

## Relative and Antecedent

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Formerly there was practically universal acceptance among scholars<sup>1</sup> of Brugmann's statement (*Grund.* 2.2.347-48) that Indo-European possessed a relative stem *yo-* and an unrelated indefinite-

<sup>1</sup> Bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows. **BB**=*Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*, edited by A. Bezzenger. **BL**=*The Odyssey of Homer*, translated into English by S. H. Butcher and A. Lang (London 1917). **Boisacq**=Émile Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Heidelberg and Paris 1907). **Brix**=*Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus*, edited by Julius Brix: *Captivi*, 5th edition revised by Max Niemeyer (Leipzig 1897); *Miles Gloriosus*, 2nd edition (Leipzig 1883); *Trinummus*, 4th edition revised by Max Niemeyer (Leipzig 1888). **Brugmann, Grund.** (sometimes referred to simply as Brugmann)=Karl Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 1-2<sup>2</sup>, 2 vols., 2nd vol. in three parts (Strassburg 1897-1916). **Brugmann, KVG**=K. Brugmann, *Abrégé de grammaire comparée des langues indo-européennes*, translated into French by J. Bloch, A. Cuny, and A. Ernout (Paris 1905). **Brugmann-Thumb**=Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>4</sup>, revised by Albert Thumb (Munich 1913). **Buck, GL**=Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 4th impression (Chicago 1948). **Buck, IE**=*A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago 1949). **Buck, OU**=Carl Darling Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1904). **Chantraine**=Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* (Paris 1948). **Conington**=P. Vergili Maronis *Opera*, edited by John Conington, 3 vols., vols. 1 and 2 4th edition, vol. 3 3rd edition, revised by Henry Nettleship (London 1881-84). **CP**=*Classical Philology*. **Delbrück, SF** 1=B. Delbrück, *Syntaktische Forschungen* 1=*Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivus und Optativus im Sanskrit und Griechischen* (Halle 1871). **Delbrück, VS**=B. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*=*Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 3-5, 3 vols. (Strassburg 1893-1900). **Duckworth**=T. Macci Plauti *Epidicus*, edited by George E. Duckworth (Princeton 1940). **Ernout-Thomas**=Alfred Ernout and François Thomas, *Syntaxe latine* (Paris 1951). **Fairclough-Brown**=*Virgil's Aeneid, Books I-VI*, edited by H. R. Fairclough and Seldon L. Brown (Boston 1908). **Friedrich, EL**=Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1940-46). **Gildersleeve-Lodge**=B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*<sup>3</sup> (Boston 1894). **Goetz and Schoell**=T. Macci Plauti *Comoediae*, edited by Georgius Goetz and Fridericus Schoell, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1893-96). **Goetze, Kleinasien**=Albrecht Goetze, *Kleinasien*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1957). **Goodwin**=William W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar*, revised edition (Boston 1895). **Hahn, SO**=E. Adelaide Hahn, *Subjunctive and Optative: Their Origin as Futures* (New York 1953). **Hale**=William Gardner Hale and Carl Darling Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (Boston 1903). **Hentze**=Carolus Hentze, *De pronominum relatiuorum linguae Graecae origine atque usu Homérico* (Göttingen 1863). **Hirt**=Hermann Hirt, *Indogermanische*

interrogative stem *qui- quo-*, which subsequently and independently developed into a relative in Armenian, Greek, Albanian, Italic

*Grammatik*, 7 vols. (Heidelberg 1921–37). **Hirtzel**=*P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, edited by Fredericus Arturus Hirtzel (Oxford—preface dated 1900). **Hofmann**=Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*<sup>5</sup> (Munich 1928). **Ianell**=*P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, edited by Gualtherus Ianell (Leipzig 1930). **JAOS**=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*. **Kent, OP**=Roland G. Kent, *Old Persian* (New Haven 1950). **Knapp**=*The Aeneid of Vergil Books I–VI, Selections VII–XII*, edited by Charles Knapp, revised edition (Chicago 1928). **Lane**=George M. Lane, *A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*, revised edition (New York 1903). **Lane, Studies**=George S. Lane, *Studies in Kuchean Grammar I=Supplement to the Journal of the American Oriental Society* 13 (Baltimore 1952). **Leaf**=*The Iliad*, edited by Walter Leaf, 2 vols. (London 1900–2). **Leumann**: see Hofmann. **Lindsay**=*The Captivi of Plautus*, edited by W. M. Lindsay (London 1900). **LLM**=*The Iliad of Homer*, translated into English by Andrew Lang, Walter Leaf, and Ernest Myers, revised edition (New York 1915). **Löfstedt**=Einar Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Oxford 1911). **Meillet-Vendryes**=A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1927). **Merry**=*Homer's Odyssey*, Books I–XII, edited by W. Walter Merry and James Riddell, 2nd edition revised (Oxford 1886). **Monro**=D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1891). **Nauck**=*Homeri Ilias*, edited by Johann August Nauck, 2 vols. (Berlin 1877–79). **Page**=*The Aeneid of Virgil, Books I–VI*, edited by T. E. Page (London 1894). **Paley**=*The Iliad of Homer*, edited by F. A. Paley, 2 vols. (London 1866–71). **Pedersen, Hitt.** (also referred to simply as Pedersen)=Holger Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen* (Copenhagen 1938). **Ribbeck**=*P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. by Otto Ribbeck (Leipzig 1898). **Schwyzzer**=Eduard Schwyzzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 3 vols., vol. 2 completed by Albert Debrunner, vol. 3 (*Register*) by Demetrius J. Georgacas (1939–53). **Sommer**=Ferdinand Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, 2nd and 3rd edition (Heidelberg 1914, reprinted 1948). **Sommer, HAB**=Ferdinand Sommer and Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II.)* (Munich 1938). **SSS**=Emil Sieg, Wilhelm Siegling, and Wilhelm Schulze, *Tocharische Grammatik* (Göttingen 1931). **Sonnenschein**=*T. Macci Plauti Rudens*, edited by Edward A. Sonnenschein (Oxford 1901). **Speijer**=J. S. Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax* (Leyden 1886). **Sturtevant, HG**=Edgar H. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* (1st edition Philadelphia 1933, revised edition New Haven 1951; unless otherwise indicated, the revised edition is meant). **Sturtevant, IHL**=Edgar H. Sturtevant, *The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals* (Baltimore 1942). **Sturtevant, Pseud.**=*T. Macci Plauti Pseudolus*, edited by Edgar H. Sturtevant (New Haven 1932). **Szantyr**=J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, revised by Anton Szantyr=Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*, vol. 2<sup>8</sup>, revised by Anton Szantyr (Munich 1964). **Wackernagel**=Jacob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, 3 vol., vol. 3 by Albert Debrunner and Jacob Wackernagel (Göttingen 1896–1930). **Walde-Hofmann**=A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*<sup>9</sup>, revised by J. B. Hofmann, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1938–54). **Walde-Pokorny**=Alois Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, revised by Julius Pokorny, 3 vols., vol. 3 (*Register*) by Konstantin Reichardt (Berlin and Leipzig 1927–32). **Whitney**=William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, 5th printing (Cambridge 1923). For the meaning of **H**, **H2**, and **S**, see below, notes 31, 10, and 6 respectively. References are to pages. In the interest of brevity, quotations give only enough words to make clear the sense and the syntax, with no indication of omissions. In the interest of simplicity, diacritics are usually not employed in transliterations.

Germanic, and Balto-Slavic—in other words in all the Indo-European groups known in Brugmann's day except Indo-Iranian and Celtic.<sup>2</sup> Brugmann (*ibid.* 348) terms this "eine junge Erscheinung," and declares that the lateness of this development is clearly demonstrated in Greek, German, and Slavic, which is of course true;<sup>3</sup> he ignores the—to my mind highly significant—fact that Italic<sup>4</sup> wholly lacks the *yo-* stem, and shows *qui- quo-*, and only *qui- quo-*, as a relative from the earliest date. Later scholars in general agree with Brugmann:<sup>5</sup> see e.g. Sommer 434, Leumann 288, Meillet-Vendryes 571, all of whom employ the term "Neuerung" or "innovation" in regard to the use of this stem as a relative. So too Buck, *GL* 226, who says of this stem, "its use in Latin as a relative is secondary, one that developed in Italic, it being Oscan-Umbrian as well as Latin"; but he, unlike the others, qualifies this by adding, "but there is some reason to believe that the indefinite relative use ('whoever,' etc.) had already developed in part in the parent speech." In this connection he cites in his appendix (371) two articles on the relative: Fowler, *Language* 7 (1931) 14–29, and Sturtevant, *Language Monograph* 7.141–49.<sup>6</sup> Fowler's article consists of an analysis of Latin *qui* clauses (of which he recognizes three main types, indefinite, definite, and independent<sup>7</sup>), but it really does not involve the question whether the genesis of these *qui* clauses is to be assigned to Indo-European or to Italic. Sturtevant's article, however, is of the utmost importance for the origin of the *qui- quo-* relative, since in it, on the basis of the Hittite pronoun *kwis kwit* (which is relative as well as indefinite and interrogative),

<sup>2</sup> In Tocharian too, both "A" and "B"—better called Tocharian and Kuchean respectively—the relative stem resembles the indefinite and the interrogative. See SSS 176–80; Lane, *Studies* 46–49.

<sup>3</sup> In Ancient Greek it does occur occasionally in the dialects, but probably this is a purely Greek development; we meet it more frequently in the *koinê*, and regularly in Modern Greek. See Schwyzler 1.615 and 2.644–45.

<sup>4</sup> The use is met in Oscan and Umbrian as well as in Latin. See Buck, *OU* 143–46.

<sup>5</sup> There is considerable disagreement and uncertainty as to whether this "new" relative developed from the indefinite or the interrogative—a point on which Brugmann does not commit himself.

<sup>6</sup> *Language Monograph* 7 = *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies*, ed. by James Taft Hatfield, Werner Leopold, and A. J. Friedrich Zieglschmid (Philadelphia 1930). The article is entitled "Relatives in Indo-European and Hittite." Since I shall have occasion to refer to it several times, I shall designate it simply **S**.

<sup>7</sup> I.e., those introduced by a "connecting relative."

he sets forth two theses which seem to me compelling: (1) that the relative force of the *qui- quo-* stem goes back to the *Ursprache*<sup>8</sup> (142), and (2) that this *Ursprache* had two relative pronouns, *qui-quo-* used as "a general relative" and *yo-* used "to refer to a definite antecedent" (148).

We may assume that most languages dropped one of these two relatives and used the other in a double sense. Yet the distinction is a very real one. Thus in English, though we in general use only a single relative form, a development of the *qui- quo-* stem,<sup>9</sup> we none the less make the distinction in question, in speech by a difference in intonation, in writing by a difference in punctuation. Thus we have a general, or restrictive, relative in "the man who wrote the Aeneid was a genius," but a definite, or non-restrictive, relative in "Vergil, who wrote the Aeneid, was a genius." To be sure, the same words, pronounced or pointed differently, may be open to either interpretation: "my father, who is a writer, is well-known" can be only non-restrictive, but "my brother(,) who is a writer(,) is well-known" normally depends for its manner of utterance and punctuation on whether I have or have not more than one brother, though even in the former case the context may demand the non-restrictive form if I have already been specifically referring to one particular brother. Such possible overlapping may be a factor in helping us to see how restrictive and non-restrictive clauses came to have identical forms,<sup>10</sup> and thus

<sup>8</sup> Sturtevant's view that this *Ursprache*, which he terms Indo-Hittite, is a language still older than Indo-European, has in recent years been either contradicted or ignored. I am glad to see that Professor George S. Lane has recently revived it, with the telling comment, "such matters are not settled by majority vote" (see *Language* 37 [1961] 472 and note 12a). The late Professor George M. Bolling said to me several times that the term "Indo-Hittite hypothesis," used by Sturtevant and his adherents, is unfortunate, for the existence of Indo-Hittite should be regarded as a fact, proved by correct employment of the comparative method, and not at all as a mere hypothesis. I myself do not get extremely excited as to whether we are to seek the origin of Hittite in Indo-Hittite or in a very early form of Indo-European (cf. Hahn, *SO* 52, note 92); but that this origin is early, in other words that Hittite (as opposed to Indo-European languages in general) is a language of archaisms and not, as some have thought, of innovations, I am convinced.

<sup>9</sup> We also have a second relative, *that*, which is quite limited in its scope. It comes from a demonstrative stem, but belies its origin in its use. Cf. below, note 22.

<sup>10</sup> I discuss such overlapping at considerable length in "The Non-Restrictive Relative in Hittite," *Language* 25 (1949) 346-72 (number dedicated to Roland Grubb Kent), with copious examples both from Hittite and from English. This article, which is to some extent a sequel to *H* (on which see note 31), will be referred to as *H2*.

how a language came to use everywhere one and the same relative, whether originally indefinite or definite in its force; yet such a language may develop a new type of distinguishing sign, as did the Italic languages by specializing the *qui-* stem as an indefinite relative (as well as an indefinite and interrogative) and the *quo-* stem as a definite relative.<sup>11</sup>

As for the differentiation of the two original relative stems, *yo-* and *qui- quo-*, this was certainly conditioned by their etymological background. I agree with those<sup>12</sup> who would connect the relative *yo-*<sup>13</sup> with the demonstrative stem seen in Latin *is*;<sup>14</sup> and I am convinced that the relative *qui- quo-* is a development of the indefinite.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to *yo-* and *qui- quo-*, there are two other pronominal stems which ultimately developed into relatives. These are (1) a demonstrative stem *so- to-*<sup>16</sup> (which produced relatives in Greek,

<sup>11</sup> There are some traces of this in Latin (see Leumann 288 and Hofmann 706), and it is somewhat more marked in Oscan and Umbrian (see Buck, *OU* 143–44).

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. the etymological dictionaries, Walde-Pokorny 1.97 and 98, Boisacq 721 (s.v. *hos*), Walde-Hofmann 720 (s.v. *is*).

<sup>13</sup> Seen in Sanskrit *yas yā yad* and Greek *hos hē ho*.

<sup>14</sup> Hirt (3.25 and 7.130) comments on the fact that Latin and German have preserved *is* but not *jos*, and Greek has preserved *jos* but not *is*. This is interesting but hardly significant. Both stems occur in Indic, as Hirt himself recognizes (7.130), and perhaps in Hittite too, where the sandhi doublets of the enclitic conjunction “and,” *-a* and *-ya*, may correspond respectively to the demonstrative stem (cf. note 16) and the relative stem. (We may compare Latin *-que*, which similarly corresponds to the indefinite-relative stem.)

<sup>15</sup> Cf. note 5. My reasons for my own view will appear below: see especially notes 31 and 37.

<sup>16</sup> Brugmann 2.2.313–20, Walde-Pokorny 2.509 and 1.742–43. The absence of this stem in Hittite and its presence in Indo-European provides one of Sturtevant’s strongest arguments in favor of his “Indo-Hittite hypothesis” (referred to above in note 8); see *Language* 15 (1939) 11–14, *HG* 109, *IHL* 26. (This is the argument which convinced Goetze of the correctness of Sturtevant’s view: see *JAOs* 65 [1945] 52–53, *Kleinasien* 60, and *Language* 37 [1961] 472, note 12a.) Hittite has two early “sentence connectives” (which I prefer to call “clause connectives”), the rare and archaic *su* and the early *ta*, representing Indo-Hittite *so* and *to* respectively (both later replaced by the extremely common *nu*, which may have affected the vocalism in *su*). We frequently find *ta*, like the later *nu*, combined with the Hittite enclitic pronoun *-as*, similar to Latin *is* in meaning and presumably akin to it in stem (both Pedersen 58 and Sturtevant, *HG* 109, equate it with the stem seen in Sanskrit genitive *asya*; this is traced, e.g. by Brugmann 2.2.327 and Walde-Pokorny 1.96, to an original *e-*, but I think we must posit a by-form *o-* to account for Hittite *a*). According to Sturtevant’s very plausible theory, Indo-Hittite *so* developed into Indo-European *so-*; and Indo-Hittite *tom* (to plus masculine accusative *-om*, whence Hittite *ta* plus *-an*, in other words *tan*) developed into Indo-European *tom*—similarly the other case-forms. By assuming that the forms with *s-* appeared only as a simple particle, employed when there was no change of subject and hence no need for a pronoun, Sturtevant accounts neatly for the

Celtic, Germanic, and Albanian), with a related, possibly adjectival, form *s(i)yo- t(i)yo-*<sup>17</sup> (which produced relatives in Old Persian<sup>18</sup>); and (2) an indefinite stem *sem- som- smo-*<sup>19</sup> (which, as is pointed out below, page 118, produced relatives in Hittite).

The demonstrative continued to function as a demonstrative in Indo-Iranian (Sanskrit *sa*, Avestan *hāu*, Old Persian *haw*), Greek (demonstrative and article *ho hē to*, and its compounds *hode* and *houtos*), Celtic (but with considerable changes), Germanic (Gothic *sa*, Icelandic *sa*, Old English *se*, Modern English *this* and *that* and article *the*, Modern German *dieser* and article *der*, etc.). But it also developed into a relative in certain Greek dialects (*ho* in Homer competes with the relative *hos*<sup>20</sup> from *yo*s, and in Herodotus supplants it) and in Germanic (note that in Modern German *der* from the demonstrative is regularly used as is English *who*,<sup>21</sup> while *wer* from the indefinite remains true to its origin, being normally an indefinite relative, "who" in the sense of "whoever"<sup>22</sup>).

As for *sem- som- sm-*, this functions widely as an indefinite, as in Sanskrit *sama-* "any," Greek *oudamos* "no," Gothic *sums* "any," English *some* and *same*; likewise as the numeral "one,"<sup>23</sup> as in

fact that in Indo-European the *s-* forms appear only in the masculine (and feminine) nominatives, while everywhere else throughout the paradigm we have forms in *t-*.

<sup>17</sup> Brugmann 2.2.320, Walde-Pokorny 2.509 and 1.743.

<sup>18</sup> Kent (*OP* 68) explains this relative, *hya hyā tyā*, as resulting from an earlier \**syas syā tyad*, an amalgamation of a demonstrative \**sa sā tad* (from Indo-European *so sā tod*) and a relative \**yas yā yad* (from Indo-European *yo yā yod*). But the usual explanation, of tracing *hya* back directly to an original Indo-European form, seems simpler, especially as Sanskrit has an early demonstrative, *syas syā tyat* (Whitney 191). Old Persian has retained the *yo-* stem in the conjunctions *yadā* "where," *yadih* "when, if," *yathā* "as," *et al.*, and the *s-* stem in the pronoun *haw* "this one, he"; but there is no sign anywhere else of contamination.

<sup>19</sup> See Walde-Pokorny 2.488-92. Brugmann ignores this stem as an indefinite in the *Grundriss*, taking cognizance of it only as a numeral (2.2.7); but he has a brief note on it in *KVG* (425).

<sup>20</sup> Incidentally, *hos* as well as *ho* is often demonstrative in Homer.

<sup>21</sup> Like English *who*, German *der* may serve as either a restrictive or a non-restrictive relative; but in German the distinction is made only in intonation, not in punctuation. (On the English distinction, both oral and written, cf. above, 114.)

<sup>22</sup> In striking contrast with the state of affairs in German is that in English, where *that* as a relative is used *only* in an indefinite or restrictive sense. But this is due to the peculiar and complicated history of *that*; see *H2* 25.350, note 23.

<sup>23</sup> The same stem often functions for "one" the numeral and for "one" the indefinite. Cf. from a different stem meaning "one" the numerals Latin *unus*, German *eins*, English *one*; the English indefinites *one* and *any*; the indefinite articles French *un* and the other Romance derivatives of Latin *unus*, German *ein*, English *a(n)*; etc. Also note the translation of Latin *simul* by English *once* both as an adverb and as a conjunction (for the latter use, cf. below, note 26).

Greek *heis mia hen* "one,"<sup>24</sup> *hekatón* "one hundred," *hapax* "once," Latin *singuli*, *simplex*, *simul*, *semel*, perhaps *mille*, etc. Relative or interrogative uses of this stem were almost unknown in the various Indo-European languages, the only apparent instances being provided by the use of Greek *mechri* (perhaps)<sup>25</sup> and Latin *simul*<sup>26</sup> as subordinating conjunctions; and this doubtless grew up within their own languages from the prepositional and adverbial use respectively. Other possible evidence is scanty and dubious.<sup>27</sup>

But in 1938 the world of Hittite scholars read surprising and exciting news, namely, that Hittite revealed a new indefinite-interrogative-relative stem *ma-* (from original *mo-*) heretofore unknown to Indo-Europeanists! Pedersen (*Hitt.* 67-71), on the basis of Hittite *masiwanz*, *masiyas*, *masiyanki*, *manka*, declared (71): "So ist es also wahrscheinlich, dass das Hittitische einen, allerdings im Rückgang begriffenen, Pronominalstamm \**mo-* gekannt hat, die den zehn altbekannten Sprachzweigen abgeht"; Sommer (*HAB* 164-66) showed that *masis*, like *mahhan*, could be interrogative as well as indefinite or relative; and Sturtevant (*Language* 14 [1938] 241, note 11a) stated that Hittite certainly had (in addition to *kwi-kwo-*) a second interrogative-indefinite-relative stem, *ma-*, and showed how the conjunctions *man* and *mahhan* were derived from it.

Could this be true? Could an indefinite-interrogative-relative stem alive and active in Hittite have disappeared practically without trace<sup>28</sup> from all the Indo-European languages?

<sup>24</sup> Also, I believe, Greek *monos* "only, alone." I am proud to note that the explanation of this word's origin which I offered (*Language* 18 [1942] 88) in opposition to Brugmann, has been accepted by Buck, *IE* 938.

<sup>25</sup> It is by no means certain that *mechri* comes from the *sm-* stem, but I have argued in favor of it (*Language* 18 [1942] 112). We may compare its synonym Greek *achri*, which may be from the same stem as *mechri* (as Fick suggested, *BB* 5.168) or from the stem *yo-* (see Hahn, *Language* 18 [1942] 112, note 178). In either case the loss of the initial aspirate is of course due to dissimilation.

<sup>26</sup> I have not the slightest doubt that *simul* (e.g. in Terence, *Phorm.* 823, *hic simul argentum repperit cura sese expedit*, which we can translate quite literally "once he found the money, he freed himself of anxiety") is to be classed as a conjunction. To say that *ac* is "understood" is to my mind methodologically unsound. When present, *ac* reinforces *simul*; when absent, its absence indicates that it is not necessary, and need not, or, rather, should not, be "supplied." Nor would I explain the use of *simul* as a conjunction in terms of *simulac*, as does Hofmann (759), followed by Szantyr (638).

<sup>27</sup> See Hahn, *Language* 18 (1942) 112-13. The words involved are listed just below, note 28.

<sup>28</sup> Pedersen found some traces of interrogative or relative uses of his supposed *mo-* stem in Greek *mē*, Albanian *mos*, Armenian *mi*, Celtic *ma* (see Hahn, *Language* 18 [1942] 112, with notes 180, 181, and 182). Cf. above, note 27.

And further must we, on the basis of Sturtevant's equation of Hittite *man* and *mahhan* with Attic *men* and Doric *mān*, separate them from the Sanskrit *sma* and *smā*, with which they had been convincingly identified?

In 1942 I solved the problem, at least to my own satisfaction, by proposing that the Hittite stem *ma-* was to be traced back not to an original *mo-* but to an original *smo-*, in other words our familiar *sem-* *som-* *smo-* stem (see *Language* 18 [1942] 83–116).<sup>29</sup> So this indefinite stem too, like *qui-* *quo-*, may be thought to have generated not only an interrogative but a relative as well.<sup>30</sup>

It is now time to consider the evolution of the relative from the indefinite. This I tried to trace in an article which appeared in 1946.<sup>31</sup> I began with an example from Hittite chosen quite at random,<sup>32</sup> *Pap. 1.8 U-NU-TE-MES-ya-kan ku-e an-da-an na-at sa-ra-a da-a-i*. Here we have a sentence consisting of two clauses, of which the first one would probably be explained as a relative clause; but—and this is in Hittite absolutely typical of so-called relative clauses in general—the so-called relative pronominal form (*ku-e*) might just as readily be explained as an indefinite, in which case we have a compound and not a complex sentence. The meaning would then be “some (*kwe*) utensils (are) therein, and these he picks up.” But if *kwe* is viewed as a relative, the meaning would be “which utensils (are) therein, these he picks

<sup>29</sup> I recognize, and always have recognized, the fact that some of the material included in this article is controversial; but I trust that the fundamental premise is sound.

<sup>30</sup> I believe any indefinite *can* generate a relative, though not all do. Note that “*everywhere* I go, I have a good time” means just the same as “*wherever* I go, I have a good time.” The explanation is not that *where* in *everywhere* is relative as it is in *wherever*, for we can also say (in sub-standard English, to be sure) “*every place* I go, I have a good time,” just as we can say (in perfectly standard English) “*every time* I go, I have a good time” in the sense of “*whenever* I go, I have a good time.” In the article by Fowler already referred to (in the opening paragraph of this paper), the author (*Language* 7 [1931] 23 and note 24) quotes an example of dialect English already quoted by Curme (*Language* 4 [1928] 146) from Lucy Furman, *Mothering on Perilous*, Chapter 15: “Any man can’t fight for his friends better be dead.” And in completely acceptable English we can say, “Any time you call me, I’ll gladly come.” Cf. also the use of *simul* and *once* as conjunctions (notes 23 and 26).

<sup>31</sup> “The Origin of the Relative *kwi-* *kwo-*,” *Language* 22 (1946) 68–85 (number dedicated to Edgar H. Sturtevant). I make so many references to this article in the course of the present paper that for convenience I shall refer to it simply as *H*.

<sup>32</sup> It happened to be the first one cited by Sturtevant in his article (*S*) in the volume dedicated to Curme, to which mine, appearing in the number of *Language* dedicated in turn to Sturtevant (*Language* 22 [1946] number 2), was a sort of sequel.



up.” The ambiguity is due to the fact that each clause is regularly joined by a connective to the preceding clause, no matter whether the latter is, from our point of view, coordinate with it or subordinate to it.<sup>33</sup> In this particular example the connective is the very common *nu*, which here fuses with the enclitic pronoun *-at*<sup>34</sup> (an original nominative-accusative neuter singular which has come to be used as a plural as well) to produce the form *na-at*. In either case, *kwe* is an adjective modifying *UNUTE-MES*, and *UNUTE-MES* belongs in the first clause, *not* in the second (where, indeed, it is “resumed” by *-at*<sup>35</sup>). We must not allow ourselves to be blinded as to the above facts by our English idiom, which would demand a rendering “the utensils which (are) therein he picks up,” or by our English grammatical system, which

<sup>33</sup> If the subordinate clause follows instead of preceding, then there is no connective (which is probably the only proof that Hittite distinguishes between coordinate and subordinate clauses at all); but this order is very, very rare. Out of 390 examples of relative clauses examined by me, only 12 followed the main clause (*H* 75, note 31, and 76, note 43).

<sup>34</sup> The pronoun *-as -at* is very hard to classify. I have already (note 16) compared it with Latin *is*, and it does resemble a demonstrative in that it varies for gender, but, unlike a demonstrative, it can be used only substantively, never adjectivally. Probably for this reason, Friedrich (*El.* 1.26) classes it as a personal pronoun. Sturtevant in the first edition of *HG* (198) classed it as a demonstrative; in the second edition (108) he classes it simply among “defective pronouns,” which is correct enough (it has only nominative and accusative cases) but seems to me rather a begging of the question. I am inclined to think we should recognize it as *sui generis*, and not try to put it into a category with other pronouns at all.

<sup>35</sup> A resumptive of some sort is usually present (for complete statistics, see *H* 75–80). This resumptive may be: (1) a substantival pronoun, whether *-as* (cf. note 34) or a true demonstrative, normally *apas* “ille” (or occasionally a possessive adjective representing the genitive of such a pronoun); (2) the demonstrative *apas* used as an adjective with a repetition of the noun “antecedent”; (3) the noun antecedent alone; (4) some substitute of similar meaning for the noun antecedent. My figures for the four types are respectively 219 (an overwhelming majority), 18, 11, 24 (*H* 76). In simple, straightforward examples a resumptive is most likely to be omitted (1) when, if present, it would have been in the same case as the antecedent (36 instances) or (2) when it would have been the subject of the verb, if present, and thus can be easily dispensed with (30 of the previous 36 instances, and 5 others); only in 5 instances involving what would have been an accusative resumptive following a nominative antecedent is the absence of a resumptive slightly harder to account for (see *H* 79, especially notes 63 and 64). However, in 23 instances without a resumptive, this omission is so harsh that from the English point of view we have an anacoluthon (*H* 77, note 48; 78, notes 50 and 54); but the structure of the Hittite passages becomes much easier to understand if we stress the original indefinite nature of the “relative,” and hence the original independent status of the “relative” clause, which thus does not demand a following completing clause as it would in English (see *H* 77–79). On the similar use of resumptives in Sanskrit and in Latin, see below, notes 59 and 60 in regard to Sanskrit, and note 86 in regard to Latin.

views *utensils* as belonging in the main clause and calls it the *antecedent*<sup>36</sup> of the relative.

I examined 390 examples of sentences which might be classed as relatives, distributed throughout 68 documents of varying dates, to test them as to whether the so-called relative pronominal forms conformed to what I considered their origin as indefinites. I found that they did indeed (71–85).<sup>37</sup> Most noteworthy were the facts that in Hittite (1) the relative clause is almost always indefinite (restrictive, exexegetical) in its force;<sup>38</sup> (2) the relative clause regularly precedes the main clause;<sup>39</sup> (3) the “antecedent” is a part of the relative clause, not of the main clause;<sup>40</sup> (4) this “antecedent” is frequently represented by a “resumptive” in the main clause.<sup>41</sup>

Thus is established the pattern (most clearly seen in Hittite and Latin) of the sentence containing a relative that is derived from an indefinite. On the other hand, the pattern of the sentence containing a relative that is derived from a demonstrative (most clearly seen in Greek) is quite different. Here the original must have been of the type “I pray to Apollo—*him* Leto bore,” which ultimately developed into “I pray to Apollo, *whom* Leto bore,” or even, with a change of “antecedent,” “take bronze and gold—*these* gifts my father and mother will give you,” which ultimately developed into “take bronze and gold, *which* gifts my father and mother will give you,” or rather in our usual idiom “take bronze and gold, gifts *which* my father and mother will give you.”<sup>42</sup> Hence we may expect to find that as a rule the relative clause in early Latin, just as in Hittite, is restrictive, and

<sup>36</sup> *Faute de mieux*, I am using the term *antecedent* for the word modified by the indefinite-relative adjective. I admit that this is inexact (particularly when, as can happen, the adjective precedes the noun), but I trust it will not be misleading.

<sup>37</sup> I also found (H 85) that, although certain characteristics of these relative clauses would apply equally well if the relatives had originated as interrogatives, certain others would not. I may mention here two particularly telling details. (1) If this type of relative evolved from an interrogative, the original meaning must have been: “Which utensils (are) therein? These he picks up.” But that is not the point at all. Of necessity, the interrogative form would rather have been: “Which utensils does he pick up? These (are) therein.” (2) The presence of a connective is not in order between a question and answer.

<sup>38</sup> Only 22 of my 390 examples are indubitably non-restrictive (H 81).

<sup>39</sup> There are only 12 fairly certain instances out of the 390 where it does not (H 82–83).

<sup>40</sup> This is invariable.

<sup>41</sup> See above, note 35.

<sup>42</sup> The Greek passages which are here paraphrased will follow directly.

precedes the main clause, but in early Greek is non-restrictive, and follows the main clause.<sup>43</sup> The following examples from Homer, to which might have been added innumerable others of the same sort, behave in just the way we might have anticipated.

1. Examples with *hos hē ho* :

*Il.* 2.26–27:

Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι,  
ὃς σευ ἄνευθεν ἑὼν μέγα κήδεται ἧδ' ἐλαίρει.

I am a messenger to you from Zeus, who  
though he is far away cares greatly for  
you and pities (you).

*Il.* 2.324–25:

ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεὺς,  
ὄψιμον ὀψιτέλεστον, ὅου κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται.

Counsellor Zeus showed us this great sign,  
late (and) late of fulfillment, the fame of  
which will never be lost.

*Od.* 1.1–2:

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ  
πλάγχθη.

Tell me, Muse, of the man of many wiles, who<sup>44</sup>  
wandered far and wide.

*Od.* 1.68–71 (contains two instances):

ἀλλὰ Ποσειδάων γαιήοχος ἄσκελὲς αἰεὶ  
Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται, ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάσεν,  
ἀντίθρονον Πολύφημον, δού κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον  
πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι.

But Poseidon the Earth-Holder has always  
been implacably angry because of the  
Cyclops, whom he deprived of his eye—  
godlike Polyphemus, whose strength is  
greatest among all the Cyclopes.

<sup>43</sup> Another difference in use which may be due to this difference in origin is the fact that in a clause which is coordinate with a preceding relative clause, Greek regularly, but Latin rarely, uses a demonstrative instead of a second relative.

<sup>44</sup> Taken out of context, the relative here might seem indefinite, "tell me of a man (some man, any man) who wandered"; but of course *andra* here is "the man" *par excellence*.

2. Examples with *ho hē to* :*Il.* 1.35–36:

πολλὰ δ' ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε κιὼν ἡρᾶθ' ὁ γεραίος  
Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνακτι, τὸν ἡύκομος τέκε Λητώ.

And then going apart the old man made  
many prayers to Lord Apollo, whom fair-  
haired Leto bore.

*Il.* 22.340–42:

ἀλλὰ σύ μὲν χαλκὸν τε ἄλις χρυσόν τε δέδεξο  
δῶρα, τὰ τοι δώσουσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,  
σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν.

But accept both bronze and gold in abun-  
dant—gifts which (my) father and (my)  
lady mother will give you—and give my  
body back to my home.

(Here the relative clause is practically parenthetical.)

But the state of affairs in Homer is not always so simple as this. Having, as I believe, lost the indefinite relative from the *qui- quod*-stem,<sup>45</sup> Greek must use another relative in its place. For this purpose, perhaps under the influence of the regularly indefinite

<sup>45</sup> Sturtevant (*S* 148–49) cites a few passages from Homer where this relative may be preserved. In three of these he believes “the relative force is possible,” though “on the whole it is safer to retain the customary interpretation.” I believe it is not only “safer” but essential to take *tis* in all three as the interrogative, and I am punctuating accordingly. They follow. (1) *Il.* 1.8–9:

τίς τ' ἄρ' σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;  
Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός.

After invoking the Muse, the poet naturally asks her for information as to the cause of all the trouble which, with the Muse's help, he is going to recount. (Vergil directs a rather similar question to *his* Muse in *Aen.* 1.8–11, only he uses an indirect instead of a direct question—Musa, mihi caussas memora, quo numine laeso quidve dolens regina deum etc.) (2) *Od.* 6.276–77:

τίς δ' ὅδε Ναυσικάα ἔπεται καλὸς τε μέγας τε  
ξείνος; ποῦ δέ μιν εὔρε; πόσις νύ οἱ ἔσσεται αὐτῇ.

The ill-natured bystander whose scurrilous gossip Nausicaa prudently fears is naturally concerned with maliciously asking who her companion is and where she picked him up. (3) *Od.* 23.184–85:

τίς δέ μοι ἄλλοσ' ἔθηκε λέχος; χαλεπὸν δέ κεν εἴη  
καὶ μάλ' ἐπισταμένῳ.

Odysseus in his natural indignation demands who has performed what he knows is for the ordinary man a well-nigh impossible feat; he certainly does not say, as Sturtevant suggests, “whoever has set my bed elsewhere, it would be a hard task for him,”

*hostis*,<sup>46</sup> it borrows *hos*, which thus acquires a double use, indefinite or restrictive<sup>47</sup> as well as definite or non-restrictive.<sup>48</sup> On the other hand *ho*, whose demonstrative origin is of course far more transparent, is regularly non-restrictive only.<sup>49</sup> The two uses are well illustrated by *Il.* 16.156–59:

οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὥς  
ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσιν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή,  
οἷ τ' ἐλαφον κεραὸν μέγαν. οὐρεσι δηώσαντες  
δάππουσιν.

Like flesh-eating wolves, in whose hearts  
(there is) great strength, that are devouring  
a big horned deer after killing it in the  
mountains.

for he knows full well that hardly any one could have done so. But in one passage Sturtevant feels that “we pretty clearly have a general relative”: this is *Il.* 18.192:

ἄλλου δ' οὗ τευ οἶδα, τευ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύνω.

As Leaf says of this line, its sense is clear, but its syntax “very puzzling.” The first *teu* (indefinite) has been variously explained: (1) as attracted into the genitive by the following *teu* (but such “attraction” is very rare in Homer, and the few passages which do exemplify it are quite different from 18.192, as we shall see); (2) as depending on *teuchea* to be “supplied” from the next clause (but in that case I would expect not the second genitive *teu* but an accusative in agreement with *teuchea*, “nor do I know [the arms] of any one else *which* arms I might don”); (3) as the genitive with *oïda*, like *pentheos* in *Il.* 11.657–58 (an explanation which on the whole I think is the best way out). But even more difficult is the second *teu* (interrogative, with the circumflex), for the interrogative instead of the indefinite relative after an antecedent certainly appears “anomalous,” as Monro says (216). Monro suspects textual corruption, and Nauck actually proposes the emendation *outina oïda hoteu*, but Leaf calls this “too plain to be corrupted.” Perhaps Leaf’s own explanation is the best, that we should “assume a sudden change of thought” (which would certainly fit very well Achilles’ distracted and despairing state of mind)—“With respect to any other I know not—whose armor can I wear?” (Incidentally, the scholiasts’ query quoted by Paley on 18.192—“why did not Achilles use the armour of Patroclus?”—seems to me simple to answer: it would have been too small for him! Note that he himself says in 193 that the only shield possible for him is Ajax’.)

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Brugmann-Thumb (644): “Zwischen *hos* und *hostis* war oft nur ein geringfügiger Unterschied.” Thus *hos* could replace *hostis* as an indefinite relative, and eventually it even happened that *hostis* replaced *hos* as a definite one.

<sup>47</sup> A good example is *Od.* 19.577–79.

<sup>48</sup> Goodwin (220) well distinguishes between the restrictive type *ἃ ἐβούλετο ταῦτα ἔλαβεν*, “what he wanted, that he took,” and the non-restrictive type *ταῦτα ἃ ἐβούλετο ἔλαβεν*, “he took these things, which he wanted.” (I would have set the second relative clause off by commas in the Greek as well as in the English.)

<sup>49</sup> So Monro (231–32) and Chantraine (278). Both note a few exceptions, but suggest that in some of them the text may be at fault. I must admit that, in a number of others in which the relative appears to me to be restrictively used, the scholars class it otherwise on the ground that it refers to a “definite antecedent.”

Here the *hoi t(e)* clause is restrictive and the *toisi te* clause (despite the often generalizing *te*) is non-restrictive.<sup>50</sup>

In view of what has just been said, it is not surprising that, while the *hos* clause frequently precedes the main clause,<sup>51</sup> the *ho* clause almost invariably follows.<sup>52</sup> It has been stated that to the latter rule there are only two exceptions:<sup>53</sup> *Il.* 1.125:

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράδομεν, τὰ δέδασται.

What we plundered from the cities, these  
things have been distributed;

and *Od.* 4.349–50 = 17.140–41:

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μοι ἔειπε γέρων ἄλιος νημερτής,  
τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.

But what the truth-telling old man of the  
sea said to me, of these things no word will  
I conceal or hide from you.

There has been much discussion of these two passages, and the commentators are divided as to whether the first *ta* is demonstrative or relative. To me it seems that we need a relative, but an indefinite and not a definite one; and therefore I am inclined to prefer the reading *alla th' ha men* suggested by Monro (231), and mentioned with approval by some of the editors (e.g. Leaf).<sup>54</sup>

<sup>50</sup> I recently came across an English example which similarly combines the two types of "who" clauses in a single sentence. This occurred in an article by Walter Lippmann headed "Congress and the President," dealing with the proposed tax cut (*New York Herald Tribune*, July 19, 1962, page 18): "There are some, who should be heard, who think that the right amount would even be fifteen billion." Had the sentence ended with "who should be heard," the clause would certainly have been restrictive; but as it is, the second *who* clause is restrictive, and the first one is non-restrictive.

<sup>51</sup> According to Meillet-Vendryes 574, this is the *normal* position of the relative clause in Greek, but they give no examples or statistics, and furthermore they evidently have in mind the whole extension of the language, not simply the Homeric period.

<sup>52</sup> So Monro (231).

<sup>53</sup> So far as I know, the first person to make this statement was Hentze (11), in his dissertation on the Greek relative pronoun (1863); but both Monro (231) and Brugmann-Thumb (645) repeat it without giving him credit. Merry in his note on *Od.* 4.349 does give him credit; but his reference, "Philol. 30. p. 504," seems wrong (if "Philol." means *Philologus*, as I suppose it must).

<sup>54</sup> Bolling makes the ingenious suggestion (*CP* 41 [1946] 233) that the reading *allatamen* really means *alla t' a men*, with *a* representing the relative which is regularly written *ha*. This suggestion rests on the belief that the original text of Homer was in a psilotic dialect.

But a difficulty still remains in the *Odyssey* passage: the lack of a *de* to balance the *men*<sup>55</sup> (in *Il.* 1.126 there is a *de* that will serve).

With the two passages just discussed, Merry (on *Od.* 4.349) compares *Od.* 14.227:

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τὰ φίλ' ἔσκε, τὰ που θεὸς ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκεν.

This seem to me quite different, for here I believe it is the second clause that is subordinate, the meaning being "but these things were dear to me which the god put into my heart."<sup>56</sup> But here again I find the use of *ta* difficult, for once more it seems to me to be indefinite. (Cf. above, note 49.)

At all events we have found that Greek relatives, though their origin was different, could behave like Latin relatives, in other words that when the *γος* relative replaced the *quis* relative, it acted like a *quis* relative. And this behavior is of a type so widely extended throughout Indo-European that it is amazing how little it has been understood.

Thus in Indo-Iranian, which has only the *γο-* stem,<sup>57</sup> we find a pattern reminding us of Hittite.

<sup>55</sup> Hentze's attempt to explain this (11) seems to me quite lame.

<sup>56</sup> This is evidently Monro's idea too, for he cites this line as one of the exceptions to his rule that "the Art. cannot stand as correlative to a Demonstrative" (231), by which he clearly means that the pronoun from the demonstrative stem (which I would not call an "article" when it occurs in Homer) when used as a relative cannot stand in a clause following a clause containing a demonstrative. The other exceptions that he lists are *Od.* 19.573 and perhaps 9.334; *Il.* 7.452, which Hentze (11) classes with *Od.* 9.334, Monro explains differently. He does not explain his hesitancy about *Od.* 9.334; I presume if it is an exception to his rule, he must interpret *hoi* as a demonstrative and *tous* as the "article" used as a relative, and translate with BL (144) "and the lot fell upon those four whom I myself would have been fain to choose." This must be the general idea, for all the editions that I have consulted read *hoi* (demonstrative). But might it not be possible to read *hoi* with the accent (relative) and reverse the relationship of the two clauses, taking the first as the relative clause and the second as the main clause, *tous* in that case being a demonstrative? The meaning then would be, to paraphrase BL, "and those four upon whom the lot fell, I myself would have been fain to choose"—i.e., "they were the very ones that I myself would have wanted to choose."

<sup>57</sup> This stem even came in both Sanskrit and Avestan to function as indefinite: see Wackernagel 3.554. Perhaps the connecting link was the second of Whitney's "marked peculiarities" (196), "a frequent conversion of the subject or object of a verb by an added relative into a substantive clause," e.g. *AV* 4.20.8, *pari no pāhi yad dhanam*, translated by Whitney (*ibid.*) "protect of us what wealth [there is]"; see Wackernagel's more precise discussion of this tournure (3.554–55). Such a development is apparently an innovation within Indo-Iranian. Whether there are traces in Indo-Iranian, as there surely are in Greek (see above, note 20), of what I believe was the original demonstrative force of the stem (see above, note 12, and the portion

Whitney (196) classes as among “marked peculiarities in the Sanskrit use of the relative” “a very decided preference for putting the relative clause before that to which it relates”;<sup>58</sup> and one of the examples that he cites, though he does not comment on this as an additional “peculiarity,” is a passage from the *Rig Veda* (*RV* 1.1.4) with an accusative relative and antecedent (*yam yajñam*) in the first clause, resumed by a nominative (*sa*) in the main clause: *yam yajñam paribhur asi se id deveṣu gacchati*, “which offering you protect, assuredly that goes to the gods.” In Sanskrit precisely as in Hittite,<sup>59</sup> the “resumptive” may take the form, as here, of the demonstrative substantively used, or of the demonstrative adjectivally used plus the antecedent repeated (in a different case when necessary), or of the antecedent, or of a synonym of the antecedent; or the antecedent may stand *only* in the relative clause, with no resumptive at all in the main clause.<sup>60</sup>

In Old Persian the familiar pattern is even more striking, and is, I think, almost invariable; none the less it has apparently not been recognized. Here the regular formula demands a relative clause followed by a main clause, the relative clause opening with the antecedent and its modifying relative adjective, and the main clause containing a resumptive. The usage seems confined to instances in which the antecedent with its modifying relative adjective serves as subject of the relative clause and is therefore in the nominative; the resumptive is of course in whatever case is required by the structure of the main clause. But when the antecedent is not in the case of the resumptive, Kent, who as a good Latinist ought to have known better, labels the passage an

of the text to which it refers), is disputed: see Wackernagel 3.557–58. Delbrück (*SF* 1.103) holds that a comparison of Greek and Sanskrit reveals that the relative had not as completely evolved in Greek as in Sanskrit, and that therefore Indo-European *yo-* could not have itself reached the relative stage, but must still be anaphoric. However, he later reversed himself (*VS* 3.316).

<sup>58</sup> So too Speijer (349 and 352). On the other hand, Whitney adds that “the other arrangement, though frequent enough, is notably less usual.” This “other arrangement,” i.e. with the relative clause following the main clause, is usual in non-restrictive clauses (for this statement, and for examples, see Delbrück, *VS* 3.296–97; also see above, page 120).

<sup>59</sup> The Hittite usage, which is amazingly similar, is summarized above in note 35.

<sup>60</sup> For these rules, with examples, see Delbrück, *SF* 1.33–34. According to him (34), by far the commonest type is the one that has the antecedent “assimilated” (“aufgenommen”) into the relative clause, in which case the main clause most commonly follows the relative clause and generally contains a resumptive.



instance of anacoluthon;<sup>61</sup> see especially *OP* 99. A simple, and typical, example is *DB* 1.21–22, *martiya hya agriya āha avam abaram hya arika āha avam aparsam*, which may be rendered in Latin as “*homo qui eximius erat, illum tollebam; qui malus erat, illum puniebam*,”<sup>62</sup> in English as “which(ever) man was excellent, him I elevated; which(ever) was evil, him I punished.” Kent’s comment on this (*OP* 99) that “the nom. *martiya* is resumed and set in proper syntactical relation by the acc. *avam*” shows a lack of realization that the noun *martiya* (“homo”) belongs in the two *hya*<sup>63</sup> clauses, and is therefore in the “proper” case as it stands. One more example may be cited here, *DB* 2.30–31 = 2.50–51, *kāra hya hamičiya manā naiy gaubataiy avam jadiy*, “*exercitus qui seditiosus mei (gen.) non se vocat, eum opprime*,” “which army, (being) rebellious, does not call itself mine, smite it.” Of this Kent says (96), “an adjective belonging to the antecedent is incorporated within the relative clause”; of course the adjective belongs in the relative clause, since the antecedent does.<sup>64</sup>

When the same construction occurs in Greek or Latin, the grammarians and commentators do not call it anacoluthon; they call it attraction.

Now of course there really is a quite different phenomenon in Greek that is also called attraction, and that I do not know how to explain on other grounds. This occurs in sentences in which the antecedent is truly a part of the main clause, and the relative shifts to the case of this antecedent.<sup>65</sup> (For discussion and

<sup>61</sup> I treated this problem in a paper entitled “On Alleged Anacolutha in Old Persian” which I presented before the American Oriental Society on April 3, 1962, and which appears in *JAOS* 85 (1965) 48–58.

<sup>62</sup> I am retaining the tenses of the Old Persian in my Latin translation, but perhaps *sustuli* and *punivi* would be preferable, for apparently there is no aspectual distinction in Old Persian between the aorist and the imperfect (see Kent, *OP*, 90–91).

<sup>63</sup> This is the Old Persian relative (on which see note 18).

<sup>64</sup> On the other hand I find absolutely amazing a similar passage which probably seemed normal to Kent, *DB* 2.83–84, *kāram hamičiyam hya manā naiy gaubātaiy avam jatā*, “*exercitum seditiosum qui mei non se vocat, eum opprime*.”

<sup>65</sup> In (early) Latin, the supposed “attraction” in case was from the relative to the antecedent; this we have accounted for by the fact that the relative was once an indefinite, and therefore the supposed antecedent was a part of the relative clause. In (classical) Greek, the usual attraction in case was from the antecedent to the relative; can there be any significance in the fact that here the relative was once a demonstrative, and therefore the supposed antecedent was always a part of the main clause? (Cf. *H2* 346, note 4; and 349, note 17.) But I cannot trace the Greek type of attraction in its development as I can the Latin.

examples, see Schwyzer 2.640–41.) Such a development is clearly an innovation on the part of Greek and not an inheritance; according to Monro (246) it does not occur in Homer.<sup>66</sup> A small group of examples cited from Latin<sup>67</sup> are doubtless borrowings from Greek;<sup>68</sup> most of them are late, and none of them is early.<sup>69</sup> They began to be in use in the Golden Age: examples are Caesar, *BG* 5.2.2, *sescentas eius generis cuius supra demonstravimus navis invenit*; <sup>70</sup> Cicero, *Att.* 10.8.7, *hoc confirmamus illo augurio quo diximus*; Horace, *Serm.* 1.6.14–15, *notante iudice quo nosti populo*. According to Hofmann (715) and Szantyr (567), “die häufigen Fälle im Bibellatein sind direkte Gräzismen.”

Rather oddly, the commentators treat this strictly Greek and, to my mind, anomalous type of attraction as the normal one, and the perfectly normal and natural inherited type as the abnormal one, for they call the former *attractio (relativi)* and the latter *attractio inversa*.<sup>71</sup>

This type of attraction, unlike the other, does occur in Homer, as we might expect. In Greek as in Indo-Iranian, the *yo*-stem in taking over the function and position of the *qui-quo*-stem naturally included this type of construction, although not to a

<sup>66</sup> Schwyzer (2.640) is of the same opinion, save for *Il.* 5.265–66:

τῆς γάρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωί περ εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς  
δῶχ' υἱὸς ποιήν Γανυμήδεος.

This passage has been rather widely accepted as an example (cf. e.g. Meillet–Vendryes 573). But I think Monro is certainly justified in dismissing this as a possible example, for *hēs* is surely a genitive in its own right. Zeus gave Tros not the whole breed of horses but (certain members) *of the breed*; that *hēs* does not represent the object of *dōch-* is indicated by the case of *poīnēn*. Leaf's translation (*LLM* 90), “they are of that breed whereof farseeing Zeus gave to Tros recompense for Ganymede his child,” makes very clear what I think is the true structure of the lines.

<sup>67</sup> Opinions apparently differ as to just how small! The construction is pronounced “rarely used” by Lane (306) and “im Gegensatz zum Griechischen nur selten” by Hofmann (715) and Szantyr (566); so too Ernout–Thomas (118), “elle n'a lieu qu'isolément en latin.” But according to Gildersleeve–Lodge (398), “it is rare in early Latin, but common from Cicero on.”

<sup>68</sup> Ernout–Thomas (118) deny this, but offer no proof for their statement.

<sup>69</sup> As least I know of none. As already reported (note 67), the statement is made by Gildersleeve–Lodge (398) that the construction is “rare in early Latin.”

<sup>70</sup> Hofmann (715), followed by Szantyr (566), suggests that here “elliptische Auffassung” is possible. Probably he has in mind an explanation similar to the one offered for *Il.* 5.265 in note 66.

<sup>71</sup> See e.g. for Greek Schwyzer 2.641, for Latin Hofmann 716 and Szantyr 566 and 567.

great extent. Four examples from Homer are listed by Monro (239).<sup>72</sup>

The two examples which are probably the simplest are both from the 14th book of the *Iliad*:

14.75–76:

νῆες ὅσαι πρῶται εἰρύαται ἄγχι θαλάσσης,  
ἔλκωμεν, πάσας δὲ ἐρύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα διάν.

As many ships as have been drawn up in the front line near the sea, let us drag (down) and draw all (of them) into the divine brine.

14.371–72:

ἀσπίδες ὅσαι ἄρισται ἐνὶ στρατῷ ἥδὲ μέγισται,  
ἑσσάμενοι.

Donning<sup>73</sup> as many finest and biggest shields as are in the army.

These two passages resemble each other in that they use *hos(s)os* “quantus” instead of *hos* “qui,” and also in that there is no resumptive with the main verb, so that we probably should say that the *hos(s)ae* clauses serve as objects<sup>74</sup> of their verbs.<sup>75</sup>

There is a resumptive, but a rather unusual one, a singular indefinite “no one” instead of the plural demonstrative that we might have expected, in Monro’s third example, *Il.* 10.416–17:

φυλακὰς δ’ ἄς εἶραι, ἥρως,  
οὗ τις κεκριμένη ρύεται στρατὸν οὐδὲ φυλάσσει.

Which guards you ask about, hero, none is watching over the army, having been set apart (for the purpose), or is on guard.

<sup>72</sup> In my opinion he completely misunderstands the construction, for he says (240), “it can only arise when the original construction of the Antecedent . . . has been forgotten.”

<sup>73</sup> In translating I try to keep as close to the original order as I can, but here it is almost impossible to render the relative clause before the main verb (which in this case is a participle).

<sup>74</sup> We shall find some Latin examples that may be similarly explained. See e.g. note 95.

<sup>75</sup> In the case of the first, an alternative, but in my mind inferior, explanation would be that *pasas*, the object of the second main verb *eryssomen*, is “felt” with the first one *helkōmen*.

In all three examples we have the usual restrictive relative clause preceding the main clause; there is also a possible exception, not cited under this rubric by Monro, in which a possibly though doubtfully restrictive relative clause follows. This is *Il.* 18.192 (already discussed in note 45). But this is completely foreign to the regular pattern (one would not expect an indefinite relative to attract a *preceding* pronoun to its case), and I think for this and other reasons may be safely dismissed from the present category.

Monro's fourth example is still more different from the other three, and in my opinion should not be classed with them. This is *Il.* 6.394–96:

ἐνθ' ἄλοχος πολύδωρος ἐναντίη ἦλθε θεούσα  
 Ἀνδρομάχη, θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἡετίωνος,  
 Ἡετίων ὃς ἔναιεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὕληεσση.

Then his richly-dowered wife came running  
 to meet him, Andromache, daughter of  
 great-spirited Eetion, which Eetion dwelt  
 under woody Plakus.

Here, instead of the usual restrictive relative clause preceding the main verb, we have a non-restrictive one following it, so that the structure points to the demonstrative force that really lies back of the relative rather than to its acquired indefinite force, the meaning being "Andromache, daughter of Eetion—this Eetion dwelt under woody Plakus." The word order—*Êtîôn hos*—seems to me no less natural than *nêes hosai*, *aspides hossai*, and *phylakas has* in Monro's other three examples; and I certainly do not agree with Paley that it is "very forced" and probably a sign of interpolation.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Paley sees an interpolation also in 6.401–3. I should be reluctant to surrender either set of lines, for it seems to me that the information about Andromache's illustrious race, as well as that about Astyanax' impressive name, heightens the pathos of the change in destiny impending for both. I am glad to note that Leaf defends the passage on purely linguistic grounds. However, Bolling, *Language* 24 (1948) 47–48, has a quite different explanation from Leaf's, as I am reminded by the very helpful referee. Bolling specifically rejects Leaf's view, electing rather to follow Wackernagel, *IF* 31 (1912) 257–58, who sees in *Êtîôn hos* an instance of haplogy, stemming from *Êtîônōs hos*. I wonder whether the rough breathing of *hos* might constitute an obstacle (to be sure, Bolling has stated elsewhere that the text of Homer may have been originally in a psilotic dialect, as remarked above, note 54). But I would prefer *not* resorting to such an explanation as Bolling's when another is quite possible. In rapid speech, haplogy may well occur; but it seems to be much less likely in metrical composition, whether oral or written.

As might be expected because of the origin of the Latin relative, early Latin has many more, and much more striking, instances of "inverse attraction" than early Greek. I present here a number of these instances.<sup>77</sup> For the time being, I am classifying them according to the case of the "antecedent" and relative; but, since later on I shall want to regroup them on other bases, I am numbering them for convenience of later reference.

1. *Trin.* 137, ille qui mandavit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus?
2. *Most.* 1046, ostium quod in angiporto est, patefeci fores.
3. *Capt.* 807–10, tum pistores scrofpasci, qui alunt furfuribus sues, eorum si quousquam scrofam conspexero, ex ipsis dominis exculcabo furfures.
4. *Capt.* 813–16, tum piscatores, qui praebent piscis foetidos, eis ora verberabo.<sup>78</sup>
5. *Poen.* 769–70, hi qui illum conciliaverunt mihi peregrinum, id nunc his cerebrum uritur.
6. *Pseud.* 718–19, servos qui hunc ferebat, ei os sublevi modo.
7. *Most.* 250, mulier quae se spernit, speculo ei usus est.
8. *Pseud.* 225–27, tu autem quae pro capite argentum numeras, ea pacisci scis, tibi haec loquor.
9. *As.* 621, patronus qui vobis fuit futurus, perdidistis.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>77</sup> In this list, all quotations without an author's name are from Plautus.

<sup>78</sup> This passage is followed directly by another, 818–22, with three successive *qui* clauses referring to the butchers and enumerating their misdeeds, like the *qui* clauses in 3 and 4. But one particular piece of misbehavior referred to in the last of these, 820, *qui* petroni nomen indunt verveci sectario, gets Ergasilus so excited that he almost forgets about the butchers and concentrates on the *petro*, 821–22, eum si petronem conspexero, et petronem et dominum reddam mortales miserrimos (*dominum* of the particular butcher responsible for this special piece of fraudulent dealing coming in as a sideline or an afterthought). In other words, we have here a genuine anacoluthon. I am not therefore including this passage for study, though certainly *lanii qui* is absolutely parallel to *pistores qui* and *piscatores qui* in 3 and 4. To be sure, if in 821 instead of *eum* we read *eorum* as in 809 (an emendation proposed by Brix, and accepted by Goetz and Schoell), we have a perfect parallel for 3; but, as Lindsay reminds us, there is no MS. authority for this. Moreover, there is a reason for saying *eorum scrofam* in 809, for we have not heard before of any particular sow belonging to the millers (we have merely had the word *scrofpasci* in 807), but in 821 we may expect *eum petronem* rather than *eorum petronem*, for we have heard of the butchers' special trickery in regard to the tough old ram, so it is natural to talk about *that* tough old ram in particular.

<sup>79</sup> I am including this passage on the assumption that it means "the patron who was going to be to you (i.e. *anglice* the patron whom you were going to have) you have lost," with *patronus qui* subject of the relative clause. But it may be that *qui* alone is the subject, and *patronus* the predicate noun—"the man) who was going to be your patron, you have lost"—in which case there is no so-called "attraction" at all. But

10. *Rud.* 1240–41, ille qui consulte cavet, uti licet partum.
11. Lucilius 900–1 (Marx), tu qui iram indulges nimis manus a muliere abstinere melius est.
12. Cato, *Agr.* 34.2, in creta et uligine et rubrica et ager qui aquosus erit, semen serito.
13. *Capt.* 1–2, hos quos videtis stare hic captivos duos, hi stant ambo.
14. *Trin.* 985, illum quem ementitus es, ego sum ipse Charmides.
15. *Poen.* 644–45, hunc chlamydatum quem vides, ei Mars iratust.
16. *Capt.* 110–12, istos captivos quos emi, is indito catenas.
17. *Mil.* 140–42, unum conclave cencubinae quod dedit miles, in eo conclavi ego perfodi parietem.
18. *Bacch.* 935–36, has tabellas quas fero non sunt tabellae.
19. *Amph.* 1009, Naucratem quem convenire volui, in navi non erat.
20. Terence, *Eun.* 653, eunuchum quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit!
21. Cato, *Or. Frag.* 32.2 (Jordan), agrum quem vir habet, tollitur.
22. Varro,<sup>80</sup> *Lin. Lat.* 8.41, Diona et Theona quos dicunt esse paene geminos, inveniuntur esse dissimiles.
23. *Curc.* 419, istum quem quaeris, ego sum.
24. *Ep.* 448–49, istum quem quaeris Periphanem Platenium, ego sum.
25. *Truc.* 746, illis quibus invidetur, i rem habent.
26. *Ep.* 329–30, quid illum ferre vis qui, tibi quoi divitiae domi maxumae sunt, is nummum nullum habes nec sodali tuo in te copias?
27. *Aul.* 573–74, ego te reddam madidum, tibi quoi decretum est bibere aquam.

In 1–12, the antecedent is nominative.<sup>81</sup> It has an accusative resumptive in 1 and 2;<sup>82</sup> genitive in 3; dative in 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; none in 9, 10, 11,<sup>83</sup> and 12.<sup>84</sup>

the first interpretation seems to me to be preferable, for two reasons: (1) the emphatic position of *patronus* puts the passage in line with most of the others here cited; (2) what has been lost is not just a *man* but the *patron*.

<sup>80</sup> Despite the comparative lateness of Varro's date, I am including him among early writers because of the old-fashioned nature of his style.

<sup>81</sup> As already noted, this is the only case used in the construction in Old Persian. In Latin it is said by Hofmann (716) to be commoner than the oblique cases, but in my examples the accusative seems to be just as common, and Szantyr (567) correctly revises Hofmann to this effect. Other cases, to be sure, are much rarer.

<sup>82</sup> However, 2 is a rather harsh type. See below, note 92; and cf. note 83.

<sup>83</sup> 11 is again harsh (cf. note 82). Again see below, notes 96 and 97.

<sup>84</sup> 12 is peculiar and clumsy. Cf. note 98.

In 13–24, the antecedent is accusative. It has a nominative resumptive in 13 and 14; dative in 15 and 16; ablative in a prepositional phrase in 17; none in 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

In 25–27, the antecedent is dative. It has a nominative resumptive in 25 and 26; an accusative in 27.<sup>85</sup>

The resumptive when present is most frequently the demonstrative,<sup>86</sup> twice *hic* (5 and 13), usually *is* (1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16, 25). There is one passage, 26, in which *is*<sup>87</sup> is equivalent to *tu*,<sup>88</sup> in contrast with 8 and 27, where we have *tibi* and *te* respectively. In 14, where we might have had *is*,<sup>89</sup> we have the more impressive combination of an intensive pronoun plus a proper name—not “I am he (the one, the man) whom you have lied about,” but “I am that very man Charmides whom you have lied about.”<sup>90</sup> In 17 we have the antecedent repeated,<sup>91</sup> with a modifying demonstrative adjective (*is* again). In 2 the antecedent *ostium* is replaced in the main clause by a synonym, *fores*, which gives almost the effect of an anacoluthon.<sup>92</sup>

The absence of a resumptive from the main clause produces diversified results. In passages in which, if present, it would have been nominative and subject of the verb, it is not missed at all,

<sup>85</sup> However, 27 is so different from all the other examples that we can hardly speak of a “resumptive” in regard to it. See below, page 137.

<sup>86</sup> Thus Latin agrees with Hittite, in which, as already noted (note 35), in an overwhelming number of instances the resumptive is the true demonstrative *apas* or the quasi-demonstrative *-as*. Of course Latin *is* resembles both of these in that it virtually functions as a personal pronoun of the third person.

<sup>87</sup> On the rather peculiar double function of this *is*, see below, note 112.

<sup>88</sup> Thus here it virtually functions as a personal pronoun of the second person (cf. note 86). Of course its use as a substitute for *tu* (or zero) is possible here only because the preceding *tibi*, and the ending of the verb *habes*, make it clear that the second person is involved. In 8 *ei* for *tibi* might have been ambiguous; and in 27, where the relative clause follows the main one (see below, page 136), of course nothing but *te* could be used.

<sup>89</sup> Or zero as in 23 and 24. On these see below, note 94.

<sup>90</sup> Had the relative clause followed the proper noun, it might have seemed non-restrictive. (So too in Vergil, *Aen.* 1.72–73; see note 128.) I have discussed elsewhere (*H2* 334 and note 40) the difference that word-order can make as regards the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses.

<sup>91</sup> Lindsay in his note on *Capt.* 1 says that “often the Subject or Object is found in both clauses,” but his “often” does not apply unless he is thinking exclusively of legal language; the *Mil.* passage is the only one that he cites from literature. The repetition of the antecedent, whether with (18 times) or without (11 times) a demonstrative, is not common in Hittite either (see note 35).

<sup>92</sup> Already referred to in note 82 as a harsh type. I have noted 24 examples of this sort in Hittite (*H* 75–76 and 77).

since the subject of the verb need not be expressed. Such passages are 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. In these it might be said that the relative clause refers to the unexpressed subject of the verb as denoted by the personal ending, but perhaps that is too English a way of looking at it; probably the best explanation is that the relative clause is itself the subject of the verb.<sup>93</sup> In the same way in 23 and 24, the relative clause is the predicate nominative with *ego sum*;<sup>94</sup> while in 9, where, if present, the resumptive would have been accusative, the relative clause is the direct object of *perdidistis*.<sup>95</sup> These passages seem smooth enough; but it is a little harder to envisage a relative clause that is used as a dative, which is the way we shall have to view the clauses in 10 and 11<sup>96</sup> unless we wish to have recourse to the expedient of recognizing an anacoluthon.<sup>97</sup> In 12, which, as already stated,<sup>98</sup> is clumsily constructed,<sup>99</sup> the clause is equivalent to an ablative parallel to the three preceding nouns *creta* and *uligine* and *rubrica*, and, like them, dependent on *in*; the compound prepositional phrase does not demand a resumptive as a relative clause might, but if we had one with the main verb (*serito*), it would be *in eis* (or *in eo*)<sup>100</sup> or perhaps *ibi*.

So far, we have found Latin behaving very much as Hittite does; but there is one important point of difference that must mark an independent development on the part of Latin. This

<sup>93</sup> Similarly in Vergil, *Aen.* 1.573, and Petronius 134.8—both to be discussed later—the relative clause is the subject of *est* and *natus est* respectively.

<sup>94</sup> It is rather interesting to contrast these two passages with 14, where the main clause, *ego sum ipsus Charmides*, itself contains its predicate nominative, of which the relative clause is clearly an adjectival modifier. 24 contains a proper name too, (*Periphanem Platenium*, referred to again in note 104), but in striking contrast with 14, it is here incorporated into the relative clause.

<sup>95</sup> Similarly in Vergil, *Aen.* 1.72–73—likewise to be discussed later (cf. note 93)—the relative clause is the direct object of *iungam*.

<sup>96</sup> I am assuming that the resumptive, if present in 11, would have been the dative *tibi*, as in *Mil.* 292, *medicum istuc tibi melius percontarier*. Of course *te*, as subject of *abstinere*, would also have been possible, and in that case the clause would have been accusative. The question is purely academic.

<sup>97</sup> Another way out is to say that a dative *ei* or *tibi*, to which the relative clause refers, is to be “understood” or “supplied” with *licet* in the main clause of 10 and with *melius est* in the main clause of 11; but, as I have already said (note 26), it always seems to me that in syntactical problems we ought to deal with the words that we have and not add to them.

<sup>98</sup> See note 84.

<sup>99</sup> This is classed as an extreme case by Ernout and Thomas in *Syntaxe latine* (117); but see the discussion in my review of this work, *Language* 30 (1954) 251.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *in eo conclavi* in 17.



is the tendency to use a demonstrative not only in the main clause but also in the relative clause. Sturtevant (*S* 146) expresses the view that such use was typical of Hittite as well as of Latin, but he was mistaken: a demonstrative certainly did not belong alongside of the indefinite in the original type of expression, and we rarely meet it in Hittite in its early use that developed from the indefinite, as I pointed out in *H* 80–81.<sup>101</sup> But among the twenty-seven Latin examples that we have been studying, there are seven, or perhaps eight, in which the antecedent is a demonstrative pronoun<sup>102</sup> (*hic*<sup>103</sup> in 5; *iste* in 23 and 24; *ille* in 1, 10, 14, and 25; and possibly *is* in 8<sup>105</sup>), and four more in which it is a noun modified by a demonstrative adjective (*hic* in 13, 15, and 18; *iste* in 16). We also find the personal pronoun *tu* in four instances, 8, 11, 26,<sup>106</sup> and 27.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>101</sup> I found only 25 examples out of my 390 (see again *H* 80–81: especially 80, notes 67 and 68; and 81, note 69). An interesting detail is the relatively high proportion of examples (4 out of 12) of passages with such demonstratives in the small group of examples in which the relative clause follows the main clause (*ibid.* 81, note 74), a rare use which likewise represents a departure from the original pattern (see on these *ibid.* 76, note 43, and 82–83).

<sup>102</sup> As I have already commented (note 86), these demonstratives really function almost as personal pronouns of the third person, so we may compare with them the four examples in which the antecedent is the personal pronoun of the second person (8, 11, 26, and 27, which will be noted directly).

<sup>103</sup> So too *hunc* in Petronius 134.8, to be discussed later (note 126).

<sup>104</sup> I am taking *istum* in 24 as a substantive, and the proper noun *Periphanem Platenium* (on which see note 94) as in apposition with it. But of course the proper noun might be the antecedent of the relative, with *istum* an adjective modifying it.

<sup>105</sup> Duckworth, in his note on *Ep.* 330 (my No. 26), offers *quae ea* in the *Pseud.* passage as a parallel for *qui is* in the *Ep.* passage (on which see note 112). However, I am not sure that he is right, since *ea* is not in the same clause as *quae*: in two successive coordinate relative clauses joined by a conjunction, a relative in the first may be continued by a demonstrative in the second (cf. note 43), and that is perhaps what we have here, even though the usual conjunction is lacking. (The interpretation in Sturtevant's edition of the *Pseud.*, which takes *ea* as a neuter plural accusative, seems to me much less likely.)

<sup>106</sup> Here the *tibi* is helpful in showing that *quoi* (as well as the preceding *qui*) refers to the subject of *vis* and not, as might well have been supposed, to *illum*. To be sure, the person of *habes* would have ultimately made this clear; but until that point was reached, the audience could easily have been misled. (We might compare the use in German, pleonastic from the English point of view, of a personal pronoun of the second person along with the relative in a relative clause in which the verb is in the second person—*du, der du* instead of the simple *du, der*.)

<sup>107</sup> Here the *tibi* is not only helpful, as in 26 (cf. note 106), but really necessary, for otherwise the *quoi* clause might have been taken as applying to *ego* rather than to *te*. Also, the *tibi* repeats in a mocking way the *mihi* of 572, *mihi bibere decretum est aquam*.

In ten of the remaining twelve examples, the antecedent is an unmodified noun. In the other two, 3 and 17, it has an accompanying adjective modifier.

As for the position of the antecedent, in all these examples it comes before the relative—normally just before it, though in 3, 8, and 17 there is an intervening word. This position is natural, for the word is used emphatically. But there actually are early passages in which the noun is buried deep within the relative clause; presumably in these cases every one realizes that it is a part of the relative clause, so no one talks about “attraction” in these instances. A case in point is *Capt.* 179–80, *nisi qui meliorem adferet quae mihi placeat condicio magis*; had the order been, *nisi condicio melior quae mihi placeat magis aliquis adferet*, with the antecedent directly preceding the relative and the relative clause preceding the main clause, the passage would doubtless have been classed as an example of attraction, standing for, *nisi qui meliorem condicionem quae mihi placeat magis adferet*.<sup>108</sup>

As for the position of the relative clause, in these early Latin examples as in Hittite,<sup>109</sup> it is almost invariably before the main clause. The only exception among my examples is 27, where there is good reason for this order, as we shall see directly.

In one other respect Latin, like Hittite, remains true to the prototype, and that is that nearly all the relative clauses just studied are restrictives. In 3 and 4, since Ergasilus probably thinks that *all* millers and *all* fishmongers are guilty of the mis-

<sup>108</sup> It seems to me that the question of order is of no great moment so far as the analysis of the construction goes; it is merely a matter of emphasis. But some editors (e.g. Brix on *Mil.* 140 and *Trin.* 137, Sonnenschein on *Rud.* 1240–41) and some grammarians make quite a point of it. Hofmann (716) speaks of the relative as directly following the antecedent in instances of “inverse attraction”; similarly Lane (304) and Hale (Hale and Buck 176). Ernout and Thomas (117) recognize the possibility of a quite different order, but set up an odd dichotomy: that when this “attraction” takes place, the antecedent is usually enclosed (“enclavé”) within the relative clause, as in Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.41; but that in the spoken language, the antecedent is sometimes left dangling (“*laissé en suspens*”) before the relative clause, the only example of this from the literary language being Vergil, *Aen.* 1.573. Similarly, Knapp in his note on this very passage says that attraction of the antecedent into the case of the relative “is not uncommon in prose, but there the antecedent is set within the rel. clause,” as in *Aen.* 1.72. The examples from Cicero and Vergil I shall discuss later (they are my numbers 28, 29, and 30); for the moment I shall content myself with saying that, though it is a relief to find some scholars aware that the antecedent need not precede the relative, I question whether it is correct to hold that its enclosure within the relative clause is the regular thing.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. above, notes 33 and 39.

demeanors with which he charges them, the *qui* clauses might be thought to be non-restrictive, but the causal force implicit in them lands them an element of restrictiveness.<sup>110</sup> In 19, where the antecedent is a proper noun referring to a particular person, we certainly have one of the rare examples of this type of relative used non-restrictively.<sup>111</sup> And in 27, where the antecedent is equally definite, being the personal pronoun *te*, the relative clause is likewise non-restrictive, and in this instance *follows* the main clause as we might expect.<sup>112</sup>

It sometimes seems that early manners of expression, especially if they run counter to what has come to be viewed as the more logical or the more "correct" form of the language, linger on in common speech longer than they do in the literary language (except for forms of writing that deliberately affect archaic style). There may be two reasons why the ancient construction that we have been studying appears so often in the early writers where it is found: (1) precisely because they *are* early; (2) because their style is closer to that of ordinary speech than, e.g., that of the writers of epic or lyric poetry or of elegant prose. It will be noted that most of my examples come from the two great comic writers, especially from Plautus, the earlier and less polished of the two (there is only one example from Terence); and that there are also

<sup>110</sup> I discuss this phenomenon in *H2* 352.

<sup>111</sup> We have an exactly parallel example in Hittite: *KBo* 4.4.2.68–70, *nu-kan Na-na-LU-in ku-in ne-eh-hu-un nu u-un-ni-es-ta*, "NanaLUem quem misi venit." This is one of the few indubitably non-restrictive clauses in Hittite; cf. note 38, and see *H* 81, note 77, and *H2* 367.

<sup>112</sup> The *tibi quoi* clause in 26 is quite different, being restrictive. But it is worth noting in passing that this *quoi* clause is itself part of a *qui* clause which is used non-restrictively with the subject of *vis*, or as itself the subject of *vis* (cf. note 93 and the corresponding portion of the text), and that this non-restrictive *qui* clause follows the main clause just as does the *tibi quoi* clause in 27, to which it would have been an exact parallel had it opened with *tu qui* instead of with simple *qui*. But the *qui* does have another pronoun with which it is in agreement, *is*, which thus serves not only as a resumptive with *tibi quoi* but also as a sort of "antecedent" with *qui*. In other words, *qui is* in its case use may be compared with *ille qui* in 1, and *qui is habes* in its relation to the preceding *vis* may be compared with *eunuchum quem dedisti* in its relation to the following *dedit* in 20. (We have also noted, note 105, that Duckworth compares this *qui is habes* with *quae ea scis* in 8.) But the combination *qui is* has not been widely commented on, since it is not conspicuous here, for several reasons: (1) *is* follows *qui* (cf. what was said above of *Capt.* 179–80, and note 108 just below it on the whole subject of the position of the relative in its clause); (2) the relative clause follows the main clause; (3) *is* even if placed in the main clause would still have been nominative; (4) *is* is more obviously used as resumptive to *tibi quoi* than as antecedent to *qui*.

examples from satire as written by the unpolished Lucilius, and from the writings of the likewise unpolished Cato and his later counterpart Varro. In other words this construction belongs to the *Umgangssprache*, and not to *Kunstprosa* or to genuine poetry.<sup>113</sup> It is therefore not surprising to find a survival of it in Petronius, perhaps the only Roman to represent people speaking as they actually did speak: this is 134.8, *hunc adolescentem quem vides, malo astro natus est*, words which Petronius puts into the mouth of a dishevelled and presumably illiterate old crone.<sup>114</sup> Nor is it surprising to find the construction reappearing, according to Hofmann (716), "oft im Spätlatein, namentlich bei Archaisten . . . und vulgären Autoren"; Szantyr (567) gives a lengthy list. Compare, too, a specialist on the subject, Löfstedt, who points out (225) that the construction "auch in spätlateinischer Zeit lebendig ist . . . und besonders der Volks- und Umgangssprache angehört." But it *is* rather surprising to meet it in the works of the greatest artists of the Golden Age, Cicero, Vergil, and Horace.<sup>115</sup>

The Cicero passage is in *Tusc.* 1.18.41: *quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat*. This is an iambic trimeter, and is apparently a translation, presumably but not necessarily made by Cicero himself, of a line in Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 143:<sup>116</sup>

ἔρδοι τις ἣν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην.

The Latin version is quite free syntactically;<sup>117</sup> in the Greek there

<sup>113</sup> Amazingly, some authorities (Gildersleeve-Lodge 398, Hale 176) speak of the usage as restricted to poetry. Of course comedy and satire may be classed as poetry; yet Horace seems right in saying that only in metrical form do they qualify as such, otherwise they are prose (*Serm.* 1.4.45-48 on comedy, 39-42 and 56-62 on satire), and I would hesitate to use them as examples of poetic style. But even if we do so use them, what of Cato, Varro, Petronius, and numerous later prose-writers? Actually, the only examples from genuine poetry that can be cited are the two from Vergil.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. 133.4, *anus laceratis crinibus nigraque veste deformis*.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. above, note 113.

<sup>116</sup> Cicero says (*ibid.*) that the passage was a Greek proverb. It seems strange that he does not recognize, and record, its provenience from Aristophanes. Is it possible that the maxim is older than Aristophanes, and merely quoted by him, or echoed in his own words? Or has the line as written by Aristophanes become proverbial? If so, was a corresponding line in Latin made by some Roman other than Cicero, perhaps earlier than he, and is he quoting that?

<sup>117</sup> Horace's simpler rendering, *Epis.* 1.14.44, *quam scit uterque libens censebo exerceat artem*, is close to the Greek. Propertius' version, 2.1.46, *qua pote quisque, in ea conerat arte diem*, is also more straightforward in construction, but is farther away from the Greek, at least as we have it in Aristophanes.

is no hint of attraction, since both *erdō* and *oida* can govern the accusative. Perhaps the translator, whether Cicero or someone else, though it suitable to use a mainly archaic form in a translation from Greek.<sup>118</sup>

The Horace passage is from the Satires, *Serm.* 1.1.1–3, *nemo, quam sibi sortem seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa contentus vivat.* It is didactic and not at all poetic in tone; and we must remember that Horace specifically excludes his own satires as well as those of Lucilius from the category of poetry.<sup>119</sup>

But we must not overlook what is perhaps the best-known and the oftenest-quoted of all examples of the construction: Vergil, *Aen.* 1.573, *urbem quam statuo, vestra est.* Dido in her embarrassment looks down and speaks briefly<sup>120</sup> and perhaps a trifle jerkily, and I do detect a faint hint of the colloquial in her use of *adeo* (567) and *tam* (568); still I would not suggest that Vergil deliberately attributes a bit of *Umgangssprache* to her, and so I suppose we must explain her *urbem quam* as an archaism rather than as a colloquialism. But an instance of “attraction” it is not.<sup>121</sup>

There is another example in Vergil, far less widely cited, of the agreement of the antecedent with the relative, *Aen.* 1.71–73, *sunt mihi bis septem praestanti corpore Nymphae, quarum quae forma pulcherrima Deiopea*<sup>122</sup> *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo.* Here the antecedent is regularly said to be “incorporated” within the relative clause, but this is no more true of *Deiopea* than it is of *urbem*. The former comes at the *end* of the

<sup>118</sup> Cf. the translators dealing e.g. with Homer or Vergil who introduce such forms as *thou goest, he goeth.* And then there are the historical novelists of the *Last Days of Pompeii*—*Ben Hur*—*Quo Vadis?* school—now happily extinct—who make their characters use *thou* and *thee* in talking to one another.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. above, note 113, and see especially *Serm.* 1.4.39–42, in which he specifically declares that he must not be classed as a poet, for he writes *sermoni propiora*; and 56–62, where he states that the works written by him now and by Lucilius formerly, if robbed of their metrical form, would be found not to contain *disiecti membra poetae*.

<sup>120</sup> 1.561, *tum breviter Dido, voltum demissa, profatur.*

<sup>121</sup> The commentators of course say it is. See as samples of scholarly editions those of Conington and Page, as samples of school editions those of Fairclough–Brown and Knapp.

<sup>122</sup> Most of the editors—e.g. Conington, Knapp, and the editors of the two most recent Teubner texts Ribbeck and Ianell—place a comma after *Deiopea*. The Oxford text editor, Hirtzel, places commas both before and after it; I think this is much better, but it ignores the origin of the construction. (I realize I myself have been far from consistent in this respect in my own punctuation of my examples.)

relative clause, the latter at the *beginning*; both *belong* in the relative clause.

We may take a moment to analyze these five passages from classical Latin as we did the twenty-seven from early Latin, for convenience repeating them together here, and numbering them as we did the others:

28. Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.18.41, quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat.
29. Vergil, *Aen.* 1.71–73, Nymphae, quarum quae pulcherrima Deiopea conubio iungam.
30. Vergil, *Aen.* 1.573, urbem quam statuo, vestra est.
31. Horace, *Serm.* 1.1.1–3, nemo, quam sibi sortem ratio dederit, illa contentus vivat.
32. Petronius 134.8, hunc adolescentem quem vides, malo astro natus est.

The antecedent is in the nominative in 29, with no resumptive. It is in the accusative in 28, 30, 31, and 32; with no resumptive in 30 and 32, with *in hac* in 28, and *illa* in 31<sup>123</sup>. The relative clauses without a resumptive serve as either the subject<sup>124</sup> (30 and 32) or the object<sup>125</sup> (29) of the following verb.

The only instance of a demonstrative with the antecedent is 32.<sup>126</sup>

The antecedent precedes in 30 and 32, but not in the others. This departure from the norm in early Latin is interesting but probably not particularly significant.<sup>127</sup>

The relative clause always precedes the main clause.

All the relative clauses are restrictive.<sup>128</sup>

Thus on the whole the pattern that we found in early Latin persists fairly unchanged in classical Latin, though examples of it recur much less frequently.

<sup>123</sup> Ablative resumptives such as we have in these two instances (in one of them with the preposition *in*) are not common. The only example that I have in my early list is 17 (*Mil.* 140–42).

<sup>124</sup> Cf. above, note 93.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. above, note 95.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. note 103. Perhaps this use of the demonstrative, which we have already noted is common in comedy (page 135), is a feature of Latin popular speech, even though it is not an inheritance from the *Ursprache* (cf. note 101 on its rarity in Hittite).

<sup>127</sup> Cf. note 108.

<sup>128</sup> But note that in the case of 29, had the antecedent stood outside the relative clause after the normal manner of the period—Deiopeam, quae (est) pulcherrima, iungam—the clause would have been non-restrictive. Cf. note 90.

Since the pattern was inherited, it is not surprising to find that it existed throughout Italic.

One example is cited from Oscan: *Tab. Pomp.* 4 (Buck), Aadirans citiuvam paam deded, eisak citiuvad Viinikiis triibum ekak upsannam deded, "Adiranus pecuniam quam dedit, ea pecunia Vinicius domum hanc faciendam dedit." Here we have the repetition of the antecedent together with a demonstrative as in 17, in the form of an ablative of means as in 31.

Another example is cited from Umbrian: *Tab. Iguv.* 6a.19-20, vator pors ostensendi, eo iso ostendu, "vasa quae ostendentur, ea sic ostendito." This as it happens is a perfect parallel for the Hittite example with which I opened this paper, as will be seen if this too is rendered into Latin: "instrumenta quae intra (sunt), ea tollit." So we are back where we started!

Thus a Greek and Latin construction which has been widely misunderstood<sup>129</sup> becomes clear when, on the basis of Hittite and Indo-Iranian, we trace it back to its Indo-European—or Indo-Hittite—ancestry.

<sup>129</sup> See for various details notes 61, 71, 108, 113. Also Szantyr at the outset of his discussion of "sog. 'attractio inversa'" (567) shows a misunderstanding of the construction by his opening clause, "Wird ein Satz durch einen Relativsatz unterbrochen"; the relative clause, "antecedent" and all, regularly comes at the beginning of the sentence, and does not "interrupt" it. But above all the misunderstanding lies in classing as anacoluthon or attraction what was really a perfectly normal inherited construction.