

*Who* is a relative or personal pronoun, used to introduce a new clause or affirmation into a sentence, which clause has an immediate dependence on the preceding one. *Who* is also used to ask questions, and hence it is called an interrogative.

Which is also a relative, but is of neuter gender. It is also interrogative. These pronouns have two cases; the nominative which precedes a verb, and the objective which follows it. They are inflected in the following manner.

	Sing.	Plu.		Sing.	Plu.
Nominative	I	we	Nom.	-	-
Objective	me	us	Obj.	-	-
Nom.	-	thou	you	-	-
Obj.	-	thee	you	-	-
Nom.	-	you	ye	-	-
Obj.	-	you	ye	-	-
Nom.	-	he	they	-	-
Obj.	-	him	them	-	-

**NOTE.**—*Mine*, *thine*, *his*, *hers*, *yours* and *theirs*, are usually considered as the possessive case. But the three first are either attributes, and used with nouns, or they are substitutes. The three last are always substitutes, used in the place of names which are understood, as may be seen in the note below.

*His* and *whose* have a better claim to be considered as a possessive case; but they equally well fall under the denomination of attributes, I have, for the sake of uniformity, assigned them a place with that part of speech.

"That *mine*, *thine*, *his*, *yours*, *hers* and *theirs*, do not constitute a possessive case, is demonstrable; for they are constantly used as the nominatives to verbs and as the objectives after verbs and prepositions, as in the following passages. "Whether it could perform its operations of thinking and memory out of a body organized as *ours* is,"—*Locke*, b. 2. 27. "In referring our ideas to those of other men called by the same name, *ours* may be false."—"It is for no other reason but that *he* agrees not with our ideas."—*ibm.* ch. 32. 9 and 10.

"You may imagine what kind of faith *theirs* was."

*Bacon*, *Unity in Religion*. "He ran headlong into his own ruin which he endeavored to precipitate *ours*."

"The reason is that his subject is generally things; *theirs*, on the contrary, is persons."

"Vours of the 26th Oct. I have received, as I have always done *yours*, with no little satisfaction."

"Therefore leave your forest of beasts for *ours* of brutes, called men."

"These return so much better out of your hands than they went from *mine*."

"Your letter of the 20th of this month, like the rest of *yours*—tells me with so much more wit, sense and kindness than *mine* can express," &c."

"Having good works enough of your own besides to ensure *yours* and their immortality."

"The omission of repetitions is but one, and the easiest part of *yours* and of *my* design."

"My sword and *yours* are kin."

It is needless to multiply proofs. We observe these pretended possessives uniformly used as nominatives or objectives. To say that, in these passages, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, and *mine* form a possessive case, is to make the possessive perform the office of a nominative case to verbs, and an objective case after verbs and prepositions—a manifest solecism.

Should it be said that a noun is understood; I reply, this cannot be true, in regard to the grammatical construction; for supply the noun for which the word is a substitute, and the pronoun must be changed into an adjective. "Yours of the 26th of October," becomes *your letter*—"he endeavored to precipitate *ours*," becomes *our ruin*." This shows that the words are real substitutes, like *others*, where it stands for other men or things.

Besides in three passages, just quoted, the word *yours* is joined by a connective to a name in the same case; "to ensure *yours* and their immortality;" "The easiest part of *yours* and of *my* design." "My sword and *yours* are kin." Will any person pretend that the connective here joins different cases?

Another consideration is equally decisive of this question. If *yours*, *ours*, &c. are real possessives, then the same word admits of two different signs, or, for we say correctly, "an acquaintance of *yours*, *ours*, or *theirs*;"—of being the sign of the possessive; but if the words in themselves are possessives, then there must be two signs of the same case, which is absurd.

Compare these words with a name in the possessive case—"My house is on a hill; my father's is on a plain." Here *father's* is a real possessive case; the word *house* being understood; and the addition of the noun makes no alteration in the word *father's*; "my father's is, or my father's house is."

! This case does not compare with that of names. We say, a "soldier of the king's," or a soldier of the king's soldiers; but we cannot say, "an acquaintance of your's acquaintance."

But it must be observed, that although *it* and *who* are real substitutes, never united to names, like attributes—it day—who man; yet *its* and *whose* cannot be detached from a name expressed or implied—as, *its* shape, *its* figure—*whose* face—*whose* works—*whose* are they? that is, *whose* works. These are therefore real adjectives.

In the use of substitutes, it is to be remarked, that *I*, *thou*, *you*, *ye* and *we* are generally employed without an antecedent name. When *I*, and the name of the person are both employed, as they are in formal writings, oaths and the like, the pronouns precede the name; as, "I, Richard Roe, of Boston." In similar language, *you* and *we* also precede the name; as, "You, John Doe, of New-York." "We, Richard Roe and John Doe, of Philadelphia."

*You* is used by writers very indefinitely, as a substitute for any person who may read the work—the mind of the writer imagining a person addressed.

*He* and *they* are used in the same indefinite manner; as, "He seldom lives frugally, who lives by chance." "Blessed are *they* that mourn, for *they* shall be comforted."

*He* and *they*, in such sentences, represent any persons who fall within the subsequent description.

*Who* and *whom* are always substitutes for persons, and never for things or brutes. *Whose* is equally applicable to persons as to things.

*Whoever* is often employed as the nominative to two verbs; as, "Whoever expects to find in the scriptures a specific direction for every moral doubt that arises, looks for more than he will meet with."

*Mine*, *thine* and *his* are equally well used as substitutes, or as attributes.

"The silver is *mine*, and the gold is *mine*," *Hag.* ii. 8. "The day is *thine*, the night also is *thine*," *Ps.* lxxv. 16. "The lord knoweth them that are *his*," 2 *Tim.* ii. 19. In these examples the words, *mine*, *thine*, *his*, may be considered as substitutes—"The silver is *mine*," that is, *my silver*.

In this character the words usually follow the verb; but when emphatical, they may precede it; as "His will I be," 2 *Sam.* xvi. 18. "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, the power and the glory," "Thine is the kingdom," 1 *Ch.* xxix. 11.

These words are also used as attributes of possession; as, "Let not *mine* enemies triumph," "So let *thine* enemies perish," "And Abram removed his tent," *Mine* and *thine* are however not used in familiar language; but in solemn and elevated style, they are still used as attributes.

"Mine eyes beheld the messenger divine," *Lusida.* B. 2.

There is another class of substitutes, which supply the place of names, attributes, sentences or parts of a sentence.

## It.

In the following sentence, it is the substitute for a name. "The sun rules the day; it illumines the earth." Here it is used for *sun*, to prevent a repetition of the word.

In the following passage, it has a different use. "The Jews, it is well known, were at this time under the dominion of the Romans," *Porteus, Lect.* 8. Here it represents the whole of the sentence, except the clause in which it stands. To understand this, let the order of the words be varied.

"The Jews were at this time under the dominion of the Romans, it [all that] is well known."

"It is a testimony as glorious to his memory, as it is singular, and almost unexampled in his circumstances, that he loved the Jewish nation, and that he gave a very decisive proof of it, by building them a synagogue," *ibm.*

To discover what is represented by the first *it*, we must inquire, what is his glorious testimony? Why, clearly that he loved the Jewish nation, and gave them a decisive proof of it, by building them a synagogue. It then is a substitute for those clauses of the sentence. The second *it* refers to the same clauses. In the latter part of the sentence, he gave a magnificent proof of it—of what? of what is related in a preceding clause—He loved the Jewish nation—of that he gave a decisive and magnificent proof. Here it represents that member of the sentence.

As for the pulling of them down, it, the affairs require it." *Bacon on Ambition*. Require what? "The pulling of them down"—for which part of the sentence, it is a substitute.

And how could he do this so effectually, as by performing works, which it utterly exceeded all the strength and ability of men to accomplish," *Porteus, Lect.* 5.

What utterly exceeded? To what does it refer? Let us invert the order of the words—"it as by performing works to accomplish which exceeded all the strength of men." Here we find to accomplish, a verb in the infinitive; it is the nominative to exceed, and for that verb, it is a substitute.

This inceptive use of *it* forms a remarkable idiom of our language, and deserves more particular illustration. It stands as the substitute for a subsequent member or clause of a sentence; and is a sort of pioneer to smooth the way for the verb. Thus, "It is remarkable, that the philosopher Seneca makes use of the same argument," *Porteus Lect.* 6. If we ask, what is remarkable? The answer must be, the fact stated in the last clause of the sentence. That this is the real construction, appears from a transposition of the clauses. "The philosopher Seneca makes use of the same argument, that is remarkable." In this order we observe the true use of *that*, which