

I subjoin the following outline of classification, which seems to me preferable in some respects to those adopted in our Greek grammars. It appears to be not less philosophical, and is better adapted to remove some of the difficulty which elementary students experience in defining the use of the participle whenever it has other than its simple adjective force.

The participle may be used :

- I. *Adjectively*, (a) as an *attributive* adjective.  
(b) as a *predicate* adjective.
- II. *Substantively*, (a) as the object (rarely subject) of a verb.  
(b) after a preposition or adverb.  
(c) limiting a noun or other word in the predicate.
- III. *Adverbially*, (a) agreeing with the subject or object of the principal verb, or a noun remotely dependent on it.  
(b) agreeing with a noun in the case absolute.

---

V.—*Erroneous and Doubtful Usages of the Word SUCH.*

By CHARLES ASTOR BRISTED.

We are all of us acquainted with the grammatical warning against the use of the adjective *such* before another adjective, to qualify it, instead of the adverb *so*. We are all of us equally aware that this rule is constantly violated, not merely by the loose and inaccurate editors and correspondents of newspapers, but by some of the choicest masters of the language. Some of us may have remarked instances in which it was positively inapplicable; and others may have felt that in certain cases, the use of *such* for *so*, though grammatically improper, was logically allowable by a species of *πρὸς τὸ σημαίνον* construction. Accordingly, some persons have been led purposely to ignore the grammatical rule, and even to denounce it as weak and useless pedantry. Some years ago a correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* maintained that “such tall trees” was as good English as “those tall trees” or “several tall trees”; and, oddly enough, the distinguished editors and proprietors of that paper seemed to find no fault with his conclusions. This same person, by the

way, denied that one numeral could be used as an adjective to qualify another numeral used as a noun. Such a sentence as "He chalked up three ones and four twos behind the door," was, according to this anonymous critic, bad English !

I do not remember ever having seen this question fully discussed in its logical as well as grammatical points. A few remarks on it may not be unworthy the attention of our meeting. I shall examine it by means of illustrative examples.

1st. A visitor, passing through a grove of trees, is struck with their height. He exclaims, as most of us would be apt to, "I never saw such tall trees in this country !" Most of us, I repeat it, would be apt to speak thus, but we should be speaking ungrammatically in the fullest sense of the term. *Such* applies to the quality of the substantive, it does not enhance or otherwise modify the adjective. But the speaker has nothing to say about the kind or color or shape of the trees, or any quality except their height, and the particle of comparison is intended to *qualify* (by intensifying) *this quality* in reference to the other trees of the country, no matter whether of the same or other species, no matter what their form, color, thickness, &c., &c. Logically, if "such tall trees" meant anything, it would be "trees of this kind which were tall." It is clear then, on all grounds, that we should say, "I never saw trees so tall !"

2d. A traveler is describing some very degraded fellow-creatures whom he has met — among the Digger Indians, in the slums of London or New York, anywhere. He says, "I never saw such human beings !"

Here the use of *such* is not only allowable, but proper and necessary. To say "so human beings" or "beings so human" would involve the exact contradiction of his meaning. For the particle does not enhance the adjective, but, so far as it affects it at all, diminishes and degrades it. It is not the superior but the inferior humanity of these persons that excites the narrator's astonishment. But the particle does not really qualify the adjective at all. It qualifies the substantive, and must be considered to have a direct connection with it.

We may also have noticed in the above example a tendency

of the substantive to draw the adjective to itself and absorb it. If the speaker were telling his story to another hearer, he might perhaps say "I never saw such men and women." And this brings us to a class of constructions, lying between the two of which examples have been given. It is the existence of this class which has done most to confuse our ideas and practice.

Thirdly, then, suppose a writer treating of Cannibalism, Thuggism, Kukluxism, any thing savage. After enumerating some of the facts, he proceeds, "Now let us see what was the cause of such barbarous practices." I believe this phrase "such barbarous practices" is the very one given in the old standard grammars to exemplify the faulty use of *such*. And according to strict grammar, *such* is wrong here; nevertheless it has a *quasi* justification logically, because there is a predisposition or tendency to view the adjective and substantive "barbarous practices" as equivalent to the single noun "barbarities." Of course the meaning of the two expressions would not be precisely the same; but in a loose way they would be regarded by most persons as synonymous. Referring to our first example, we see that there is no one English word to express "tall trees."

We arrive then at these conclusions:

1st. When the particle of comparison applies directly to the adjective and enhances or intensifies its meaning, *so* must be used.

2d. When the particle does not intensify the adjective and may be referred directly to the substantive, *such* is the proper word.

3d. When the particle refers directly to the adjective and enhances it, but the adjective and substantive together are equivalent to or synonymous with a familiar substantive, though strict grammar recognizes *so*, we may use *such* in *familiar* speech and writing by a *πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον* construction.

*Note.*—It has been suggested to me that the above distinctions are not scientifically drawn, and that we should have a single complete rule to cover all cases. This is not very

easy to make; but perhaps the following general formula will answer:

*Such* means 'of that [or, this] *kind*'; *so*, 'to that [or, this] *extent*'. In a doubtful case substitute both these periphrases for the single word; you will see immediately which of the two makes sense (and makes *the* sense), and will accordingly know whether to use *so* or *such*.

---

## VI.—Notes on the *Lingoa Geral* or *Modern Tupí* of the *Amazonas*.

By CH. FRED. HARTT,

PROFESSOR OF GEOLOGY IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N. Y.

The great Tupí-Guaraní stock, in its migrations over South America east of the Andes, broke up, long ago, into a large number of tribes, which, living apart from one another, developed, in course of time, more or less distinct manners and customs, religious ideas, and languages. Of these great divisions of the stock we have, for instance, the Guaranís of Paraguay; the Apiacás of Central Brazil; the Mundurucús, the Maués, and Omáuas (Omaguas) of the Amazonas; the Tupís proper of the Brazilian coast and the Amazonas, now almost entirely civilized; and other tribes which I shall not here enumerate.

The languages of these tribes appear at first sight to differ widely from one another; but, so far as we know, they all have the same general structure, and the roots are, to a greater or less extent, the same in all. Unlike the North American Indian tongues the languages of the Tupí-Guaraní family are not polysynthetic in structure, and the Tupí is remarkable for abounding in general terms.

When Brazil was discovered the Tupí was spoken along the whole coast, and this led the old writers to give it the name *Lingoa Geral Brazilica*, or the general Brazilian language. The Tupí was adopted by the Jesuits and used in their intercourse with the natives. The missionaries preached and wrote in it, and grammars, vocabularies, catechisms, prayers,