

&c., and was used as a nominative and as an accusative. In addition to this, there was a dative form, preceded always by *tô-*, and ending in *-anne*, the final *-e* being the dative ending of nouns of the 2nd declension, the final *-n* of the nominative form being doubled in accordance with the rule that a single final consonant, preceded by a single unaccented vowel, is doubled when a vowel follows in the inflection; so that the infinitive or abstract verb *bindan*, *to bind*, was declined, nom., *bindan*, dat., *tô-bindanne*, acc., *bindan*. This dative form of the infinitive, as the prefix *tô-* indicates, was employed after adjectives to express the *drift* of the feeling or quality which they designated, and after verbs to express their purpose, while the distinctive ending *-en*, of the early English infinitive, derived from the Anglo-Saxon *-an*, was fading out (in Chaucer's day, already it had generally dwindled down to an obscure *-e*, which constituted a light syllable in his verse when followed by a consonant); this dative form was gradually taking its place, and the prefix *tô-* was as gradually losing its occupation as the exponent of a relation, and becoming the meaningless sign of the infinitive in the place of the old ending. This prefix *tô-* has become so inseparable from the infinitive, that it is difficult for the mere English scholar to think of an infinitive apart from it; so much so, that in the places where the pure infinitive is still used, as after the so-called auxiliaries *do*, *did*, *will*, *would*, *shall*, *should*, *may*, *might*, *can*, *could*, *must*, &c., of which it is the direct complement, and after a few verbs like *see*, *bid*, *dare*, *let*, &c., its true character is not always recognised. The same thing has happened with nouns and pronouns; dative and accusative forms have become *name* or *nominative* forms. For example, the modern English pronoun *you* was originally a dative and an accusative plural, Anglo-Saxon *eow*, the nominative being *ge*, Anglo-Saxon *ge*. The Quakers are often accused of speaking ungrammatical-

ly, in their use of *thee* as a nominative "How does thee do?" But it is a case exactly similar to that of *you*; *thee* was in Saxon the dative and accusative singular of *thû*, *thou*. The only difference is, that the Quakers use as a nominative the singular of the old dative and accusative, instead of the plural, when addressing a single individual.

But while the old dative of the infinitive has become the *name* or *nominative* form, it still retains its dative force in many situations; as in *house to let*, *he is to blame*; *eager to learn*, *wonderful to tell*; they went *to scoff* and remained *to pray*. When the modern English infinitive is used as a nominative or an accusative, the prefix *to* cannot be parsed as an element of speech, as it is a meaningless sign of the infinitive; but when used as a dative, as in the above examples, and expressive of the *drift* of a feeling or quality, or the purpose of an act, the prefix has its old force. Now any attempt to explain our present infinitive to a class of beginners must, we are persuaded, result only in perplexity. And without a clear understanding of the infinitive, the analytic forms of the English verb cannot be understood; while to take those forms collectively, as is done by grammarians, gives the learner no idea of their structure. To learn from Gould Brown that "might have been loved" is the passive voice, potential mood, pluperfect tense, of the verb *love*, is of no use to the pupil as a grammatical exercise. In grammatical parsing, every word should be treated as a distinct part of speech, if we would have a clear understanding of the structure of language; but in the case of the English composite tenses, this would not be possible, except by studying them historically.

We did not set out to write a treatise on the study of grammar. Our purpose has been to make a few suggestions as to how that study should be pursued; and we maintain—