, in the open defiance of one of the simplest rules of English grammar, which says, "a verb must agree with its nominative case in number and person." For this violation of syntax I refer you to the third sentence of the production in question; wherein he says, "the reason for the conduct of the pedant *need* not be given."* Thus has this editor given an instance of the third person singular agreeing with the verb in the plural form. I thought at first that it was a typographical error; but on second consideration I recollected that the same solecism had been frequently used in some of his former papers.

N. B. The sentences still remain uncorrected.

G—.

* G— is probably not aware that the verb nenter, *to need*, "to be in want of," is distinct in meaning and in conjugation from the verb impersonal, *not to need*, "there is no necessity for," which, properly speaking, has neither person nor number, though *needs* is right when used in the contrary sense, "there is a necessity for," as exemplified in the sentences, "needs must, when the devil drives," "it needs a man of ability to do so," But, altho' I am not inclined to go the length of the the great Locke, who, disgusted with verbal cavillings and petty criticisms, more frequent in his age than ours, scruples not to speak of grammar as unnecessary to the perfect knowledge either of the dead or the living languages, yet I consider that much more time and paper is wasted upon such *nugæ* than the utmost benefit which the detection of trivial inaccuracies of language can produce, is worth.