Relative clauses in Latin:

some problems of description

Harm Pinkster
Universiteit van Amsterdam

1.   Formal aspects

Finite relative clauses consist minimally of a relative expression (either a single relative word or a relative phrase) and a finite verb form (rarely a historic infinitive). Relative words are relative pronouns, relative adjectives, and relative adverbs, used on their own. Relative phrases consist of the combination of a relative word and a noun (phrase). The most common relative pronoun *qui* / *quae* / *quod* 'who', 'that' is used both on its own (this use is commonly called 'substantival') and as a determiner (its so-called 'adjectival' use). An example of this so-called substantival use is (1).

(1)   Nam inprobus est homo **qui** beneficium scit accipere et reddere nescit.
           ('For shameless is the man who knows how to accept a favor, but doesn't know how to pay it
           back.', Pl. *Per*. 762)

An example of the so-called adjectival use is (2), where *quibus* determines *dictis*.

(2)   **Quibus** est **dictis** dignus, usque oneremus ambo.
        ('Let's both give him a good load of the language he deserves!', Pl. *Mer*. 978)

Ex. (3) illustrates the use of the relative adjective *qualis*, here used on its own as a subject complement with *es*.

(3)   Pariter suades, **qualis** es.
        ('Just like yourself, that advice.', Pl. *Rud*. 875)

Ex. (4) illustrates the use of the relative adverb *ubi*.

(4)   **Ubi** se adiuvat, ibi me adiuvat.
        ('When she cheers up, she cheers me up, too.', Pl. *Per*. 304)

N.B.:   Latin has a large number of relative words, some more common than others. Many are built with *qu-*, of which the most frequent are cited below following the Oxford Latin Dictionary.

        substantival/adjectival:
        qui 'who', 'that', *quisque* 'whoever', 'whatever', *quisquis* 'whoever', 'whatever' (all from Early Latin onwards)
        adjective:
        qualis 'of which sort or quality', *quantus* 'of what size' (both from Early Latin onwards), *quantulus* 'of what (small) size' (from Cicero onwards), *quot* 'as many as';
        adverb:
        (all from Early Latin onwards, unless indicated) *cum* (*quom*) 'when',), *cur* (*quor*) 'on account of which', *qua* 'by which route', *qualiter* 'in which manner' (from Ovid onwards), *quam* 'as much as', *quamdiu* 'as long as' (from Cicero onwards), *quamobrem* 'for which reason', *quando* 'at which time', *quandoque* 'at whatever time', *quanto* 'by how much', *quantopere* 'in what degree' (from Cicero onwards), *quantum* 'to what extent', *quapropter* 'wherefore', *quare* 'for which reason', (from ca. 170 B.C. onwards), *quemadmodum* 'in the manner in which', *quo* 'to

which place', *quomodo* 'in the manner in which', *quotiens* 'as often as', *quotiensque* 'as often as' (from Columella onwards), *ubi* 'where', *unde* 'from where', *ut* 'in the same way as' and its compounds such as *sicut*.

The use of *cum* (*quom*) as relative adverb deserves special attention.

2. Two types of relative clauses

Latin has two major types of relative clauses: adnominal relative clauses and autonomous relative clauses (see Lavency 1998, Pinkster 1995, and Touratier 2002, with references). The first type is illustrated by exx. (5) and (6) below.

(5)   O Libane, uti miser est homo {**qui** amat}.
         ('Oh Libanus! How miserable is a man who's in love.', Pl. *As*. 616)

(6)   Mercurius, {Iovi' **qui** nuntius perhibetur}, numquam aeque patri / suo nuntium lepidum attulit ...
         ('Mercury, who's said to be Jove's messenger, never brought such a sweet message to his sire.', Pl. *St*. 275)

In ex. (5), the relative clause *qui amat* functions as attribute of the noun *homo*, which in turn is the HEAD of the relative clause. The relative pronoun *qui* refers to the same entity as *homo*: in other words, it is coreferential with *homo*. In its relative clause, *qui* functions as the subject. *Homo* is the subject in the main clause. A common label for the head of a relative clause is ANTECEDENT, but I prefer the term 'head'. Ex. (6) resembles ex. (5) in that *qui* is coreferential with *Mercurius*, but the semantic relationship between the relative clause and its head in ex. (6) is less close than in ex. (5): in ex. (5), the relative clause is essential for a correct understanding of *miser est homo*; in ex. (6), the relative clause contains supplementary information. The relative clause in ex. (5) will be called RESTRICTIVE, the one in ex. (6) NONRESTRICTIVE or APPOSITIVE. Both types of relative clause will be called ADNOMINAL. They function at the level of the noun phrase. That this is so appears from the fact that there exist instances of coordination of adjectives and relative clauses that function as attribute with the same noun (phrase). Examples are (7) and (8) below.

(7) Ille autem superior (scil. Xenophon) **leniore** quodam sono est usus <u>et</u> {**qui** illum impetum oratoris non **habeat** ...}
('His predecessor, however, adopted a gentler kind of tone, lacking the characteristic vigour of oratory …', Cic. *de Orat*. 2.58)

(8) Cum homine <u>et</u> **edaci** tibi res est <u>et</u> {**qui** iam aliquid **intellegat**}.
('You are dealing with a hearty eater, no longer one wholly ignorant of what's what.', Cic. *Fam*. 9.20.2)

The second type of relative clause is illustrated by exx. (9) and (10) below.

(9) {**Qui** amat} … adficitur misera aerumna.
('A man in love … is a sorry plight.', Pl. *Cur*. 142)

(10) {**Qui homo** mature quaesivit pecuniam} / … mature essurit.
('The man that's made money quickly … will quickly go hungry.', Pl. *Cur*. 380-1)

These examples differ from exx. (5) and (6) above in that there is no head constituent in the main clause: they are 'headless' relative clauses. I call them AUTONOMOUS relative clauses. As the examples show, there are two types of autonomous relative clauses, one, (9), with a relative word alone (again the relative pronoun *qui*), the other, (10), with a RELATIVE PHRASE that consists of the relative pronoun *qui* and the noun *homo*. *Qui* functions as determiner with its head *homo*. The difference between ex. (5) and ex. (10) is that *qui* in ex. (5) has an 'external' head, that belongs to another clause, whereas *qui* in ex. (10) has an 'internal' head within its own clause.
  A further important distinction between the adnominal relative clauses in (5) and (6), on the one hand, and the autonomous relative clauses in (9) and (10), on the other, is that the latter do not function at the noun phrase level, but at the sentence or clause level. The relative clause *qui amat* in ex. (9) is as a whole the subject of *adficitur* in the main clause. Similarly, in ex. (10), *qui homo … pecuniam* is as a whole the subject of *essurit* in the main clause. I give a few more examples illustrating the diversity of functions such autonomous clauses may fulfil. In ex. (11), the relative clause is the object of *abducam*.

(11) Ibo, abducam {**qui** hunc hinc tollant et domi devinciant …}
('I'll go and fetch some to carry him away from here and tie him up at home …', Pl. *Men*. 845)

In ex. (12), the relative clause is the argument with three-place *eripui* donoting the group of people from who the 'you' has been saved.

(12) Quin modo eripui, {**homines qui** ferebant te sublimen **quattuor**}, / apud hasce aedis.
('I just now snatched you away when four men were carrying you off, hoisted up, right in front of this very house.', Pl. *Men*. 1051-2)

In ex. (13), the relative clause funtions as a beneficiary satellite ('dativus commodi').

(13) ... alteram insulae partem ... adgreditur praemiis magnis propositis {**qui** primus insulam cepisset.}
('… he launched an attack … upon the other side of the island, offering large rewards to the first to capture it.', *B. Alex*. 17.3)

Rare, but grammatical, is the use of the relative clause as a whole as an attribute, as of *vestigia* in ex. (14).

(14)   … nec {ad **quos** pertineat facinus}, vestigia ulla extare.
         ('… nor were there any clues as to the perpetrators of the crime.', Liv. 31.12.1)

An autonomous relative clause may also function within an ablative absolute clause. An example is (15). *Excepta rana* would be incomprehensible without saying that this is how they call a certain animal, but the relative clause is functionally equivalent to *rana*.

(15)   ... hoc genus solum, ut ea quae cete appellant, animal parit, excepta {**quam ranam vocant**}.
         ('This kind alone with the exception of the species called the sea-frog is viviparous, like the creatures termed crustaceans.', Plin. *Nat*. 9.78)

Exceptional, and much-discussed, is ex. (16), where the relative clause is part of a prepositional phrase headed by *cum*. I will come back to this later on in § 5.

(16)   ... ibique Scipio cum {**quos** paulo ante nominavi} interiit.
         ('… and Scipio and those I have just named perished aboard them.', *B. Afr*. 96.2)

The fact that autonomous relative clauses function at the clause or sentence level finds further support in the existence of instances of coordination of a noun phrase and an autonomous relative clause, as in ex. (17).

(17)   Nunc ego hac epistula / tris deludam, **erum** et **lenonem** et {**qui** hanc dedit mi epistulam}.
         ('I'll trap three people with this letter now – master, the pimp, and the man that gave this letter to me.', Pl. *Ps*. 690-1)

Autonomous relative clauses are not rare at all, and they are even predominent in certain texts. The following Table 1 demonstrates this. In this table are also included so-called connecting relative clauses (relative clauses functioning as independent sentences), to which I may have time to come back later on. Note the relative frequency of autonomous relative clauses and the relative infrequency of adnominal ones in Cicero and Livy.

Table 1   Relative frequency of types of relative clauses (in %, 50 clauses per text)

	Pl. *Rud*.	Cic *Att*.	Cic. *Catil*.	Caes. *Civ*.	Liv. 9	Plin. *Nat*. 2	Tac. *Ann*. 1	Lucr. 3	Verg. *A*.1	Ov. *M*.1
Autonomous	40	**54**	**48**	22	**54**	40	32	28	32	28
Adnominal	56	38	34	60	38	52	54	54	60	54
– restrictive	*18*	*16*	*16*	*18*	*24*	*40*	*34*	*42*	*52*	*42*
restrictive	*38*	*22*	*8*	*42*	*14*	*12*	*20*	*12*	*8*	*12*
Connecting	4	8	18	18	8	8	14	18	8	18

[Type the document title]   381
[Type the document title]   381
381

3.   The relationship between adnominal and autonomous relative clauses

It is time now to turn our attention to how to deal with these different types, both the difference between adnominal and autonomous relative clauses and, more specifically, with the relationship between adnominal (that is: head external) clauses and autonomous head internal clauses. As for the first difference (adnominal versus autonomous), as you know, traditional grammars describe relative clauses as 'adjective clauses'. They do so, because in examples like (5) and (6) the relative clauses are attributes modifying a noun (phrase), just as adjectives may do. Think of a word like *sapiens*, which as an adjective means 'wise', as a noun 'philosopher', 'wise man'. The autonomous relative clause is as a consequence regarded as a relative clause that behaves like a noun, that is, in other words, used substantivally. It is slightly odd to describe autonomous relative clauses as substantivally used adjectives. Why describe the behaviour of *clauses* in terms of the word classes adjective and substantive and why not simply accept that Latin has several forms of relativization? Note also that from the point of view of frequency distribution, as shown in Table 1, there is no reason to describe all relative clauses as adjective clauses and to regard that type as the 'basic' type. A good reason to accept the existence of more than one type of relativization is that the two types of relativization can be combined, as in exx. (18) and (19) below.

(18)   (cum) id ... bonum solum sit **quo** *qui* potiatur necesse est beatus sit ...
         ('since that alone is good which necessarily makes its possessor happy …', Cic. *Fin*. 5.83)

(19)   ... magna vis conscientiae, **quam** *qui* neglegunt, cum me violare volent, se ipsi
indicabunt.
('… the power of conscience is great, and those who neglect this, wishing to injure me, will be
betraying themselves.', Cic. *Catil*. 3.27)

In ex. (18), *quo* is coreferential with *bonum*. It is governed by *potiatur*, which has *qui*
as its subject. *Quo qui potiatur* is the subject of *beatus sit*, the combination of which
in turn forms a sentence with *necesse est* in which it is the subject. The adnominal
construction is incorporated into the autonomous construction. Ex. (19) shows the
same form of FUSION (the Germans call it 'relative Verschränkung'; English
grammars have no term for it).

N.B.:   Examples (18) and (19) are essentially different from cases like ex. (20), which is not an
instance of fusion.

(20)   Magna est enim admiratio copiose sapienterque dicentis [quem {qui audiunt}
intellegere etiam et sapere plus quam ceteros arbitrantur].
('For the eloquent and judicious speaker is received with high admiration, and his
hearers even think him understanding and wise beyond all others.', Cic. *Off*. 2.48)

Let's now turn to the relationship between 'normal' adnominal relative clauses and
head internal autonomous relative clauses, which were illustrated with exx. (5) and
(10).

(5)   O Libane, uti miser est homo {**qui** amat}.
('Oh Libanus! How miserable is a man who's in love.', Pl. *As*. 616)
(10)   {**Qui homo** mature quaesivit pecuniam} / … mature essurit.
('The man that's made money quickly … will quickly go hungry.', Pl. *Cur*. 380-1)

The head internal type (ex. 10) is often described as a variant of the adnominal
relative clause type (ex. 5), that is, as a 'normal' relative clause with the head
incorporated into the relative clause. However, such a description ignores the fact that
adnominal relative clauses function at the noun phrase level

and the head internal ones at the sentence or clause level. From a typological perspective it can be added that there are languages that possess just one of the two types (for arguments against explaining all forms of relative clauses as adjective clauses see Serbat [1988]).

A further argument for just accepting that Latin has two types of relative clauses (adnominal and autonomous ones) can be found in the existence of patterns with the same noun in the main clause and in the relative clause. There are various types, of which I can only briefly mention one. Ex. (21) is the type of which Caesar has relatively many instances.

(21)   Omnibus rebus ad profectionem comparatis **diem** dicunt, {**qua *die*** ad ripam Rhodani omnes conveniant}.
        ('Having therefore provided all things for their departure, they named a day by which all should assemble upon the bank of the Rhone.', Caes. *Gal.* 1.6.4)

In ex. (21), *die* in the relative clause could be omitted and in that case we would have a normal instance of the adnominal relative type with an external head *diem* in the main clause. Note that we cannot leave out *diem* and end up with a head internal relative clause. (If anything, the *qua die* clause would be a dependent question, functioning as the object of *dicunt*.)

4.   Determiners and resumptive pronouns

Both types of relative clauses occur with determiners and resumptive pronouns. The relationship between the determiner and the relative clause with which it occurs is usually considered identical to the relationship between the resumptive pronoun and the relative clause. This is incorrect. Relative clauses with and without a determiner may as a whole be picked up by a resumptive pronoun, which proves that determiner and resumptive pronoun have a different function.

4.1   Determiners and resumptive pronouns with adnominal relative clauses

A noun or noun phrase that is modified by an adnominal relative clause may as a whole be modified by various sorts of determiners. This is the case in ex. (22).

(22)   Et *hic* [{**qui** poscet eam sibi uxorem} *senex*], / <u>is</u> *adulescentis illius* est avunculus, / {**qui** illam stupravit noctu, Cereris vigiliis}.
    ('And this old man who's going to ask for her hand, he's the uncle of that young fellow who violated her chastity by night during the vigil held in honor of Ceres.', Pl. *Au*. 34-6)

In ex. (22), the *qui poscet* … relative clause is the attribute of head noun *senex* and the combination of head and attribute is determined by the demonstrative pronoun *hic*. The same is the case with the relative clause *qui illam* … which is the attribute of the head noun *adulescentis*. The combination is determined by the demonstrative pronoun *illius*. Note furthermore that the subject of the sentence (*hic … senex*) is picked up by the resumptive pronoun *is*. Another example, with the determiner *is*, is (23).

(23)   Dici'n an non? # Diniarchus, quoi illam prius desponderas. / # Ubi *is homo*'st {**quem** dicis}?
    ('Will you name him or not? # Diniarchus – the one you once betrothed her to. # Where is this man you name?', Pl. *Truc*. 826)

The use of resumptive pronouns is quite common in Early Latin comedy, but is not restricted to that type of texts and to that period. The various possibilities for combinations of a head noun and an adnominal relative clause are expressed in the following formula.

{ [Determiner <Noun   (Relative clause)>], Resumptive pronoun}
{ [*hic*   < *vir*   (*qui* ...)   >],   *is* }

4.2 Determiners and resumptive pronouns with autonomous relative clauses

We now turn to autonomous relative clauses and the use of determiners and resumptive pronouns with them. This is not so easy as the situation with the adnominal relative clauses just described. A good example to start with is (24).

(24)   *Ill'* {**qui** adoptavit hunc sibi pro filio}, <u>is</u> illi Poeno, huius patruo, hospes fuit.
         ('That gentleman, who adopted this lad as his son – he was once the family friend of the boy's Carthaginian uncle.', Pl. *Poen*. 119-20)

In ex. (24), the pronoun *ille* determines the autonomous relative clause *qui … filio*. Together they are the subject of the sentence, picked up by the resumptive pronoun *is*. In ex. (25), we see the use of the resumptive pronoun *eum* picking up the autonomous relative clause *quem … osculantem* which is not determined by a pronoun.

(25)   **Quem**que hic intus videro / cum Philocomasio osculantem, <u>eum</u> ego obtruncabo extempulo.
         ('Whomever I see here inside kissing Philocomasium, I'll slaughter him on the spot.', Pl. *Mil*. 460-1)

At this point many Latinists will start protesting, because this analysis is not the normal one in our grammars (with a few exceptions, such as Lavency [1998] and Buchwald in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae *s.v.* 474.60ff.). The common description of ex. (24) would be as in exx. (22) and (23): the relative clause is taken as the attribute and *ille* as the head, just as in ex. (22) *qui ... vigiliis* is the attribute of the head noun *adulescentis*. However, this analysis is clearly wrong. These pronouns cannot be modified by attributes.

   The most common determiner of autonomous relative clauses is *is*. An example is (26) below.

(26) Cedo. # Accipe. # Bene *ei* **qui** invidet mi et *ei* **qui** hoc gaudet.
('Let me have it. # Take it! # To the health of him who envies me, and of him who rejoices with me!', Pl. *Per.* 776)

Again, *ei* in both clauses are the determiner of an autonomous relative clause. Not surprisingly, we can also find the combination of an autonomous relative clause determined by *is*, with a resumptive *is*, as in ex. (27).

(27) *Id* **quod** in rem tuam optumum esse arbitror, ted <u>id</u> monitum advento.
('I've come to recommend to you what I consider to be in your best interest.', Pl. *Au.* 143)

The various possibilities for autonomous relative clauses are expressed in the following formula.

{ [Determiner <Relative clause>], Resumptive pronoun}
{ [*hic*   < *qui ... / qui vir*>],   *is*   }

5.   The role of *is* as a determiner and its resumptive use

In the literature on relative clauses the distinction between the use of *is* as a determiner and its use as a resumptive pronoun is usually not made. The combinations *is* (...) *qui* and *qui ... is* are regarded as equivalent, with only a difference in linear order. However, the very fact of the existence of instances like ex. (27) proves that the two *is* forms have different functions. It is interesting that as a determiner *is* is part of a paradigm of deteminers like *hic* and *ille*, whereas as a resumptive pronoun there is no such paradigm.

What exactly is the function of *is* when used as a determiner? The most common function of the pronoun *is* is ANAPHORIC, which means that it refers back to an entity in the preceding context. This is the function of *is* used as a determiner in exx. (23) and (26) above. In ex. (23) *homo quem dicis* is mentioned in the immediately preceding context. In ex. (26) the persons referred to by *qui invidet mi* and *qui gaudet hoc* are also clear from the preceding context. The

resumptive use of *is* fits in well with this anaphoric function. *Hic* and *ille* (also *iste* to some extent) are DEICTIC pronouns. The typical function of *hic* and *ille* is to refer to something in the non-linguistic context or situation (something that is 'near by' or is 'far away' in space or time), but they are also used to refer to something in the preceding (linguistic) context (for the differences between the anaphoric use of *hic*, *ille*, and *is* see Bolkestein [1996]).

However, *is* is also used 'praeparative', as the TLL calls it (474.6ff.). An example in which a phrase with *is* announces an entirely new sentence is (28).

(28) (*sc*. da mi) Viginti minas. / Atque *ea* lege: si alius ad me prius attulerit, tu vale.
   ('Twenty minas. And on this condition – if some one else brings me the money before you, it's good-bye to you.', Pl. *As*. 230-1)

Ex. (27) above, probably also counted as 'praeparative', is different. There is no such 'announcing' function. The combination *id quod* seems to function as one unit, in a way similar to the use of *is qui* in the apposition *is qui ... habebat* with Heraclus, in the following ex. (29).

(29) Cum haec agerem, repente ad me venit Heraclius, *is* {**qui** tum magistratum Syracusis habebat }...
   ('While thus occupied, I rceived an unexpected visit of Heraclius, the man who at the time was one of the chief magistrates in Syracuse ...', Cic. *Ver*. 4.137 – N.B.: Loeb translation adapted.)

The function of *is* here is to exclude that the relative clause is interpreted as indefinite ('a person who was'): it is 'the (very) person who was'. Also, in an earlier Verrine oration, Cicero had mentioned another Heraclius. In the same way, in ex. (27) *id quod* does not mean 'something that', but 'the very thing that'. *Is* helps to identify the entity it is attached to.

Whereas so far we have seen *is* having a clear semantic contribution to the autonomous relative clause it determines, this is not so obvious in instances like exx. (30) and (31).

(30) Matronae magi' conducibile'st istuc, mea Selenium, / unum amare et *cum eo*
      aetatem exigere, {**quoi** nupta'st semel}.

      ('It is more profitable for a lady, my Selenium, to love one man and spend her years with him,
      once she's married him.', Pl. *Cist*. 78-9)

(31) ... aut num iam satis *pro eo*, {**quod** fecerit}, honos habitus sit.

      ('… whether he has already received sufficient honour for what he did.', Cic. *Inv*. 2.113)

We have to do with a main (or superordinate) clause within which an autonomous
relative clause fulfils a function that is marked by a preposition. In ex. (30) *cum*
relates *quoi nupta'st semel* to *aetatem exigere* in the superordinate clause. In ex. (31)
pro relates *quod fecerit* to *honos habitus sit* in the superordinate clause. In spite of
rare exceptions as ex. (16) above, Latin, apparently, does not like combinations of a
preposition with an autonomous relative clause, which would leave the case
unmarked, as for instance in ex. (31)'.

(31)' ... aut num satis pro **quod** fecerit honos habitus sit.

Although the use of *is* as a determiner marks the referent of the autonomous relative
clause as definite ('known'), as in the examples above, *is* seems also to function as a
grammatical support for marking the role of such relative clauses within their
sentence or clause.

6.   Relative connexion

The term RELATIVE CONNEXION refers to the use of relative expressions (words or
phrases) to connect independent sentences. Two examples to start with are (32) and
(33).

(32) Verbero, etiam quis ego sim me rogitas, ulmorum Acheruns? **Quem** pol ego
      hodie ob istaec dicta faciam ferventem flagris.

('You hug, you even ask me who I am, you burial ground for elm rods? For those words I'll warm you up with whips today.', Pl. *Am*. 1030)

(33)   Lycurgus quidem, qui Lacedaemoniorum rem publicam temperavit, leges suas auctoritate Apollinis Delphici confirmavit. **Quas** *cum* vellet Lysander commutare, eadem est prohibitus religione.
('Lycurgus himself, who once governed the Spartan state, establishd his laws by authority of Apollo's Delphic oracle. When Lysander wished to change these laws, he was prevented by the same religious practice.', Cic. *Div*. 1.96)

In ex. (32), *quem* refers to 'you', the subject of *rogitas* in the preceding sentence. In ex. (33), *quas* refers to *leges* in the preceding sentence. The relationship between the sentence with the relative pronoun. and the constituent it is coreferential with is the same as that between a head and a relative clause in the adnominal type of relative clauses. Note that in ex. (33) the relative pronoun *quas* is part of a temporal *cum* clause, the decisive proof that we have to do with a relative pronoun in an independent sentence.

The relative expression is relatively often coreferential with the entire preceding clause, sentence, or even paragraph. A typical example from Caesar is (34).

(34)   … subito vi ventorum et aquae magnitudine pons est interruptus et reliqua multitudo equitum interclusa. **Quo** *cognito* a Petreio et Afranio … legiones IIII equitatumque omnem traiecit …
('…the bridge was suddenly broken down by a storm of wind and a great rush of water, and a large force of cavalry that remained behind was cut off. When Petreius and Afranius discovered what had happened … [Afranius] immediately threw across four legions and all his cavalry …'', Caes. *Civ*. 1.40.3-4)

In this example *quo*, part of an ablative absolute construction, refers to the preceding events. It is not always possible to decide whether an utterance with a relative expression is an independent sentence or a relative clause that is part of a sentence.

Relative connexion is rare in Early Latin except in Ennius' poetry (in Plautus three to four columns out of 63 in the article *qui* in Lodge's lexicon), but quite popular in the classical prose of Cicero and in that of Caesar, where, according to (Kurzová 1981: 47), no less than 20% of the sentences are connected in this way. The increase in the use of relative connexion is sometimes regarded as a sign of evolution. Kühner-Stegmann (: II.319), for example, state: 'Dieser relative Anschluss wird mit Recht als das letzte Moment in der Entwicklung der relativen Syntaxe betrachtet.' (K.-St.: II.319). In reality, it is a stylistic preference. It is rare in Petronius. In Table 1 above Lucretius and Ovid appear as frequent users of relative connexion.

There are two types of relative connexion, one with a relative word, the other with a relative phrase. Examples of the type with a relative word are we have seen in exx. (32) – (34). Examples with a relative phrase are (35) – (37). Very common are expressions like *quam ob rem* in ex. (36). Note in ex. (37) the resumptive pronoun *eum*.

(35) **Quae res** bene vortat mihi et tibi et ventri meo ...
('May heaven bless this undertaking for me and for you and for my belly …', Pl. *Per*. 329)

(36) **Quam ob rem** mihi magi' par est via decedere et concedere.
('For this reason it's more appropriate to get off the street for *me* and to get out of *my* way.', Pl. *Am*. 990)

(37) **Qui mos** cum a posterioribus non esset retentus, Arcesilas *eum* revocavit ...
('This practice was not continued by his successors, but was … reinstituted by Arcesilas ...', Cic. *Fin*. 2.2)

Grammars often describe the relationship between a connected relative sentence and the preceding sentence as additive (*qui = et is*), adversative (*qui = sed is*), causal (*qui = is enim*), etc. However, sentences with *qui* differ from those with *is* (and from those with *hic* and *ille*, and from those without an explicit subject) in a number of ways (see Bolkestein [1996] with findings based on Caesar). Sentences with relative connexion can, for example, not

contain connectors like *et* 'and', *sed* 'but', *enim* 'for', and *igitur* 'therefore'. *Qui* cannot be combined with the focusing subjunct *quoque* 'too', whereas *hic* can. Within its sentence the connecting relative pronoun functions less often as the subject and is more frequently part of an ablative absolute clause than the other anaphoric(ally used) pronouns. In narrative texts the events referred to in sentences with relative connexion are relatively often in the historical present or perfect and belong to the story line. They do not, as adnominal relative clauses often do, contain background information. In sum, relative connexion is one of the means to create cohesion of the discourse, with its own characteristics.

Bibliography

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt
    (1996) 'is *qui*: '*et is*'? On the so-called free relative connection in Latin', in:
        Rosén (ed.) (1996) 553-566
Kühner, Raphael & Carl Stegmann
    (1912-14) *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache II Satzlehre* (2
        vls.), Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung
Kurzová, Helena
    (1981) *Der Relativsatz in den indogermanischen Sprachen*, Hamburg, Buske
Lavency, Marius
    (1998) *La proposition relative* (Grammaire fondamentale du Latin V.2),
        Louvain, Peeters
Lehmann, Christian
    (1984) *Der Relativsatz*, Tübingen, Narr
Pinkster, Harm
    (1995) *Sintaxis y semántica del latín*, Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas (English
        version on the internet site www.harmpinkster.nl)
Serbat, Guy
    (1988) *Linguistique latine et linguistique générale*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters
Touratier, Christian
    (1980) *La relative. Essai de théorie syntaxique*, Paris, Klincksieck
    (2002) 'Discussions épistémologiques et théoriques autour de la relative', in:
        Sawicky & Shalev (eds), 351-65

H. Pinkster (2012) in: Paula da Cunha Corrêa *et al*. (eds) *Hyperboreans*: *Essays in* 392
Greek and Latin Poetry, Philosophy, Rhetoric and Linguistics, São Paulo,
Humanitas, CAPES