

On the Use

On the Use of the Relative Pronouns in the English Language.  
of the

## Relative Pronouns

in the

## English Language.

Vom Oberlehrer Dr. G. Schmidt.

(Memel, Ostern 1860.)

1952

On the Use of the Relative Pronoun in English

Relative Pronouns

English Language

Dr. Christian W. F. ...

(1952, 2000)

## On the Use of the Relative Pronouns in the English Language.

Having lost almost all terminations of declension and conjugation, the English language makes amends for its poverty in this respect by a great variety of syntactical forms, granting, at the same time, an enviable shortness of speech and a multifariousness of expression which scarcely can be attained even by the classic tongues. There can be no greater error than that of Dr. Johnson's, who, prefixing a Grammar of the English Tongue to his Dictionary, and having at large treated on Orthography and Etymology, in ten lines makes short work with the Syntax, protesting, „The established practice of grammarians requires that I should here treat of the Syntax; but our language has so little inflection, that its construction neither requires nor admits many rules.“ To such parts of the syntax, interesting as well as instructive, must be referred the peculiarly extensive use of the Passive, the function of the Participle and the Gerund, the construction of the Relatives. To compare the English with the ancient languages in any of these points might not be useless; and it was with a view of making such an attempt that, having been called upon to compose an essay for this year's School-Program, I selected my theme, but I was forced somewhat to deviate from my plan and especially to pass by all Greek, the printing-office of our town not being provided with Greek types. There will be, therefore, not too much of new in these leaves, but the gentle reader, I hope, will be satisfied when he finds some points more dwelt upon than is usual with our grammarians, whose main end is to give precepts for speaking and writing properly, and when, in illustrating notorious rules, he now and then meets with a striking example.

There are in the English language four relative pronouns, *who*, *which*, *that*, and *what*: to which may be added the two conjunctions *as* and *but*, being employed, in certain cases, as pronouns. The last of the two I will here entirely omit, because an inquiry into its nature as a pronoun cannot and ought not to be separated from the discussion of the faculties of the conjunction.

At present *who* is only applied to persons, *which* to animals and inanimate things. It was not so in the earlier times of the language, *which* being made use of indiscriminately in persons and things. So in the Lord's Prayer: Our father which art in heaven; and in innumerable places of profane and sacred literature.

Shakesp. K. Lear 2, 1. He which finds him, shall deserve our thanks.

K. Lear 2, 4. That Sir, which serves and seeks for gain,  
And follows but for form,  
Will pack when it begins to rain.

Oth. 2, 3: who is that which rings the bell? (The Quartos read that that).

Sh. K. Henry V. 1, 2: King Pepin, which deposed Childerick.

ib. 4, 3: he which hath no stomach to this fight,  
Let him depart.

Sh. Macb. 3, 1: it was he, in the times past, which held you  
So under fortune.

Sh. Haml. 5, 1: or the scull of a courtier, which could say, Good morrow, sweet Lord.

*Which* was formerly very often preceded by the article, as in

Sh. K. Lear 4, 4: our foster-nurse of nature is sleep,  
The which he lacks.

Sh. Macb. 5, 7: He only lived but till he was a man,  
The which no sooner had his prowess confirm'd,  
In the unshrinking station where he fought,  
But like a man he died.

Sh. Haml. 1, 1: Against the which a moiety competent  
Was gaged by our King.

Rom. Jul. 1, 5: The which if thou respect, show a fair presence.

Sh. Haml. 3, 1: The censure of the which one must, in your allowance, over-weigh a  
whole theatre of others.

The genitive of *who*, *whose* was, and is, likewise the genitive to *which*:

Sh. K. John 2, 1: The adverse winds, whose leisure I have staid.

Dryden: The question whose solution I require,  
Is, what the sex of women most desire?

Addison. Spect. 312: Is there any other doctrine, whose followers are punished?

Blair: This is one of the clearest characteristics of its being a religion whose origin is  
divine.

W. Scott Guy Mann. Intr. p. 9.: The hands, whose activity had so often baffled the  
closest observer, suddenly lost their power.

But *who*, when in other cases replacing *which*, relates either to a personified notion, or to animals, endowed, as it were, with reflection or reason.

Thomson Seas. 4, 715: What art thou, Frost, thou secret all-invading power,  
Whom even th' illusive fluid cannot fly?

ib. 4, 185: No more the mountain, horrid, vast, sublime,  
Who pours a sweep of rivers from its sides,  
Fills the view with great variety.

Irving. Sk. Book p. 250: It has driven before it the animals of the chase, who fly from  
the sound of the axe and the smoke of the settlement.

ib. p. 278: He is like some choleric, bottle-bellied old spider, who had wove  
his web over a whole chamber.

Ant it is in this manner, that must be interpreted even the most conspicuous of the following  
instances in Shakespeare:

King Lear 4, 3: Patience and sorrow strove  
Who should express her goodliest.

Hamlet 1, 2: 'tis a fault to nature,  
To reason most absurd, whose common theme  
Is death of fathers, and who still hath cried,  
From the first corse till he that died to-day,  
This must be so.

K. Henry IV. I. 4, 1: Let me take my horse,  
Who is to bear me, like a thunderbolt,  
Against the bosom of the prince of Wales.

ib. 5, 2: For treason is but trusted, like the fox,  
Who, ne'er so tame, so cherish'd, so lock'd up,  
Will have a wild trick of his \*ancestors.

K. John 4, 2: Hearest thou the news abroad, who are arrived?

Here the poet has construed *who* to the messengers who brought the news.

In the modern language the distinction between *who* and *which* is so fixed, that it sometimes serves to supply the want of denoting gender by inflection; as Thackeray Van. Fair 1, 11: the great rich Miss Crawley has arrived, with twenty thousand pounds in the five per cents, *whom*, or I had better say *which*, her two brothers adore. When the name of a person is used merely as a name, and does not refer to the person, the pronoun *which* is to be used, and not *who*: as, It is no wonder, if such a man did not shine at the court of queen Elizabeth, *which* was but another name for prudence and economy (Murray). On the contrary Thomson justly employs *whom* and not *which* in the line: „The beauty, *whom* perhaps his witless heart sincerely loves“; because *beauty* has been put instead of *beautiful person*. But W. Scott may scarcely be justifiable in saying (Ivanhoe ch. 8) All eyes were turned to see the new champion *which* these sounds announced.

After collective nouns, when comprehending reasonable beings, *who* as well as *which* may follow, although Murray in his Grammar thinks it a little harsh to apply the pronoun *who* to such terms as faction, party, court, family etc. Other grammarians are not so nice, nor the authors neither. Macaulay, for instance, prefers by much *who*, and in his writings there are seldom to be met with such sentences as the following, (Essays 4 p. 133) No part of Europe remained Protestant, except that part which had become thoroughly Protestant before the generation which heard Luther preach had passed away. It would be easy to find numerous instances for the one and the other in almost every writer. I will restrict myself to alledge two out of Addison's Spectator, viz. Nro. 9: That club of the George's which used to meet at the sign of the George on St. George's day, and swear before George, is still fresh in every one's memory. Nro. 31: I diverted myself with overhearing the discourse of one, who, by the shabbiness of his dress . . ., I discovered to be of that species who are generally distinguished by the title of projectors. Even in the same sentence; Cuthb. Bede The Advent. of Mr. Verd. Green: 1, 5 pag. 35: they soon found a guide, one of those wonderful people to which show-places give birth, and of whom Oxford can boast a very goodly average.

It is scarcely necessary to say that *which* is to be employed, when the relative refers to a whole sentence or to a part of the phrase going before.

Sh. Oth. 2, 1: it had been better [you had not kissed your three fingers so oft, which now again you are most apt to play the sir in.

Sh. K. Lear 2, 2: he that beguiled you in a plain accent, was a plain knave; which, for my part, I will not be.

Cooper: During the persecution under Mary I. three hundred persons were put to death, besides which several died in prison.

The third relative *that*, as Murray says, is often used to prevent the too frequent repetition of *who* and *which*. It is applied to both persons and things; but it is used in preference to *who* and *which* after an adjective in the superlative degree, and after an adjective pronoun. It cannot conveniently be dispensed with after *who* the interrogative; as „Irving Sketch B. p. 18: Who that has languished, even in advanced life, in sickness and despondency, who that has pined on the weary bed in the neglect and loneliness of a foreign land, but has thought on the mother etc.“ and, when persons make but a part of the antecedent; as „The woman, and the estate, that became his portion, were rewards far beyond his desert.“ This rule is, indeed, far from being without exceptions, whereas even such writers as Addison, after the superlative or after the pronoun *the same*, sometimes place *which* instead of *that*; but, by the very scarcity of such anomalies, it is more corroborated than subverted. *That* is likewise almost always employed, when it refers to a possessive pronoun, used, after the genius of the English language, instead of the genitive of the personal pronoun; viz., Gosp. of John 7, 6: My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.

Sh. Merch. of Ven. 5, 1: (if you had known) half her worthiness that gave the ring.

W. Scott Lady of the Lake 3, 18: Kinsman, she said, his race is run,

That should have sped thine errand on.

Nevertheless *who* is used by Shakespeare:

Merch. of Ven. 2, 1: to yield myself his wife

Who wins me by that means I told you.

K. Henry V. 3, 5: their climate on whom the sun looks pale.

Macb. 3, 1: I must wail his fall

Whom I myself struck down.

When the demonstrative pronoun *that* precedes, the relative *that* must not follow. Goldsmith, therefore, Vicar of Wakef. ch. 14 writes: „The subject insensibly changed from the business of antiquity to *that which* brought us both to the fair“; and not *that that*; Addison, Spect. Nro. 223: „they cherish and cultivate *that* humanity *which* is the ornament of our nature“; not *that* humanity *that*. The last author, in the well known Nro. 80 of his Spectator, ridicules the too frequent use of *that*. But the language in former times did not always shun the cacophony produced by the repetition of that word, and out of the one play of Shakespeare's, K. Henry IV. P. II, I can alledge four instances:

3, 2: that thou hadst seen that that this knight and I have seen.

4, 1: even by those men that most have done us wrong.

4, 2: that man that sits within a monarch's heart.

4, 4: happiness added to that that I am to deliver.

Lastly there is no making use of the relative *that*, when a preposition is to be placed before it. It is, therefore, contrary to the rules of grammar, to say „He is a person of *that* we desire to get rid“, but we may choose between the expressions „a person of *whom* etc.“ or „a person *that* we desire to get rid of.“ Wherever a preposition occurs before *that*, *that* must be conceived to be the demonstrative, and a relative or sometimes the conjunction *that* must be understood. This is the case with the frequent phrase *in that*.

Shak. Haml. 2, 2: happy in that we are not over-happy.

Bede. Verd. Green 3, 2 p. 8: this evil, however, was productive of good, in that it set aside the possibility of a deliberate interchange of formal morning-calls.

W. Scott Ivanhoe ch. 21: it is in that I require your aid, my friends (i. e. in that in which).

Other prepositions are less frequent, and there always the relative has been omitted.

Sh. Troil. and Cress. 2, 3: shall he be worshipped  
Of that we held an idol more than he (i. e. of him whom).

Sh. Much Ado ab. N. 3, 3: let that appear hereafter, and aim better at me by that  
(i. e. that which) I now will manifest.

Sh. ib. 5, 2: and yet, ere I go, let me go with that I came for, which is, with knowing  
what hath passed between you and Claudio (i. e. with that for which I came)

Bacon: To consider advisedly of that is moved (i. e. of that which).

*What* is a kind of compound relative, including both the antecedent and the relative, and is equivalent to *that which* (corresponding to the German *was*). Instead of „The governess retailed the clever remarks of the children on *that which* had preceded“ (Boz Lond. Sketch. p. 103) the author might also have written „on *what*.“ It is scarcely necessary to give examples. Irv. Sketch B. p. 189: the window of my chamber looked upon *what* in summer would have been a beautiful landscape. ib. p. 231: it stands in the chimney nook of a small gloomy chamber just behind what was his father's shop. W. Scott Peveril of the P. ch. 31: people have as little real sense of what is just or unjust, as men who talk in their sleep of what is sense or nonsense. Junius Lett. 18: he came armed with what he thought a respectable authority, to support, what he was convinced, was the cause of truth. Verd. Green 1, 12 p. 118: thus the young gentleman proved how a youth of ordinary natural attainments may acquire other knowledge in his University career than what simply pertains to classical literature.

Sometimes *what* relates to an antecedent substantive: Addison Spect. 37: A cast of his eye expressed an emotion of heart very different from *what* (i. e. from that emotion which) could be raised by an object so agreeable as the gentleman he looked at. Irving Sketch Book p. 177: he is a tolerable specimen of *what* you will rarely meet with now-a-days in its purity. Even after a substantive in the plural: Fielding Tom Jones: Neither were the congratulations paid to Sophia equal to *what* (i. e. those congratulations which) were conferred on Jones. ib.: She had scarce ever felt more pleasing sensations than *what* (i. e. those sensations which) arose from the share she had frequently had of contributing to her father's amusement. Or a substantive is added to *what*; Goldsmith Vic. of Wakef. ch. 14: I am glad that a late oversight in giving what money (i. e. that money which) I had about me, has shown me, that there are still some men like you. ib. 18: I then turned to my wife and children, and directed them to get together what few things (i. e. those few things which) were left us. Junius. Dedic. Epist.: to you they are indebted for whatever strength or beauty they possess. W. Scott Ivanhoe ch. 7: the trial of skill was made with what were called the arms of courtesy (i. e. with those arms which). Frequent, especially with poets, are the phrases *what time* or *what day* instead of *at the time (day) when*.

*What* containing already in it the demonstrative *that*, it is exceptionable to join *what* with *that* instead of *which*, as Lord Chesterfield has done in his Advice to his Son p. 36: That what is extremely proper in one company, may be, and often is, highly improper in another. For that same reason *what* cannot follow after *all* and *nothing*; the proper word being *that*, although even correct writers sometimes employ *which*. Fielding T. Jones 29: he uttered many violent protestations to her, that all which related to herself was absolutely false. Johnson Rassel. 2, 13: I could do all which they delighted in doing, by powers merely sensitive. What we read in Milton's Parad. Lost 5, 107:

All what we affirm, or what deny  
must be explained: all, as well that which we affirm, as that which we deny.

By annexing the words *soever*, or *ever* to one of the three relative pronouns *who*, *which* and *what*, they acquire the most general and ample sense so as to relate to any thing or person

of the designated kind without discrimination. Poets are permitted to abbreviate *whosoever* to *whoso*. Sh. Cymb. 4, 2: Thou know'st the law of arms is such that whoso draws a sword, 'tis present death. Bulwer Pilgr. Rh. 14: They carved Morven's effigy on a mighty stone before the temple, and whoso looked on it trembled. Murray asserts that a division of those pronouns by the interposition of the corresponding substantives has something of elegance; and that, therefore, the phrase „On whichsoever side the king cast his eyes“, would have sounded better, if written, „On which side so ever the king“ etc.

When the pronoun *such* is the antecedent, the relative must be *as*, whether it be persons or inanimate things designated by *such*, and indifferently as to the case which the relative is to be put in. But exactly like *that*, it does not suffer a preposition before it, which must be placed after the verb.

Sk. Haml. 3, 2: now could I do such bitter business as the day  
Would quake to look on.

Oth. 3, 3: Should you do so, my lord,  
My speech should fall into such vile success  
As my thoughts aim not at.

Macb. 1, 3: Were such things here as we do speak about?

K. Lear 2, 2: your purposed low correction  
Is such as basest and contemned'st wretches  
Are punish'd with.

Goldsmith Vic. of Wakef. 20: I passed among such of the French as were poor enough  
to be very merry.

Addison. Spect. 311: The finest writers among the modern Italians fill their writings  
with such poor imaginations and conceits, as our youths are ashamed of  
before they have been two years at the university.

Macaul. Speech. 2, p. 17: They are not such fools as the hon. gentl. takes them for.

ib. 2 p. 264: I am not using a mere phrase of course, when I say that the feelings  
with which I bear a part in the ceremony of this day are such as I find  
it difficult to utter in words.

Macaul. Hist. 3, p. 173: The feeling of the whole nation had now become such as none  
but the very best and noblest or the very worst and basest of mankind  
could without much discomposure encounter.

W. Scott Rob. Roy 1, 6: The sons were heavy unadorned blocks as the eye would  
desire to look upon.

In the last instance *such*, indeed, has been left out, but the form of the sentence is such  
that it easily can be understood.

To the language of Shakespeare a greater license was granted. In the same period,  
after having employed *as*, he varies from *as* to *which* or another relative:

K. Lear 1, 4: (be desired) the remainder that shall still depend  
To be such men as may besort your age,  
Which know themselves and you.

Haml. 3, 4: Such an act  
That blurs the blush and grace of modesty etc.  
O! such a deed,  
As from the body of construction plucks  
The very soul.



K. Lear 1, 1: her offence

Must be of such unnatural degree,  
That monsters it, or your free-vouched affection  
Fall into taint.

Hø construes *as* after *so*;

Hamlet 3, 1: with them words of so sweet breath compos'd,  
As made the things more rich.

in other places *that* after *so*:

Othello 3, 3: there are a kind of men so loose of soul,  
That in their sleeps will mutter their affairs.

and he relates *as* even to the antecedent *that*;

K. Lear 1, 4: but let his disposition have that scope  
As dotage gives it.

J. Cæs. 1, 2: Brutus had rather be a villager,  
Than to repute himself a son of Rome  
Under these hard conditions as this time  
Is like to lay upon us.

In Wagner's Grammar (edited by Herrig) p. 280 some few instances of the same construction have been alledged out of prose writings.

As in all secondary positions of the English language, so likewise in relative sentences, the order of the words is the same with that of any main sentence, i. e. the subject always precedes the verb, the verb the object, except, of course, the relative itself being the object, in which case the relative *that* is to begin the phrase, must go before the subject and the verb: but the order of the other parts of the sentence is not disturbed by it. Different as are in this respect the German sentences, in English the words are put in the same order, whether expressed in a main position, „Man adores the power and benevolence of God“; or in a secondary sentence, „Man who adores the power and benevolence of God.“ It is a poetical license, although not unfrequent, to place the object before the verb. Instances of this kind are such as follows.

Sh. Temp. 1, 2: abhorred slave which any print of goodness will not take.

Merch. Ven. 2, 7: which this promise carries — who this inscription bears — Some there be that shadows kiss.

Tim. Ath. 4, 2: to have his pomp and all what state compounds.

ib. 5, 5: Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate.

K. Rich. II 4, 3: make me that nothing have, with nothing grieved.

K. Rich. III 4, 4: My damned son that thy two sweet sons smothered.

K. Henry VI. II P. 5, 2: beauty, that the tyrant (acc.) oft reclaims,  
Shall to my flaming wrath be oil and flax.

Troil. and Cr. 5, 2: discourse that cause sets up with and against itself.

ib. 5, 2: a fight that a thing inseparate

Divides more wider, than the sky and earth.

M. S. N. Dream 1, 1: a time that lovers' flights doth still conceal.

K. Lear 1, 4: My train are men of choice and rarest parts  
That all particulars of duty know.

ib. 4, 2: you justicers that these our nether crimes  
So speedily can venge.

- Hamlet 3, 2: The instances that second marriage move,  
Are base respects of thrift, but none of love.
- ib. 3, 2: For what advancement may I hope from thee  
That no revenue hast, but thy good spirits.
- Hamlet 3, 2: Thou hast been  
A Man that fortune's buffets and rewards  
Hast ta'en with equal thanks.
- Othello 1, 1: a fellow  
That never set a squadron in the field,  
Nor the division of a battle knows  
More than a spinster.
- Othello 1, 3: of the Cannibals that each other eat.
- Othello 1, 3: He bears the sentence well that nothing bears  
But the free comfort which from hence he hears.
- Othello 3, 3: And O you mortal engines, whose rude throats  
Th' immortal Jove's dread clamours counterfeit,  
Farewell! Othello's occupation 's gone!
- I will add a few verses of W. Scott, as a modern poet.
- Lady of the Lake 1, 11: The rocky summits, rent and split,  
Formed turret, dome, or battlement,  
Or seemed fantastically set  
With cupola or minaret,  
Wild crests as pagod ever decked,  
Or mosque of eastern architect.
- ib. 1, 27: Pennons and flags defaced and stained  
That blackening streaks of blood retained.
- ib. 3, 11: Curse on the clansman's head,  
Who, summoned to his chieftain's aid,  
The signal saw and disobeyed.

Another anomaly is granted to poets; they may place some words at the head of the sentence and put the relative after them into the midst of it:

- W. Scott Lady of the L. 2, 13: To her brave chieftain son, from ire  
Of Scotland's king who shrouds my sire,  
A deeper, holier debt is owed.
- ib. 3, 18: And you, in many a danger true,  
At Duncan's hest your blades that drew,  
To arms, and guard that orphan's head.
- ib. 3, 21: And must the day, so blithe that rose,  
And promised rapture in the close,  
Before its setting hour, divide  
The bridegroom from the plighted bride?

The oblique cases of *who* and *which*, when being governed by an adjective pronoun, or by such words as are depending from a preposition, in the case that these are to be placed before the subject, are never to be put at the head of the sentence, but after those words by which they are governed. Cuth. Bede Verd. Gr. 1, 3 p. 19: gentlemen passengers, scarcely one of whom seemed to have passed his twentieth year. ib. 1, 11 p. 108: a chair of state, to the right and left hand of which accommodation was provided for the other victims. ib. 3, 4 p. 27:

then there was her happy rosy face, so close to which his own was brought. *ib.* 3, 12 p. 97: a series of poles and ropes, on either or all of which the pupil could exercise himself. *Boz Lond. Sk.* p. 243: in pursuance of which affection, and actuated by which feeling, Mr. John Dounce sounded the young lady on her matrimonial feelings. *ib.* p. 114: a ball room the price of admission to which is one shilling. *Sterne Sent. Journ.* p. 109: to travel it through the Bourbonnoise in the hey-day of the vintage, a journey through each step of which music beats time to labour. *W. Irving Sk. Book* p. 237: he was one of those unlucky urchins, at mention of whom old men shake their heads, and predict that they will one day come to the gallows. *ib.* p. 180: bow-windows overrun with ivy, from among the foliage of which the small diamond-shaped panes of glass glittered with the moon-beams. *Macaul. Hist.* 1 p. 167: Worthless men and women to the very bottom of whose hearts Charles II saw, could easily wheedle him out of titles, places etc. *Thackeray Van. Fair* 2, 3: The famous regiment, with so many of whose officers we have made acquaintance. *Economist* 1851 p. 231: the question was one which might be left to the decision of the women of England, 99 in every 100 of whom he believed to be decidedly opposed to any removal of the existing restrictions.

The same postposition of the relative takes place after the infinitive, the gerund and the participle, when commencing the sentence for the sake of perspicuity or emphasis. *W. Scott Ivanh.* ch. 1: his hair was arranged in numerous ringlets, to form which art had probably aided nature. *W. Scott Kenilworth* 23: a sound of noisy mirth and loud talking approached the garden, alarmed by which Wayland Smith sprung into the midst of a thicket of over-grown shrubs. *Bede Verd. Green* 1, 1 p. 4: the garden, promenading which, or perched on the stone balustrade, might be seen perchance a peacock flaunting his beauties in the sun. *ib.* 1, 12 p. 116: to fully deserve which high opinion, Mr. Verd. Green tipped for the box-seat. *ib.* 2, 3 p. 23: a chorus, without the singing of which Mr. Bouncer could not allow any toast to pass. *Thackeray Van. Fair* 1, 4: Bravo, Jos! said Mr. Sedley; on hearing the bantering of which well-known voice, Jos instantly relapsed into an alarmed silence, and quickly took his departure. *ib.* 3, 1: entertainments, to be admitted to one of which was a privilege and an honour. — But sometimes the relative goes before; *Addison Spect.* 77: he finds a coach, which taking for his own, he whips into it. *W. Irving Sk. Book* p. 182: this was the Yule-clog, which the Squire was particular in having brought in and illumined on a Christmass eve. *Bulwer Harold* 2 p. 118: tortures, which the Church taught that none were so pure as not for a while to undergo.

Where there is no preposition before the substantive which governs the genitive of the relative, the author may put the genitive after or before, as he likes, or as he things the phrase sounding best. *Macaul. Hist.* 1 p. 405: an art of which the creations derive a part of their majesty. *Bede Verd. Green* 2, 9 p. 85: a new year of hopes and joys etc., — a new year of which, who then present shall see the end? who shall be there to welcome in its successor? *Thack. Van. Fair* 3, 18: the narrow stair passage the roof of which brushed the nap from his hat. Even the dative may sometimes be postponed; *W. Scott Ivanh.* 14: the path crossed more than one brook, the approach to which was rendered perilous by the marshes through which 't flowed. *Boz Lond. Sk.* p. 114: a ball room, the price of admission to which is one shilling.

*Than* with the relative, in a sentence including a comparative, must always begin.

*Sh. Merch. of Ven.* 4, 1: — as seek to soften that (than which what 's harder?)

His Jewish heart.

*W. Irving Salmagund.* 2 p. 63: I am perfectly aware that in doing this I shall lay myself open to the charge of imitation, than which a man might better be accused of downright house-breaking. *Thackeray Van. Fair* 1, 14: she showed her friendship by abusing all her intimate acquaintances to her new confidante, than which there can't be a more touching proof of regard.

Bulwer P. Clifford: Just on that point where the roads unite was a spot, than which perhaps few places could be more adapted to the purposes of such true men as have recourse to the primary law of nature. — It is the same case with *as which*. Thackeray Van. Fair 2, 20: these gentlemen partook of the amusement of rat-hunting in a barn, as which sport Rawden as yet had never seen anything so noble. In imitation perhaps of the Latin tongue, and mistaking *than* for a sort of preposition, almost all writers employ *than whom* instead of *than who*.

Milton Par. Lost 1, 490: Belial came last, than whom a spirit more lewd  
Fell not from heaven.

ib. 2, 299: Which when Beelzebub perceived, than whom,  
Satan except, none higher sat.

ib. 5, 805: Abdiel, than whom none with more zeal adored  
The Deity.

Johnson Lives of E. P. 4, 26: Pope, than whom few men had more vanity.

Fielding Tom Jon. 23: Sophia, than whom none was more capable of feeling the calamities of her country. W. Scott Rob. Roy 2, 1: He would be a great fool to embroil himself with our Northumbrian thieves, than whom no men who live are more vindictive. Boz London Sk. p. 164: the secretary, than whom he knows no more zealous or estimable individual. ib. p. 361 Mr. F., than whom no one was more capable of answering for himself. There are also the objective cases of other pronouns employed after *than*, as if it were a preposition. Sterne Tristr. Sh. 146 p. 300: Astrologers, quoth my father, know better than us both. ib. 205 p. 373: Was not he who had more discretion than us both, town-clerk of Ephesus? Sterne Sent. Journey p. 37: and I thought, he thanked me more than them all. Byron: Of all our band none can less have said, and more have done than thee.

As in the French language, so likewise in the English, the relative, being the subject of the sentence, causes the verb to be put into the same person that is in the antecedent, the personal pronoun (which must be added in German) being omitted.

Sh. K. Rich. II 4, 6: make me that nothing have, with nothing grieved.

K. Lear 4, 6: What are you?

Edg. A most poor man, made tame to fortune's blows,  
Who, by the art of known and feeling sorrow,  
Am pregnant to good pity.

Hamlet 3, 2: Thou hast been

A man that fortune's buffets and rewards  
Hast ta'en with equal thanks.

Macbeth 1, 5: They referred me to the coming of the time

With, Hail, king that shalt be.

M. Ado ab. Noth. 5, 1: Art thou the slave that with thy breath hast killed

Mine innocent child?

M. S. N. Dream 2, 1: Are you not he

That fright the maidens of the villagery;  
Skim milk; and sometimes labour in the quern,  
And bootless make the breathless housewife churn;  
And sometimes make the drink to bear no barm;  
Mislead night-wanderers, laughing at their harm?

Gosp. of Luc. 1, 19: I am Gabriel, who stand in the presence of God.

Gosp. of Math. 6, 9: Our father which art in heaven.

Addison Spect. 25: This kind of dance may be practised innocently by others as well as myself who am often partner to my landlady's eldest daughter.

When there are two different antecedents to the relative, a personal pronoun of the first or second person and a substantive (or the pronouns *he, she, they*) determining the subject, the relative and verb may agree in person with either, according to the sense. The difference of meaning, produced by referring the relative to different antecedents, is evident in the following sentences, by which Murray illustrates this rule: „I am the general who *gives* the orders to-day“; and „I am the general, who *give* the orders to-day“, that is, „I, who give the orders to-day, am the general.“ But the English writers, oftentimes careless of that distinction, generally like better referring the relative to the subject, as Shakespeare has done in the above cited instances, K. Lear 4, 6; Haml. 3, 2; Much Ado 5, 1; M. S. N. Dream 2, 1: although in this last passage some editors have corrected: „that frights, skims, labours, makes, misleads.“ Even Addison did not avoid being censured on account of that incorrectness. We read in the Spectator, Nro. 23: „they tell me you are a person who have seen the world, and are a judge of fine breeding“; and he ought to have written „who has seen the world, and is a judge of fine breeding.“ It is a matter of course, that, when the relative and the verb have been determined to agree with either of the preceding nominatives, that agreement must be preserved throughout the sentence; as, in the following instance (Jes. 44, 24): „I am the Lord that maketh all things, and stretcheth forth the heavens alone.“ (Murray.) Any variation, as „make and stretcheth“ or „maketh and stretch“ would have been a manifest solecism.

There is another peculiarity by which the form of the relative sentences in English may differ from those in the German and other languages. In the other tongues the verb in those sentences must be „in verbo finito“, viz., either in the indicative, or subjunctive, or potential mood, but in English it may also be in the infinitive mood. Addison Spect. 42: Reason is often puzzled what to pronounce upon the mysterious distribution of good and evil in this world. W. Irving Sk. B. p. 182: an enormous pair of antlers were inserted in the wall, the branches serving as hooks on which to suspend hats, whips, and spurs. W. Scott Bride of Lamm. 4: he neither had nor wished to have a confidant with whom to communicate his reveries. Boz Lond. Sk. p. 202: the married men have a separate grating, at which to see their wives; but its construction is the same. Boz Lond. Sk. p. 67: the stranger who finds himself in the Dials for the first time and the entrance of seven obscure passages, uncertain which to take. Macaul. Speech. 1, 14: I do not conceive that the happiness of the people can be promoted by a form of government in which the middle classes place no confidence, and which exists only because the middle classes have no organ by which to make their sentiments known. Bede Verd. Green 3, 1 p. 1: a day in which to rejoice in the cool thick masses of trees, and to lie on one's back under their canopy. The same construction may be made use of after the relative adverbs *where, wherewith* etc. Gosp. of Math. 8, 20: the son of man has not *where* to lay his head. Addison Spect. 139: application to awful arts, *wherein* to employ the laborious. Sterne Sent. Journ. p. 28: was I in a desert, I should find out *wherewith* in it to call forth my affections. W. Scott Peveril of the P. 11: by this judicious selection of spots *whereon* to employ his art, the sportsman's basket was soon heavy. Bede Verd. Green 1, 4 p. 27: the porter directed them *where* to go. ib. 1, 9 p. 82: advice which the rector knew *how* to convey so well and so simply to his rustic hearers. Sh. Oth. 1, 2: She bade me, I should but teach her *how* to tell my story. — There being the possibility of omitting the relative, as I shall expose at large further on, nothing will sometimes remain but the infinitive and the preposition, and all outer appearance of a relative sentence will be extinguished. Gosp. of Luc. 12, 50: I have a baptism to be baptized with; i. e. a baptism with which men may be baptized. Sterne Sent. Journ. p. 28: If I could not do better,

I would fasten them upon some sweet myrtle, or seek some melancholy cypress to connect myself to; i. e. to which I would connect myself. W. Scott Ivanhoe 19: I have melancholy news to inform you of; i. e. news of which I must inform you.

In the German and the French languages a relative pronoun can only connect a secondary position to its main sentence; but in English as well as in Latin and Greek, besides its application in secondary sentences being far more extensive than in German, it may also and does very often combine two main sentences, replacing in some manner the conjunctions *and*, *as*, *because*, and the like. At least it is in this sort of circumstantial pharaphrase that such sentences must be translated into our own tongue, which would look very much entangled and twisted, if forced literally to imitate those locutions. Of this kind are the lines, introducing the respondents in a dialogue, as

Milton Par. L. 3, 167: To whom the great Creator thus reply'd.

ib. 4, 567: To whom the winged warrior thus return'd.

Thus even the imperative mood of the verb occurs in relative sentences.

Sh. Haml. 5, 1: For though I am not splenetic and rash,  
Yet have I something in me dangerous;  
Which let thy wisdom fear.

Sh. Oth. 2, 3: Our general cast us thus early for the love of his Desdemona, whom let us not therefore blame.

Quarterly Review London 1855. 193 p. 120: „so much that is really sacred is mixed up with the baser matter of human invention, that both are involved in the ludicrous effect. Add to which that wit is no argument — that it is just as easy to burlesque what is hallowed as what is absurd.“

Obvious and numerous to the utmost are the instances in which by means of a relative two secondary positions have been contracted into one. I will select only a few of the most remarkable cases, such as our German language can not at all express without altering them. First we may reckon amongst them those in which two or three genitives are governing one the other, the relative being the second or third. W. Scott Guy Mann. p. 395: (a vessel) part of the crew of which were engaged. Boz London Sketch p. 220: notwithstanding our respect for the old year, one of the few remaining instances of whose existence passes away with every word we write. Bede Verd. Green 3, 10 p. 83: the display of which emblems of mortality confirmed Mr. Green in his opinion. Irving Sk. Book p. 107: Falstaff, the veracity of whose taste no man will venture to impeach, flatly accuses Francis.

Beside of a conjunction, as *when*, *if*, and similar, there may be, as in Latin and Greek, at the head of a sentence the relative *which*, relating to an antecedent in the phrase going before.

Milton Par. L. 2, 299: Which when Beelzebub perceived, with grave  
Aspect he rose.

ib. 10, 863: Whom thus afflicted when sad Eve beheld,  
Soft words to his fierce passion she assay'd.

Sh. Oth. 1, 3: the house-affairs would draw her hence:  
Which ever as she could with haste despatch,  
She'd come again.

Addison Spect. 66: which when you have favoured me with, I shall further advise with you about the disposal. Irving Sk. B. p. 282: a recollection, which if some of his neighbours were to imitate, would not be to their discredit. The sentence may even have the form of an interrogative sentence, the conjunction being suppressed.

Sh. K. Henry VIII 1, 1: I beheld them, when they lighted, how they clung  
In their embracement, as they grew together;  
Which had they, what four thron'd ones could have weighed  
Such a compounded one?

By thus employing the relatives, the English tongue in brevity equals and even surpasses the ancient languages, not only making use of the construction of the accusative with the infinitive, but also permitting in the same sentence a combination of two or three verbs, to the last of which the relative refers, without the least respect to the first. In these constructions the greatest possible variety is granted; the infinitive may be exchanged with the indicative or subjunctive; the subject or object *it* may be put or omitted. Addison Spect. 31: I diverted myself with over-hearing the discourse of one, who I discovered to be of that species who are generally distinguished etc. (*Who* instead of *whom*, of which we shall speak farther on.) Irving Sk. B. p. 216: fruits and flowers which it would perplex a naturalist to classify. Boz Lond. Sk. p. 109: questions, which it would puzzle Solomon to answer, streets, which it would have been a task of some difficulty for Mr. Horner to discover. *ib.* p. 494: to take the trouble of inquiring what ailed her, which he had not yet thought it worth while to do. W. Scott Rob Roy 2, 3: what he himself did not think it apparently worth while to resent, Thorncliff resented for him. *ib.* 3, 10: your kind and affectionate feelings can well imagine what I should find it impossible to describe. W. Scott Peveril ch. 4: to confess emotions, which men whose courage was in any respect liable to suspicion would have thought it imprudent to acknowledge. *ib.* ch. 13: it comprehends all that is valuable on earth which I have it in my power to bestow. *ib.* 29: suspicions which he found it difficult to lay to rest again. Thackeray Van. Fair 1, 19: the Baronet owed his son a sum of money out of the jointure of his mother, which he did not find it convenient to pay. Macaulay Ess. 2, 224: history owes to Pitt this attestation, that he made a brave and splendid attempt to do, by means of public opinion, what no other statesman of his day thought it possible to do, except by means of corruption. *ib.* 3, 313: we have now said almost all that we think it necessary to say respecting Mr. Gladstone's theory. Macaulay Speech. Pref. X: I have before me a report of that speech which an honest and diligent editor would have thought it his first duty to consult. *ib.* 1 p. 196: I appear as a candidate, which, uninvited, I should have thought it presumption to solicit, but which, thus invited, I should think it cowardice to decline. (On the contrary, the following sentence bears almost the cast of a German period; Macaul. Ess. 2, 117: the narrowest strait was to his power what it was of old believed that a running stream was to the sorceries of a witch.) Bede Verd. Green 3, 7 p. 49: in giving way to a weakness that he considered should be indulged in by none other than faint-hearted women. Fielding Jon. 24: Mrs. Honor had heard the whole story of Molly's shame; which she, being of a very communicative temper, had no sooner entered the apartment of her Mistress, than she began to relate in the following manner. W. Scott Bride of L. 11: it was impossible for him, he said, to remember what a gentleman expressed his wish he had not uttered. Thackeray Van. Fair 1, 16: a young woman, whose business it was, to knock at Miss Sharp's door with that jug of hot water, which Firkin would rather have perished than have presented to the intruder. Macaul. Ess. 1, 161: every day we see men do for their faction what they would die rather than do for themselves.

Sometimes *which* seems to be quite superfluous, employed in a kind of construction, which in Greek is termed „anakoluthia.“

Sh. Haml. 3, 3: Majesty is a massy wheel; *which* when it falls,  
Each small annexment, petty consequence,  
Attends the boisterous ruin.

Tillotson: *who*, instead of going about doing good, *they* are perpetually intent upon doing mischief. Fielding Jon. 36: the parson said every thing he durst in behalf of the young lady, *which*, though it was not quite so much as his duty required, yet was *it* sufficient to throw the Squire into a violent rage. Sterne Sent. Journ. p. 101: the history of myself, *which* I could not die in peace unless I left *it* as a legacy to the world.

In all these instances either *which* or *it* ought to have been suppressed. But there are also phrases to be found, especially in the writings of Swift, in which either the relative ought to have been repeated or a demonstrative to have been inserted, namely when *which* is subject to one verb and, at the same time, object to the other. It is this solecism which must be censured in Fielding Jon. 48: hence arose all that coldness in her behaviour to Blifil, *which*, though the Squire imputed to a wrong cause, infused into Blifil himself a suspicion of the real truth.

Here will be the fittest place for observing that the English language is very apt to leave off the construction of the relative and to change it into a main sentence, not at all minding with what word the sentence commenced.

Shak. Macb. 3, 1: I must not,  
For certain friends that are both his and mine,  
Whose loves I may not drop, but wail his fall  
Whom I myself struck down.

Although to „wail his fall“ the subject „I“ must be supplied out of the sentence going before, there is no possibility of combining it also to „whose loves“, standing in the same sentence. Of a similar kind is:

Shak. Haml. 1, 3: The friends thou hast, and their adoption tried,  
Grapple thou to thy soul with hoops of steel.

But this license is by no means restricted only to poets; it is likewise allowed to prose-writers. Bede Verd. Green 1, 2 p. 12: that he would have a companion who would be able to cheer him etc., to initiate him etc.: all which the rector professed his son would be glad to do, and would be delighted to see his old friend and play-fellow. — In a somewhat different manner the change takes place in the following sentence. Thackeray Van. Fair 1, 4: Poor Joe's panic lasted for two or three days; during which he did not visit the house, nor during that period did Miss Rebecca ever mention his name.

As in all other languages, so in English a relative sentence may go before, and the demonstrative to which it refers, may follow; as, Gosp. of Math. 13, 9: *who* has ears to hear, let *him* hear. This order of the clauses must be observed, when *ever* or *soever* is annexed to the relative; Genes. 31, 32: with *whomsoever* thou findest thy goods, let *him* not live. Gosp. of Marc. 14, 44: *Whomsoever* I shall kiss, the same is he. But in most instances the demonstrative has been quite suppressed and must be implied. This is almost regularly the case, when it would be the subject, \*being in the nominative; Gosp. of Luc. 18, 17: whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein.

Milton Par. L. 4, 888: lives there who loves his pain?

ib. 9, 724: Whoso eats thereof, forthwith attains

Wisdom without their leave.

Gay: My tongue within my lips I rein:

For who talks much, must talk in vain.

Pope: See! the sole bliss Heaven could on all bestow,

Which who but feels, can taste; but thinks, can know.



ib.: I know there are to whose presumptuous thoughts

These freer beauties, even in them, seem faults.

Hume: whoever refused to submit to their decrees was exposed to the most severe penalties.

In a somewhat unusual manner Shakespeare has left out the demonstrative:

Macb. 3 6: The cloudy messenger turns me his back,  
And hums, as who should say, You 'll rue the time.

The omission of the demonstrative, when object, is not so frequent, but by no means only poetical.

Proverb. 3, 12: Whom the Lord loves, he corrects.

Milton Par. L. 8, 42: Eve, — with lowliness majestic from her seat,  
And grace that won *who* saw to wish her stay,  
Rose, and went forth among her fruits and flowers.

ib. 8, 361: And all this good to man? for whose well-being  
So amply, and with hands so liberal,  
Thou hast provided all things: but, with me  
I see not *who* partakes.

Hume: they punished with the severest tortures *whoever* dared to secrete any part of the consecrated offering.

Even the genitive of the demonstrative may be replaced by the relative alone, and the latter may, after the Greek fashion, assume the case of the implied antecedent.

Milton Par. L. 6, 808: Vengeance is his, or *whose* he sole appoints (instead of *of that whom*).

An instance of a similar construction is in Shakespeare:

Hamlet. 4, 5: Make choice of whom your wisest friends you will,  
And they shall hear and judge 'twixt you and me.

(i. e. of those your wisest friends whom you will.)

Where there is a preposition governing the implied demonstrative, the form of the relative is always *whom*, when either the same preposition is governing the relative too, or when the relative is object to the verb. 2. Mos. 33, 19: I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy (i. e. to him to whom; — on him on whom).

Milton Par. L. 1, 332: As when men wont to watch  
On duty, sleeping found by whom they dread,  
Rouse and bestir themselves.

(i. e. by him whom they dread).

But when the relative is the subject, the preposition going before it only belonging to the implied demonstrative, the English grammarians will have it always put in the nominative case. Hume: Elizabeth publicly threatened that she would have the head of *whoever* had advised it. Edinb. Review 1855. p. 64: These two points should be borne in mind by *whoever* would attain to a real understanding of the past, the present, or the future state of France. — This rule, however, is far from being strictly observed, the same authors employing the nominative or the accusative, as they please. Hume: He offered a great recompense to *whomsoever* would help him to a sight of it. Edinb. Review 1855 p. 81: Philosophically speaking, this, the least studied portion in the modern Alexander's (i. e. Napoleon's) nature, would probably be the one richest in curious information to *whomsoever* should undertake to explore it attentively. ib. p. 84: Benjamin Constant beforehand heaped contempt upon *whomsoever* should prove weak in opposition, or should submit to so odious a yoke. Bulwer. The gates and bridges of the state should be under the control of *whomsoever* should be elected chief magistrate. — It is difficult to decide,

whether in these phrases the accusative has been employed after a kind of construction, which in Greek grammar is called „*attractio*“ (the relative adopting the case of the demonstrative), or because the two forms *who* and *whom* have been confounded, an occurrence not unfrequent in the language formerly. So *who* has been used instead of *whom* by Shakespeare.

Wint. Tale 5, 1: she might make proselytes of who she but bid follow.

Rom. Jul. 5, 3: whoe'er you find, attach.

Macb. 3, 4: Here had we now our country 's honour roof'd,

Were the grac'd person of our Banquo present,

Who may I rather challenge for unkindness,

Than pity for mischance.

H. Henry VI. II. P. 3, 2: They care not who they sting in his revenge.

K. Henry VIII. 2, 1: whoe'er the king favours, the cardinal instantly will find employment.

The same permutation takes place in the interrogative:

Cymb. 4, 2: Yield thee. — To who? To thee?

Macb. 4, 3: the dead man's knell

Is there scarce asked, for who.

K. Lear 5, 3: What in the world he is

That names me traitor, villain-like he lies.

Call by thy trumpet; he that dares approach,

On him, on you, who not? I will maintain

My truth and honour firmly.

Troil. Cr. 3, 1: who play they to?

As You L. 3, 2: I'll tell you who time ambles with.

Merch. Ven. 2, 6: who love I so much?

But likewise by prosewriters. Addison Spect. 31: I 'diverted myself with overhearing the discourse of one, who, by the shabbiness of his dress, I discovered to be of that species. ib. 32: who should I meet at the coffee-house door the other night, but my old friend? ib. 57: a little after, who should I see but the doctor? Fielding Jon.: I don't know, Madam, said the other, who you mean by me and us. Irving Sk. B. p. 215: The Captain seated himself beside the fair Julia, who I had noticed to be somewhat affected by the picture he had drawn.

On the contrary *whom* has been employed instead of *who*:

Sh. K. John 4, 2: Arthur, whom they say is killed tonight.

Gosp. of Math. 16, 13: Whom do men say that I am?

Adventurer Nro. 76: He whom you pretend reigns in heaven, is so far from protecting the miserable sons of men, that he perpetually delights to blast the sweetest flowrets in the garden of hope.

Locke: If you were there, you would find three or four in the parlour after dinner, whom you would say passed their time agreeably.

An „*attractio*“ on the other side is likewise permitted to the English language: where the demonstrative, which ought to be in the nominative case, has adopted the accusative case of the relative, whether expressed or implied.

Sh. K. Henry VI. I. P. 4, 7: Him that thou magnifiest with all these titles,  
Stinking and fly-blown lies here at our feet.

Haml. 2, 1: Your party in converse, him you would sound,  
He closes with you in this consequence.

Coriol. 5, 5: Him I accuse, the city ports by this has entered.

Ant. and Cleop. 3, 1: Better leave undone, than by our deed acquire  
Too high a fame, when him we serve 's away.

As You L. 1, 1: Better than him I am before, knows me,  
And even, where the nominative, and not the accusative follows:

Sh. Macb. 5, 7: And damned be him that first cries, Hold, enough.

In modern conversation it is quite common to say: „It is him that I admire.

But to return to our theme: in consequence of the elision of the demonstrative, the relative *what* may be attended with two prepositions, the first of which, standing before the relative, refers to the implied demonstrative, the other, standing after the verb or at the end of the clause, to the relative itself.

Sh. Haml. 1, 2: As if increase of appetite had grown

*By what it fed on.*

ib. 2, 2: Let me conjure you by the rights of our fellowship, and *by what* more dear  
a better proposer could charge you *withat.*

Oth. 1, 3: to fall in love *with* what she feared to look *on.*

Temp. 4, 3: I am a fool, to weep *at* what I am glad *of.*

Addison Spect. 6: a selfish man, in the most shining circumstance and equipage, appears in the same condition with the fellow above mentioned, but more contemptible in proportion *to* what more he robs the public *of*, and enjoys above him. ib. 148: whisperers deal only in half accounts *of* what you entertain you *with.* Bede Verd. Green 3, 4 p. 29: he was no more conscious *of* what he was giving utterance *to*, than if he had been talking in a dream. Boz Lond. Sk. p. 400: one of those hums of admiration followed the suggestion which one frequently hears in society, when nobody has the most distant notion *of* what he is expressing his approval *of.* Edinb. Review Nro. 207 p. 61: to have a notion *of* what enthusiasm, grounded upon personal esteem and unlimited admiration, may arrive *at*, it will suffice to talk etc. Economist 1850 p. 1212: in spiritual matters names are things; they conjure up in our imaginations the most awful realities; but when we examine them, and become sensible *of* what they stand *for*, and what they are used *for*, they dwindle into their true character of mere terms.

In all constructions of the relatives I have hitherto discussed, the English language agrees, if not with all, at least with some of the kindred tongues; it might be easy to produce respectively out of the Greek, the Latin, the French or the German grammars forms of expression which might rightly be compared with the English construction. But there is one, peculiar to it alone, which it has most probably inherited from the Gaelic or Celtic; as W. Ahlwardt (in the Preface to his Translation of Oisín's Poems out of the Gaelic) asserts. In every other language, when the relative is omitted, the form of the verb of the relative sentence must be changed too; it is to be put into a participle. This the English language may likewise do. But it may also elide the relative, without altering in any thing the other parts of the clause. The following sentence „His esteem for literature may be inferred from the learned education which he gave to his children“ may, therefore, be transformed in a twofold manner; either, by employing the participle, (as in the other languages) into „education given by him to his children“, or, by only suppressing the relative, into „education he gave to his children.“ The grammarians, it is true, somewhat restrict this license. Wagner specifies five cases in which the relative must not be eliminated; namely:

1. where it is in the nominative. Goldsmith Vic. of Wakef. 8: Mr. Burchell, who was of the party, was always fond of seeing some innocent amusement going forward.

2. where the relative sentence, on account of its meaning, is to be set off, the antecedent oftentimes being a demonstrative pronoun: Gold. V. of Wak. 14: These instances of

cunning which she thought impenetrable, yet which every body saw through, were very pleasing to our benefactor. *ib.* 26: The next morning I was awakened by my family whom I found in tears at my bedside.

3. where the relative refers to a whole sentence. Fielding *Jon.*: The Squire stepped aside to give his daughter orders for the proper reception of her lover; which he did with the most bitter execrations.

4. where the preposition, belonging to the relative, has not been placed to the end of the sentence. So Irving (*Sk. B.* p. 22), instead of „I knew the auditor I had to deal with“ might also have said „I knew the auditor with whom I had to deal“, but he could not say „I knew the auditor with I had to deal.“

5. where the relative is the possessive genitive *whose* or *of which*. Gold. *V. Wak.* 16: The rest of the family was easily consoled by the company of our landlord whose visits became more frequent. Irving *Sk. B.* p. 87: He resided in the vicinity of a church, the appearance of which particularly struck my fancy.

Of the three last rules there is not one violation to be met with, but the more numerous are those of the two first. Wagner himself cites the following instances, in which the second has been infringed: Fielding *T. Jon.*: We are taught to hate them for the mischiefs they have brought on those we love. Gold. *V. Wak.* 12: The reputation of men should be prized for the size of those virtues they are possessed of. I could add a large quantity. As to the first restriction, it is in the right in such sentences as that which has been alledged, and even in Shakespeare instances of such an omission are rarely to be found; some I have noted:

*Oth.* 3, 3: was not that Cassio, parted from my wife?

*Hamlet* 4, 6: I have words to speak in thine ear will make thee dumb.

*K. Lear* 3, 4: This tempest will not give me leave to ponder

On things would hurt me more.

*Much Ado ab. N.* 4, 1: What man was he talked with you yesterday out at your window?

*Cymb.* 1, 2: Thou took'st a beggar would have made my throne

A seat for baseness.

*All 's well* 3, 2: If thou engrossest all the griefs are thine.

But after the phrases *there is* or *it is* the relative has been suppressed by the best writers, and by poets sometimes in a very remarkable manner.

*Sh. Macb.* 2, 2: There's one did laugh in his sleep, and one cried, murder.

*Hamlet* 4, 5: There's such divinity doth hedge a king,  
That treason can but peep to what it would,  
Acts little of his will.

*K. Lear* 2, 1: 'tis they have put him on the old man's death.

*ib.* 3, 5: it was not altogether your brother's evil disposition made him seek his death.

*ib.* 4, 3: it is the stars,

The stars above us govern our conditions.

*Troil. Cr.* 2, 3: 'tis this naming of him does him harm.

*W. Scott Lady of the L.* 3, 28: 'tis Ellen, or an angel, sings.

*Junius L.* 36: I think there is hardly a day passes in which one or other of his Majesty's servants etc. Irving *Sk. B.* p. 109: there is nothing sharpens the apprehension so much as antiquarian research. *W. Scott Ivanh.* 21: Never fear, exclaimed the youth; it is I will help you through. *Thackeray Van. Fair* 1, 24: It was he had brought George back to Amelia; it was he had applauded, encouraged etc.; it was his counsel had brought about this marriage.

To leave out, either the preposition governing the relative, or the relative and preposition together, is not very usual, and is censured by the grammarians. Melmoth: His compliance can by no means be considered in the favorable light which he here represents it (i. e. in which). Addison Sp. 210: A great flood left the bridge in the ruinous condition I now beheld it. ib. 326: In the temper of mind he was then. Swift: In the posture I lay. It is more frequent, when *the same* is the antecedent or may be implied. Addison Spect. 1: I was born in a small hereditary estate, which was bounded by the same hedges and ditches in William the Conqueror's time that it is at present. Bede Verd. Green 1, 5 p. 41: it was not loaded in the same manner that it had been when he came up by it. Gold. Vic. Wak. 24: The night was concluded in the manner we began the morning. ib. 25: You are going, my boy, to London on foot, in the manner Hooker travelled there before you. — Shakespeare has very often suppressed the preposition:

Cymb. 5, 5: Whom heavens in justice (both on her and hers)  
Have laid most heavy hands (i. e. on).

Oth. 1, 3: What conjuration and what mighty magic  
(For such proceeding I am charged withal)  
I won his daughter (i. e. by).

Jul. Cæs. 1, 2: Thy honourable metal may be wrought  
From that it is disposed (i. e. to which).

K. John 2, 1: In that behalf which we have challenged it (i. e. in).

ib. 3, 1: By what thou swear'st, against the thing thou swear'st (i. e. by that by which).

K. Rich. II. 1, 1: Yet one but flatters us,  
As well appeareth by the cause you come (i. e. for which).

K. Henry V. 2, 2: Which I in sufferance heartily will rejoice (i. e. at which).

K. Henry VI. III. P. 2, 5: So minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, and years,  
Passed over to the end they were created (i. e. to which).

K. Rich. III. 3, 7: True ornament to know a holy man (i. e. by which to know).

He has also, on the contrary, sometimes duplicated the preposition:

Rom. Jul. 1, 5 Chor.: That fair, for which love groaned for, and would die.

and likewise in interrogative sentences:

Coriol. 2, 1: In what enormities is Marcius poor in,  
That you two have not in abundance?

Troil. Cr. 5, 1: To what form should wit turn him to?

But I leave off, because these and other remarks I might have still to make, do not concern with the relative pronouns, but with the interrogatives.



— 19 —

[Illegible Title]

[Illegible text block 1]

[Illegible text block 2]

[Illegible text block 3]

[Illegible text block 4]

[Illegible text block 5]

[Illegible text block 6]

[Illegible text block 7]

[Illegible text block 8]

[Illegible text block 9]

[Illegible text block 10]

[Illegible text block 11]

[Illegible text block 12]

[Illegible text block 13]

[Illegible text block 14]

[Illegible text block 15]

[Illegible text block 16]

[Illegible text block 17]

[Illegible text block 18]

[Illegible text block 19]

[Illegible text block 20]

[Illegible text block 21]

[Illegible text block 22]

[Illegible text block 23]

[Illegible text block 24]

[Illegible text block 25]

[Illegible text block 26]

[Illegible text block 27]

[Illegible text block 28]

[Illegible text block 29]

[Illegible text block 30]

[Illegible text block 31]

[Illegible text block 32]

[Illegible text block 33]

[Illegible text block 34]

[Illegible text block 35]

[Illegible text block 36]

[Illegible text block 37]

[Illegible text block 38]

[Illegible text block 39]

[Illegible text block 40]

[Illegible text block 41]

[Illegible text block 42]

[Illegible text block 43]

[Illegible text block 44]

[Illegible text block 45]

[Illegible text block 46]

[Illegible text block 47]

[Illegible text block 48]

[Illegible text block 49]

[Illegible text block 50]

[Illegible text block 51]

[Illegible text block 52]

[Illegible text block 53]

[Illegible text block 54]

[Illegible text block 55]

[Illegible text block 56]

[Illegible text block 57]

[Illegible text block 58]

[Illegible text block 59]

[Illegible text block 60]

[Illegible text block 61]

[Illegible text block 62]

[Illegible text block 63]

[Illegible text block 64]

[Illegible text block 65]

[Illegible text block 66]

[Illegible text block 67]

[Illegible text block 68]

[Illegible text block 69]

[Illegible text block 70]

[Illegible text block 71]

[Illegible text block 72]

[Illegible text block 73]

[Illegible text block 74]

[Illegible text block 75]

[Illegible text block 76]

[Illegible text block 77]

[Illegible text block 78]

[Illegible text block 79]

[Illegible text block 80]

[Illegible text block 81]

[Illegible text block 82]

[Illegible text block 83]

[Illegible text block 84]

[Illegible text block 85]

[Illegible text block 86]

[Illegible text block 87]

[Illegible text block 88]

[Illegible text block 89]

[Illegible text block 90]

[Illegible text block 91]

[Illegible text block 92]

[Illegible text block 93]

[Illegible text block 94]

[Illegible text block 95]

[Illegible text block 96]

[Illegible text block 97]

[Illegible text block 98]

[Illegible text block 99]

[Illegible text block 100]