REVISITING THE MOODS IN RELATIVE CLAUSES IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE*

WOLFGANG D. C. DE MELO
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

ABSTRACT This contribution discusses relative clauses in four comedies by Plautus and one by Terence, as a representative sample of early Latin comedy. The main questions are, firstly, to what extent modal usages are the same as in classical Latin, and, secondly, how any differences can be explained. In defining and non-defining relative clauses alike, subjunctives make up 25% of the total, but they are used for somewhat different reasons in the two types of relative clauses. In defining relative clauses, the subjunctive can be the result of indirect speech, modal attraction, or the desire to express purpose. In classical Latin, the subjunctive is also employed if the head noun is indefinite and non-specific; this type is still spreading in early Latin, being almost obligatory in presentative constructions, but not yet elsewhere.

In non-defining relative clauses, subjunctives can be used to express wishes or doubts, or they can be the result of indirect speech or modal attraction. In classical Latin, the subjunctive is also common if the relative clauses have causal or concessive nuances; in early Latin, on the other hand, the subjunctive is more restricted in such contexts. In 'causal' relative clauses, it mostly occurs if the superordinate clause contains a negative evaluation, and I argue that we are dealing with a reanalysis of relative clauses expressing purpose here. The subjunctive has barely begun to spread to concessive relative clauses, and the further spread to *cum*-clauses only really happens after Plautus and Terence.

1 A PROBLEM THAT IS 'HARDLY PROBLEMATIC'?

An important article on the moods in relative clauses, by Elseline Vester, begins with the statement that the interpretation of relative clauses in the sub-

junctive is 'hardly problematic' (1989: 327); however, the fact that she dedicated twenty-four pages to the subject shows quite clearly that while such sentences may be easy to translate, there is still a discussion to be had as to what drives the choice between indicative and subjunctive. Such a discussion is particularly important for early Latin, since most studies focus on the classical period.

In this article, I examine the relative clauses in four comedies by Plautus and one by Terence; my focus lies on these two authors because together they make up 75% of the Latin written before 100 BC. For Plautus, I have examined the *Aulularia*, *Curculio*, *Menaechmi*, and *Mercator*; and for Terence, the *Adelphoe*.[1] I hope to demonstrate that while the choice of moods is indeed hardly problematic in the majority of relative clause types, there are some areas where previous research is in need of refinement. My piece is meant as a modest contribution, and it does have new things to say especially about 'consecutive'[2] as well as causal and concessive relative clauses, but it has its limitations, limitations which I hope to remedy in future, broader work.

In the remainder of this introduction, I shall give the briefest of overviews of previous research before explaining what I do, and why. The two main parts of the article then cover restrictive relative clauses and non-restrictive ones.

1.1   Previous work

Relative clauses are a hot topic at the moment, and many studies are dedicated to them. For a general typological overview, Lehmann (1984) remains a classic, while for Latin, one may consult especially the thorough discussions by Pompei (2011) or Pinkster (2021). My own focus is on other works because I am interested in the moods in relative clauses, an issue that is not of central importance to either Pompei or Pinkster.[3]

Most studies draw a distinction between defining and non-defining relative clauses. In English, as in many other languages, there is an intonational difference between the two: defining relative clauses following a head noun form an intonation unit with it, while non-defining ones form an intonation

---

1 I have taken all translations of Plautus and Terence from the Loeb editions (Plautus: de Melo 2011–2013; Terence: Barsby 2001).

2 The traditional term for the type *sunt qui dicant* 'there are people who say' is quite a misnomer; no consequence is expressed, but rather, we are dealing with indefinite, non-specific antecedents. One could more accurately speak of 'generic' relative clauses.

3 Pompei dedicates only a few pages to modal attraction (2011: 434–5) and to the subjunctive used when the head noun is indefinite and non-specific (2011: 436–8); for this second issue, she relies on work by Vester discussed below. I shall come back to Pinkster later, in connection with 'causal' relative clauses.

unit in their own right. In written English, we use commas around non-defining relative clauses in order to show that they are separate intonation units.[4] Almost two decades ago, Jim Adams quoted to me a famous Medievalist who shall remain unnamed (1):

(1)   *Medievalists, who know no Latin, have very strong opinions.*

Adams stressed that there was 'comma intonation', and that is what makes the statement funny. Pinkster (2021) divides restrictive relative clauses into 'identifying' and 'descriptive' ones, and calls non-restrictive ones 'appositive'. Without commas or comma intonation, the relative clause in (1) would identify a subset of Medievalists, those who do not know Latin, and would pit them against the subset of Medievalists who do. With commas and comma intonation, on the other hand, all Medievalists are referred to, and the relative clause is an apposition that describes them further, which entails that there are no Medievalists who know Latin. A restrictive relative clause would have been neutral in tone, while the non-restrictive one is offensive and self-deprecating at the same time.

Defining relative clauses leave a noun phrase indefinite, but they make it identifiable. In this connection, another concept needs to be introduced, that of specificity. A noun phrase is specific if the speaker can identify the entity referred to, and non-specific otherwise. Vester (1989: 331) illustrates the contrast with two French examples (2–3):

(2)   *Je cherche une jeune fille qui* sait *parler français.*

(3)   *Je cherche une jeune fille qui* sache *parler français.*

Both sentences could be rendered in English as 'I am looking for a young girl who can speak French'. In both cases, the relative clause is defining; the young girl starts out as indefinite, but is then made identifiable by the relative clause. The difference between (2) and (3) is that the indicative *sait* in (2) shows that the young girl is specific, while the subjunctive *sache* in (3) shows that she is non-specific. In other words, in (2) I know the girl I am looking for and I could name her, but in (3) I do not know her, and in fact any young girl who speaks French would do; in (2), the girl clearly exists, while in (3) the existence of the girl is not asserted – it is in fact possible that no such girl exists.

For Vester, the Latin subjunctive fulfils different roles in defining and non-defining relative clauses. In defining ones, it indicates that the head noun is

---

4 German relative clauses are always separated by a comma, whether they are defining or not, and German editors follow the same practice in Latin editions; in this contribution, the punctuation of the Latin texts is taken over from the editions.

indefinite and non-specific, just as in French. Non-defining relative clauses in the indicative function as non-restrictive attributes or appositions, while those in the subjunctive function as *praedicatiuum*; the subjunctive indicates that an unspecified semantic relation exists between the relative clause and the superordinate clause, and this relation may be causal, concessive, or something else (1989: 333–4).

Lavency (1996) tries to find a common denominator between the subjunctives in defining and non-defining relative clauses. Based on a Ciceronian example with a defining relative clause, *eius uiri ... quem nos omnes secuti sumus* 'of this man whom we have all followed', he states that a corresponding question would be introduced by *cuius uiri?* 'of which man?'; but if the relative clause were in the subjunctive, the question would begin with *cuius modi uiri?* 'of what kind of man?'. The indicative, then, is 'déterminatif', while the subjunctive is 'qualificatif'. The same distinction applies to non-defining relative clauses: a relative clause in the indicative is again 'déterminatif' and provides further (e.g. biographical) information, but it is weakly integrated into the main clause, whereas a relative clause in the subjunctive is 'qualificatif', which means that a semantic connection between relative clause and main clause is indicated, even if we have to work out the exact nature of that connection for ourselves. Hence, *Pythius, qui argentariam faciebat* merely identifies Pythius as a banker, while the subjunctive would mean something along the lines of 'Pythius in his function as banker'.

The idea that all subjunctives share some basic meaning or function has always appealed to me, and Lavency's discussion is both intelligent and delightful. That said, I cannot shake off some misgivings. Just as the efforts of many late antique metricians to derive all lyric metres from dactyls and iambs are a little forced and require some mental gymnastics that we are not prepared to indulge in any longer, so the efforts of some theoretical linguists to describe every phenomenon with binaries are bound to run into problems. While it is indeed possible to find certain core meanings of the subjunctive, we have to acknowledge that some usages of the subjunctive, for example in consecutive *ut*-clauses that are factual, can perhaps be motivated diachronically, but not explained synchronically. At the end of the day, understanding the core meaning of the subjunctive will help us to understand the core usages of this mood, but every learner, whether native or non-native, will still have to memorize certain non-core usages. For example, Lavency acknowledges that for non-defining relative clauses we can often establish a logical connection with the main clause, and yet it is the indicative that is used. This raises important questions that no purely theoretical study can answer: how often is the logical connection expressed through a subjunctive, how often is

it left implicit, and do these frequency patterns change from early to classical Latin?

Menge, Burkard & Schauer (2000) have few theoretical insights. On this last question, however, they state that in causal relative clauses, the subjunctive is more common than the indicative, and that in concessive relative clauses, the indicative is also possible (2000: 878). It is reassuring to get some rough idea of frequency patterns, but a little more precision would have been welcome.

The three works that have been the most helpful for my purposes are, on the one hand, the old contributions by Hale (1887–1889) and Hornor (1913), both of whom discuss subjunctives in Latin relative clauses, and on the other hand, Philomen Probert's brilliant study of early Greek relative clauses (2015), which introduced me to many relevant concepts. I shall return to them later; now I want to explain what I have done, and why.

1.2   Procedure

I have examined the relative clauses in four plays by Plautus (*Aulularia*, *Curculio*, *Menaechmi*, *Mercator*) and one play by Terence (*Adelphoe*). I have not considered the plot summaries, which were written centuries after these authors, but I have taken into account passages which have been excluded by editors, such as *Merc.* 619–24, because these tend to be doublets written by stage workers no more than a generation after Plautus and Terence.

I have only looked at relative pronouns like *qui*, ignoring pronominal adverbs like *quo* 'where to' and *qua* 'where',[5] as well as *ubi* and the like. I have also excluded purpose constructions of the type *quo … facilius* (*Aul.* 27), always combined with the subjunctive, because it is not always clear whether they are still genuine relative clauses ('through which … more easily') or whether they have been fully grammaticalized ('so that … all the more easily'). I ignore *quod si* 'but if', unless *quod* is a genuine relative connection referring to something in the preceding sentence. I do not include exclamations like *quae cogito!* 'what do I think!' (*Ad.* 35) because these resemble questions more than relative clauses. I have not examined generalizing pronouns of the type *quisquis* and *quicumque* 'whoever', as the indicative is the norm here. And finally, if one relative clause contains two coordinated verbs, I still only count one relative clause.

At this point I should acknowledge that counting and classifying relative clauses is not always straightforward. In some contexts, it is hard to decide whether something is a relative clause or an indirect question. And although

---

5 Where *quo* and *qua* function as regular ablatives, I have of course counted them in.

	Indicative	Subjunctive	Total	Indicative (%)
Defining	439	140	579	75.82
Non-defining	124	41	165	75.15
All relative clauses	563	181	744	75.67

Table 1   Types of relative clauses and their moods in Plautus & Terence

the distinction between defining and non-defining relative clauses is clear in principle, in practice there are some ambiguous instances. The individual categories also have an unfortunate tendency to blend into each other; for example, how can we reliably distinguish between genuine non-defining relative clauses and relative sentence connections? The reader should thus take my figures with a pinch of salt. I have done my best to be consistent, but different scholars may classify certain instances slightly differently.

After these prolegomena, now at last we can look at the relative clauses in our five comedies. Table 1 sums up the most basic distribution patterns, looking at defining and non-defining relative clauses as well as moods.

Our text sample contains 752 relative clauses in total. Eight of these are verbless and will be excluded in what follows. The remaining 744 relative clauses fall into four groups: 439 of them are defining relative clauses in the indicative; 140 are defining relative clauses in the subjunctive; 124 are non-defining relative clauses in the indicative; and 41 are non-defining relative clauses in the subjunctive.

In sum, then, we have 579 defining relative clauses and 165 non-defining ones; 77.82% of all relative clauses are defining. Of our total of 744 relative clauses, 563, that is, 75.67%, are in the indicative. Interestingly, the proportion of indicative and subjunctive is the same in defining and non-defining relative clauses: 75.82% of the defining relative clauses are in the indicative (439 out of 579), while for non-defining relative clauses the figure is 75.15% (124 out of 165).

Let us now turn to the defining relative clauses in more detail.

2   DEFINING RELATIVE CLAUSES

2.1   *Unproblematic tokens in the indicative*

The vast majority of defining relative clauses in the indicative, 428 out of 439, are unproblematic. They typically fulfil one of two functions: either they pick

out one precise referent from a line-up of two or more potential candidates; or they indicate that a statement is true of every potential referent. Two English examples can show the difference (4–5):

(4)   *The children who refused to wear their school uniforms were trying to make a point.*

(5)   *A man who is rude to waiters is not to be trusted.*

In (4), the function of the relative clause is to pick out one set of children, the ones who refused to wear their uniforms, and to contrast them with another set of children, those who wore their uniforms; the former set is the referent the main clause is about. In (5), on the other hand, it is not one specific man who is contrasted with one other man or several other men; rather, the main clause statement is true of any man who is rude to waiters.

In Plautus and Terence, defining relative clauses most commonly follow their head nouns; in our sample, this is the case for roughly two-thirds of relative clauses. Two examples should suffice (6–7):

(6)   *Hanc domum*
      iam multos annos est quom possideo et colo
      patri auoque iam huius qui nunc hic habet. (*Aul.* 3–5)
      'For many years already I've been occupying this house and
      protecting it for the father and grandfather of the man who lives here
      now.'

(7)   *Alium comitem quaerite,*
      non amittunt hi me comites qui tenent. — Qui sunt ei?
      — Cura, miseria, aegritudo, lacrumae, lamentatio. (*Merc.* 868–70)
      'Look for another companion; the companions who are clinging on to
      me won't let go of me. — Who are they? — Worry, wretchedness,
      grief, tears, wailing.'

In (6), the relative clause picks out one particular referent; *huius* 'of this person' is not sufficiently clear to tell us who is being referred to, but the relative clause narrows down the field of potential candidates. On the other hand, in (7) the companions clinging on to the first speaker are not contrasted with other companions, but rather, the main clause statement is about the whole set of companions, who are clinging on to him.

Headless or head-internal relative clauses are always maximalizing in Plautus and Terence, as they are in Greek (8–9; see Probert 2015: 131):[6]

(8) *Quin coniectores a me consilium petunt:*
     quod eis respondi, ea omnes stant sententia. (*Curc.* 249–50)
     'In fact, even the soothsayers ask me for advice. Whatever reply I
     give them, that advice they all abide by.'

(9) *Quoi homini di sunt propitii, ei non esse iratos puto.* (*Curc.* 557)
     'With him to whom the gods are well-disposed I don't think they're
     angry.'

In (8), we have a genuinely headless relative clause, not one where the head noun is missing, but can be inferred easily from the preceding context. In genuinely headless relative clauses, *quod* 'what' is the equivalent of 'whatever'. In (9), we can see a head-internal relative clause: the dative *homini* is the head noun of the relative clause, but follows the relative pronoun, also in the dative; a literal translation would be 'to which man', and in Plautus and Terence such relative clauses always receive a maximalizing interpretation ('to whichever man'). Note that here the head noun is picked up by the pronoun *ei* at the start of the main clause.

Sometimes a maximalizing interpretation is achieved when a word like *omnis* forms part of the head noun phrase; (10) is comparable:

(10) *Honoris causa quicquid est quod dabitur gratum habebo.* (*Merc.* 527)
     'In order to show you my appreciation I'll be grateful for anything
     I'm given.'

Quicquid est leads to a maximalizing interpretation of *quod dabitur*.

Finally, (11) and (12) are not different in interpretation from other unproblematic relative clauses, but they show unusual case features:

(11) *Quin modo*
     erupui, homines qui ferebant te sublimem quattuor,
     apud hasce aedis. (*Men.* 1051–3)
     'But just now, at this house, I rescued you from four men who had
     lifted you up and were carrying you off.'

---

6 Probert (2015: 73) defines 'maximalizing' relative clauses as follows: 'these relative clauses refer to a unique entity, everything in a set, or a complete lot of stuff'.

(12) *Principio, si id te mordet, sumptum filii*
quem faciunt, quaeso hoc facito tecum cogites. (*Ad.* 807–8)
'In the first place, if what's annoying you is the money our sons are
spending, please think of it this way.'

In (11), 'rescue someone from somebody' requires that somebody to be in
the dative; we might expect *erupui hominibus qui*. However, the head noun
is attracted in case to the relative pronoun. Although the identity of case
between head noun and relative pronoun makes us think of head-internal
relative clauses, (11) is different, not only in word order, but also in interpre-
tation, since the numeral *quattuor* entails that an interpretation 'from what-
ever men' is impossible. In (12), *id* points to the following relative clause,
or rather, to *sumptus*, on which the relative clause depends. Again the head
noun is attracted in case to the relative pronoun, but it precedes it, along with
the subject of the relative clause, *filii*. A maximalizing interpretation is possi-
ble ('whatever money our sons are spending'), but the word order militates
against taking this as a head-internal relative clause.[7]

2.2 'Independent' subjunctives: minor patterns

Among those defining relative clauses that are in the subjunctive, there are
quite a few in which the choice of mood is not determined by the semantic
relation between the head noun and the relative clause; rather, the subjunc-
tive is selected for independent reasons, reasons which often apply in main
clauses as well. Thus, we find subjunctival relative clauses in indirect speech,
as in (13) and (14), or if there is an impersonal second person, as in (15), or
if the subjunctive is potential, as in (16):

(13) *Et aurum et uestem omnem suam esse aiebat quam haec haberet.* (*Curc.*
488)
'He said that all the jewellery and clothes she has belong to her.'

(14) *Dic quid est id quod negem quod fecerim?* (*Men.* 397)
'Tell me what I've done that I'm now denying.'

---

7 The advantage of taking this relative clause as 'head-internal', but with fronting of the head
noun, is that *id* would now refer to the relative clause as a whole rather than to just *sumptum*,
and that this would resolve the disagreement in gender; however, this disagreement is not
really problematic.

(15) *Stultu's, et sine gratia est*
      ibi recte facere, quando quod facias perit. (*Aul.* 337–8)
      'You're a fool, and there's no benefit in doing the right thing, because
      what one does perishes.'

(16) *Quia tibi in manu est quod credas, ego quod dicam, id mi in manu est.*
      (*Merc.* 628)
      'Because what you believe is in your hand, and what I say is in mine.'

(13) is uttered by the hanger-on Curculio, who reports what the soldier Therapontigonus told him. What would have been a main clause in direct speech has become an accusative and infinitive, and the relative clause stands in the subjunctive to indicate that it is not Curculio, but the soldier, who is vouching for the truth of the statement. In (14), *quid est* could be treated as an indirect question in the indicative, or as a direct question in parataxis. There are two relative clauses dependent on *id*; both verbs, *negem* and *fecerim*, stand in the subjunctive to show that the action and its denial exist only in the mind of the addressee. Such quotative subjunctives in indirect speech are found nine times in our sample.[8]

   In (15), the subjunctive is used because *facias* is an impersonal second person ('you' = 'one'); such subjunctives may have been potential in origin, but synchronically they need not be so. The same usage exists in main clauses, both in early Latin and in the classical period. In our sample, there are six further examples of such impersonal second person subjunctives.[9] In (16), on the other hand, we have two relative clauses with genuinely potential subjunctives ('you believe' = 'you might believe', 'I say' = 'I might say'); the first of them is in the second person, yet this is not an impersonal second person, but refers to the addressee, who contrasts with the first person of the speaker in the second relative clause. In our sample, there are only two further examples of potential subjunctives in defining relative clauses.[10]

2.3   Relative clauses expressing a purpose

Relative clauses expressing a purpose also have 'independent' subjunctives, that is, subjunctives which do not depend on factors like the specificity of the head noun (classical examples in Menge, Burkard & Schauer 2000: 879–80). Such relative clauses of purpose constitute the second-largest group of

---

8 In addition to the three tokens just discussed, we can find them in *Curc.* 346–7 and 550, *Merc.* 55–7 (two examples), 75, and 77.

9 *Curc.* 292 and 481, *Merc.* 702 (twice), and *Ad.* 857 and 858.

10 *Men.* 193 and *Merc.* 490.

defining relative clauses in the subjunctive; there are forty-three of them, and as they are easy to recognize and never alternate with indicatives, I shall only present two examples (17–18):

(17) *Agri reliquit ei non magnum modum,*
     quo cum labore magno et misere uiueret. (*Aul.* 13–14)
     'He did leave him a piece of land, not a big one, though, so that he could live on it with great toil and miserably.'

(18) *Pol si est animus aequos tibi, sat habes qui bene uitam colas.* (*Aul.* 187)
     'If you have peace of mind, what you have is enough to live on.'

Such relative clauses regularly follow the rules for the sequence of tenses. Note that (18) contains the fossilized ablative *qui*.

2.4 Attraction of mood

There is another context, or rather, series of contexts, in which the choice of the subjunctive has nothing to do with the semantic relationship between head noun and relative clause; at the same time, this series of contexts does not automatically lead to the selection of a subjunctive, but rather, it merely increases the likelihood of a subjunctive being chosen. What I am referring to is what traditional grammars call 'attraction of mood' (Menge, Burkard & Schauer 2000: 628–30). What is meant by this is simply that a relative clause that would otherwise stand in the indicative is in the subjunctive because in terms of constituency, it depends on a noun phrase that is part of a subjunctival clause, and in terms of word order, it is embedded within another subjunctival clause, or precedes or follows one. Instead of being in the subjunctive, the superordinate clause may also be in the accusative and infinitive.

Here are three examples of modal attraction (19–21):

(19) *Eri ille imperium ediscat, ut quod frons uelit oculi sciant;*
     quod iubeat citis quadrigis citius properet persequi. (*Aul.* 599–600)
     'Let him have a perfect understanding of what his master commands so that his eyes can read what his face wishes; let him be in a hurry to execute his orders faster than fast chariots.'

(20) *Is speculatum huc misit me, ut quae fierent fieret particeps.* (*Aul.* 605)
     'He sent me here to watch out so that he'd have his share in knowledge of what's happening.'

(21) *Siquidem incubare uelint qui periurauerint,*
    locus non praeberi potis est in Capitolio. (*Curc.* 268–9)
    'Well, if all who had given false oaths wanted to sleep in his temple,
    there wouldn't be enough space on the Capitoline hill.'

(19)–(21) show us relative clauses dependent on constituents that belong
within subjunctival clauses; but the word order is different in the three exam-
ples. In (19), the relative clause *quod frons uelit* is factual, but stands inside a
subjunctival *ut*-clause and is itself in the subjunctive because of modal attrac-
tion; and the relative clause *quod iubeat*, also factual, stands in the subjunctive
because it precedes another subjunctival clause. Attraction is relatively rare if
the relative clause precedes a subjunctival context.[11] In (20), the factual rel-
ative clause *quae fierent* is in the subjunctive because it stands inside another
subjunctival *ut*-clause. This is the most frequent context for attraction.[12] Fi-
nally, attraction can occur if the relative clause follows a subjunctival context,
as in (21), where an unreal conditional clause precedes the factual *qui periu-
rauerint*.[13]
    In all such contexts, the indicative is also possible (22–25):

(22) *Si illud quod maxume opus est iactu non cadit,*
    illud quod cecidit forte, id arte ut corrigas. (*Ad.* 740–1)
    'If you don't get the exact throw you want, you have to use your skill
    and make the best of the one you do get.'

(23) *Sequimini, ut, quod imperatum est, ueniam aduorsum temperi.* (*Men.* 445)
    'Follow me, so that I can go to him in good time, as commanded.'

(24) *Dicit capram, quam dederam seruandam sibi,*
    suai uxoris dotem ambedisse oppido. (*Merc.* 238–9)
    'He said that the goat I'd given him to watch over had completely
    eaten up his wife's dowry.'

(25) *Immo ibo domum,*
    ut parentur quibus paratis opus est. (*Men.* 954–5)
    'No, I'll go home so that what needs to be prepared is prepared.'

In (22), *illud quod cecidit forte* precedes a subjunctival clause, but is in the
indicative. In (23) and (24), the relative clauses stand inside subjunctival

---

11 It also occurs in *Aul.* 129 and *Merc.* 36.
12 Cf. also *Aul.* 599 (see (19) above), 740, and 751, *Curc.* 29, *Men.* 111, 994, 1067, and 1100, and
Merc. 152, 504, 505, and 840.
13 For modally attracted relative clauses following subjunctival contexts see also *Aul.* 29 and 686,
Men. 229, *Merc.* 513, 623, and 1006, and *Ad.* 530, 711, and 750.

contexts. In (23), *quod imperatum est* is a sentence apposition and as such a non-defining relative clause, and since such clauses are less dependent on their surroundings, the indicative is perhaps less of a surprise. But in (24), *quam dederam seruandam sibi* is defining and stands inside an accusative-and-infinitive construction, so a subjunctive would not be unexpected; the indicative can occur, as here, but it is interesting that the reflexive pronoun *sibi* is used in this clause, referring to the subject of *dicit* in the main clause rather than to the subject of *dederam* in the relative clause. In a relative clause in the indicative, a reflexive pronoun should normally refer to the subject of the relative clause; reference to the main clause subject, 'indirect reflexivity', is typically restricted to subordinate clauses in the subjunctive. Finally, in (25) we find a relative clause in the indicative following a subjunctival *ut*-clause. Attraction is a possibility in all such instances, but it is not a requirement.

2.5   Indefinite non-specific heads

The type *sunt qui dicant* 'there are people who say' is typically described as consecutive in traditional grammars (Menge, Burkard & Schauer 2000: 880–1), although the relative clause does not express a genuine consequence. What we are really dealing with here is a relative clause following an indefinite, non-specific head (which may be left unexpressed); compare the following contrast (26–27):

(26)   *Neque is sum, inquit, qui grauissime ex uobis mortis periculo terrear.*
       (Caes. *Gall.* 5.30)
       'I am not the sort of person, he said, who is most terrified among you by the fear of death.'

(27)   *Non hercle <ego> is sum qui sum, ni hanc iniuriam*
       meque ultus pulchre fuero. (*Men.* 471–2)
       'I'm not the man I am if I don't take revenge for this injustice and myself beautifully.'

In (26), the speaker denies being a certain type of person, the kind of man who is afraid of mortal danger; the implicit question that precedes such a statement is *cuius modi uir es?* 'what kind of man are you', and as Lavency (1996) pointed out, this type of context requires the subjunctive. We could speak of a 'generic' relative clause. In (27), on the other hand, the speaker does not describe himself as a kind of person belonging to a group of similar people, but rather as a definite, unique individual; hence the indicative. Compare also (28):

(28) *Tu me curato ne sitiam, ego tibi quod amas iam huc adducam.* (*Curc.* 138)
'You make sure that I'm not thirsty and I shall bring here at once what you love.'

Here the indicative refers to a unique individual; the young man will meet his beloved. The subjunctive would mean 'someone to love' and would be entirely inappropriate here, referring to any young woman who would be available in the brothel.

I have collected 61 relative clauses with indefinite, non-specific antecedents; of these, 49 are in the subjunctive, and twelve are in the indicative. However, we have to be cautious: on the one hand, not all subjunctival relative clauses need to be interpreted as having their mood because of this type of antecedent – there may be other reasons for the choice of mood; and on the other hand, not all relative clauses in the indicative need to be interpreted as having indefinite, non-specific antecedents – some of the antecedents could potentially be given alternative interpretations. Here are some problematic cases (29–32):

(29) *Quaeso hercle, animum ne desponde. — Nullust quem despondeam.*
(*Merc.* 614)
'Please, don't give up hope. — There's none I could give up.'

(30) *Video hercle ego te me arbitrari, Euclio, hominem idoneum,*
quem senecta aetate ludos facias, hau merito meo. (*Aul.* 252–3)
'I can see that you consider me a suitable person to make fun of in my old age, Euclio, even though I don't deserve it.'

(31) *Crede hoc, ego meum ius persequar*
neque tu uerbis solues umquam quod mihi re male feceris. (*Ad.* 163–4)
'Believe me, I'll pursue my rights. You'll never talk your way out of the harm you've done me.'

(32) *Neque uendundam censeo*
quae libera est; nam ego liberali illam assero causa manu. (*Ad.* 193–4)
'I take the view you can't sell a girl who's freeborn. I hereby assert her claim to freedom.'

In (29) and (30), one could argue that the relative clauses have a final nuance, and purpose is always rendered by the subjunctive. In (31), I take *feceris* as a future perfect; but is it 'that precise harm that you will have done me', where an indicative would be expected, or 'something of the sort that constitutes harm', in which case the traditional rules would require the subjunctive?

Similarly, in (32) we know the girl that Aeschinus is talking about, but is he trying to phrase his sentence as 'I take the view that you can't sell the girl, who is free' (non-defining, causal), or as 'a / any girl who is free' (indefinite non-specific antecedent)?

If we leave these minor quibbles aside and assume that one or two instances that should have been classified differently do not skew the overall picture too much, the question remains whether there is any rationale for the choice between indicative and subjunctive. The indicative in such clauses often cannot be explained away (33–34):

(33) *Apage istius modi salutem <cum> cruciatu quae aduenit.* (*Merc.* 144)

'Away with health of the type that comes with torture.'

(34) *Num tu pudicae quoipiam insidias locas*
aut quam pudicam esse oportet? (*Curc.* 25–6)

'Are you setting a trap for any chaste woman, or for one who ought to be chaste?'

In (33), *istius modi* makes it very clear that *salutem* is to be taken as indefinite and non-specific; and while (34) lacks an explicit phrase for 'of the type', there can be little doubt that the relative clause refers to an unknown, indefinite, non-specific woman, but one of a certain type.

As it happens, the choice between indicative and subjunctive is not random; and it is perhaps no accident that the standard example of subjunctival clauses of this type is *sunt qui dicant*. If we look at the attestations, we can see that 36 out of the 49 relative clauses in the subjunctive (73.47%) are found in presentative constructions; but only 2 out of the 12 relative clauses in the indicative (16.67%) occur in presentative constructions. In the examples above, (29) shows a presentative construction, with a subjunctive; while (30) shows a non-presentative construction, also with a subjunctive; and (31–34) contain non-presentative constructions in the indicative.

That said, while presentative constructions are mostly in the subjunctive, and non-presentative ones are commonly in the indicative, we are dealing with preferences, not strict rules. All four combinations are attested (35–41):

(35) *Quisnam istic fluuiust quem non recipiat mare?* (*Curc.* 86)
'What river is there which the sea cannot swallow up?'

(36) *Ipsi sat habent quod in se possit uere dicier.* (*Curc.* 479)
'[They] have enough that could in all truth be said about themselves.'

(37) *Sed his legibus si quam dare uis, ducam:*
    quae cras ueniat, perendie, soror, foras feratur. (*Aul.* 155–6)
    'But if you'll get me a woman on the following terms, I'll marry her:
    one who comes tomorrow, dear sister, and is buried the day after.'

(38) *Quaeso hercle, mulier, si scis, monstra quod bibam*
    tuam qui possim perpeti petulantiam. (*Men.* 742–3)
    'Please, woman, if you know, prescribe me something to drink in
    order to be able to put up with your rudeness.'

(39) *Egon ab lenone quicquam*
    mancupio accipiam, quibus sui nihil est nisi una lingua
    qui abiurant si quid creditum est? (*Curc.* 494–6)
    'I should take anything formally from a pimp? They have nothing of
    their own except for the bare tongue with which they swear off if
    anything's been entrusted to them.'

(40) *Da mi operam parumper; paucis, Euclio, est quod te uolo*
    de communi re appellare mea et tua. (*Aul.* 199–200)
    'Give me your attention for a moment; there's something I want to
    talk to you about briefly, concerning our common good, mine and
    yours, Euclio.'

(41) *Prius hoc ausculta atque ades:*
    prius etiam est quod te facere ego aequom censeo. (*Merc.* 568–9)
    'First listen and pay attention. There's something I think you should
    do first.'

(35) is an obviously presentative construction; the subjunctive is used. I have
treated constructions with *habere* as presentative as well, but in a broader
sense; (36), with the subjunctive, is still a very long way removed from French
il y a.[14] (37) and (38) show non-presentative constructions in the subjunc-
tive. (38) is semantically similar to an indirect question; a change of *quod*
to *quid* would turn it into one, with little change of meaning. (39) is a non-
presentative construction with the indicative; note that *quibus*, a plural pro-
noun, cannot refer to *lenone*, in the singular, as such, but it refers to the class of
pimps as a whole. (40) and (41), finally, demonstrate that presentative con-
structions need not be combined with the subjunctive, but it has to be said
that these two examples are the only ones in my sample.[15]

---

14 For the development of *habet* to *il y a* and a timeline see now Burton (2016).
15 Here are the remaining relative clauses in the indicative not discussed in this section; all of
  them are non-presentative: *Aul.* 198 and 753, *Curc.* 66 and 304, and *Men.* 966–7. These are

For these last two examples, it is tempting to find some semantic rationale that could explain them away. Could the indicative have anything to do with the fact that in (40) there is a verb phrase of speech, or that in (41) what is considered appropriate is presented as an objective reality? Probably not, as such predicates occur with the subjunctive in other presentative constructions (42–43):

(42) *Numquid est quod dicas aliud de illo?* (*Merc.* 642)
'Is there anything else you can say about him?'

(43) *Amicior mi nullus uiuit atque is est*
qui illam habet neque est quoi magis me melius uelle aequom siet. (*Merc.* 897–8)
'No one's a closer friend to me than the one who has her, and there isn't anyone toward whom I ought to be better disposed.'

(42) and (43) are not really full minimal pairs for (40) and (41), but they are close enough to show that the semantics of the verbs cannot be the reason for the choice between indicative and subjunctive. Perhaps the difference lies in the person in the relative clause: in (40) and (41), the first person is used, and in a sense that makes these relative clauses more specific than the ones in (42) and (43), which are genuinely non-specific and generic; after all, the first person refers to the speaker, and the speaker knows what is referred to and intends to express it in what follows.

With a distribution pattern like this, we can, however, draw some conclusions: in relative clauses with indefinite, non-specific antecedents, the subjunctive is probably not original, but when it started out, it did so in presentative constructions. Here we have 34 subjunctives and only two indicatives, (40) and (41), which are to be considered relics of the original situation; the subjunctive makes up 94.44% of the total. In other construction types, the subjunctive is also spreading, but here there is still a genuine choice; there are 13 subjunctives and 10 indicatives, so the subjunctive makes up 56.52% of the total.

From a typological perspective, this distribution pattern makes good sense. Grosu (2004) examines what he calls the 'modal existential wh construction', which has the superficial appearance of a relative clause or indirect question,

---

the remaining non-presentative relative clauses in the subjunctive: *Aul.* 211, 489, and 736, *Curc.* 23, *Men.* 212, 220, 242, 243, 454, and 695, and *Merc.* 520. And here are the remaining presentative relative clauses in the subjunctive: *Aul.* 203, 320, 419, 420, 488, 522, and 810, *Curc.* 171, 248, 284, 301, and 484 (twice), *Men.* 204, 457, 636, and 665, *Merc.* 145–6, 317, 346, 453, 502, 605, and 844, and *Ad.* 39, 66, 311, and 932.

but the semantics of a narrow-scope existential quantifier ('there exist people / things who / which'); this construction is widely attested in Balkan languages as part of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, but also in non-Balkan Romance and Slavonic, in Modern Hebrew, and various other languages. He notices (2004: 424) that this construction regularly includes a modal operator expressing possibility or ability, whether it is a subjunctive or some other operator. Next to this basic construction, there are related ones of the type 'I will send you something with which to wash the clothes'; here the relative element does not depend on a typical existential introduction, but it will still have a modal operator marking possibility or ability. These related types are less widespread and only exist if the basic type is also attested in the language (2004: 434–5). This means that in Latin, the spread from the type *sunt qui dicant* to non-existential types is natural and goes in the expected direction.

Relative clauses expressing purpose are very closely linked semantically to their main clauses; this is why they follow the sequence of tenses quite strictly. The same cannot be said of all relative clauses in the category we are disussing in this section. In presentative constructions, they do generally follow the sequence rules, but elsewhere there is more freedom. Two examples should suffice (44–45):

(44) *Atque oppido hercle bene uelle illi uisus sum,*
       ast non habere quoi commendarem capram. (*Merc.* 245–6)
       'I seemed very well disposed to the monkey, but not to have anyone who I could entrust the goat to.'

(45) *Pro di immortales! quoi homini umquam uno die*
       boni dedistis plus qui minus sperauerit? (*Men.* 473–5)
       'Immortal gods! What man expecting it less have you ever given more good to in a single day?'

In (44) we have a construction that I have classified as presentative; the superordinate construction, *habere* (sc. *uisus sum*) has past reference, and the relative clause, being simultaneous with the superordinate construction, is in the imperfect subjunctive. In (45), on the other hand, the construction is not presentative. The superordinate verb, *dedistis*, has past reference again, but the relative clause, which also has past reference, is in the perfect subjunctive, that is, it is treated as anterior to the moment of speech, as having an independent past tense, and not as simultaneous with another past action, as having relative tense.

2.6 A minor pattern

In classical Latin, the type *quid est quod* 'what is the reason why' is usually followed by a subjunctive. In early Latin, there is more choice. In our sample, there are two instances of 'this is the reason why' and 'what is the reason why' followed by the subjunctive (46–47):

(46) *Hoc etiam est quam ob rem cupiam uiuere.* (*Curc.* 172)
     'This, this is why I desire to live.'

(47) *Palinure, Palinure! — Eloquere, quid est quod Palinurum uoces?*
     (*Curc.* 166)
     'Palinurus, Palinurus! — Tell me, what is it you're calling Palinurus for?'

In such combinations, the indicative predominates in Plautus and Terence. Here are two examples that are comparable to what we have just seen (48–49):

(48) *Certum est, ibo ad medicum atque ibi me toxico morti dabo,*
     quando id mi adimitur qua causa uitam cupio uiuere. (*Merc.* 472–3)
     'I'm resolved, I'll go to the doctor and kill myself with poison there, since the reason why I desire to live is being taken away from me.'

(49) *Quid illuc est quod a me solus se in consilium seuocat?* (*Merc.* 379)
     'What's the reason that he's withdrawing from me to make his plans all by himself?'

In (46) and (48), we have statements with the phrase 'why I desire to live', but in (46) the subjunctive is used, and in (48) the indicative is employed. The superordinate constructions are admittedly not identical, but each one contains a pronoun pointing forward to the reason why the speaker wants to live. (46) is as factual as (48). (47) and (49) are questions, introduced by *quid est quod* and *quid illuc est quod*, respectively. In (47), this introduction is followed by a subjunctive, and in (49), by an indicative. There is no discernible contribution that the subjunctive makes to the subordinate clause. A larger sample may reveal some differences, but based on the texts I have examined, it is impossible to find a reason for the choice of moods.

Now that we have covered the defining relative clauses, we can turn to non-defining ones.

3 NON-DEFINING RELATIVE CLAUSES

In most non-defining relative clauses, modal usage is straightforward; however, there are two problem areas that deserve more detailed discussion: first, 'restrictive' relative clauses, broadly speaking those in which *quod* could be translated as 'insofar as',[16] and second, relative clauses which can be given causal or concessive interpretations. Let us start with the straightforward categories.

3.1 Non-defining relative clauses providing additional information

Most non-defining relative clauses in our sample follow head nouns whose reference is already clear from context and which are therefore already definite. The relative clause provides further information about the head noun, but cannot be interpreted as having special nuances of meaning, such as being causal or concessive. In many ways, this is the default type of non-defining relative clause; it is usually in the indicative. (50) is a good example:

(50) *Anus hercle huic indicium fecit de auro, perspicue palam est,*
      quoi ego iam linguam praecidam atque oculos effodiam domi. (*Aul.* 188–9)
      'The old woman has denounced me as having gold, it's completely
      out in the open! But I'll cut off her tongue and tear out her eyes
      immediately when I'm home.'

In our sample, 47 of these relative clauses are in the indicative. The subjunctive is used only twice (51–52):

(51) *Hoc si ita fiat, mores meliores sibi*
      parent, pro dote quos ferant, quam nunc ferunt. (*Aul.* 492–3)
      'In that case they'd acquire a better character for themselves, which
      they could bring instead of a dowry, which is what they're bringing
      now.'

(52) *Tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,*
      qui incedunt suffarcinati cum libris, cum sportulis,
      constant, conferunt sermones inter sese drapetae,
      opstant, opsistunt, incedunt cum suis sententiis,
      quos semper uideas bibentes esse in thermopolio,
      ubi quid surrupuere. (*Curc.* 288–93)

---

16 The term 'restrictive' is employed differently by different authors: some use it as a synonym of 'defining', others use it for non-defining relative clauses hedging the main clause; it is this second category that I discuss here.

> 'Then those Greeks in their cloaks, who wander around with their
> heads covered, who prance about stuffed with books and food
> baskets, who stop and palaver among each other, those runaway
> slaves, who stand in your way and block your path, who prance
> about with their clever sayings, whom you can always see drinking
> in the tavern when they've stolen something.'

In each of these cases the subjunctive is selected for independent reasons that
have nothing to do with factors like the definiteness of the head noun or the
logical relationship between head noun and relative clause. Rather, the sub-
junctive is chosen for the same reasons that it can be chosen in main clauses.
Thus, *quos ferant* in (51) contains a subjunctive because the meaning of the rel-
ative clause is potential; the subjunctive expresses epistemic modality here,
just as it could in a main clause. In (52), *quos … uideas* contains the imper-
sonal second person ('you' = 'one'); such clauses are consistently in the sub-
junctive in Latin, regardless of whether they are main or subordinate clauses.
Historically, this type of subjunctive may derive from potential ones, but syn-
chronically this connection was probably not perceived any longer.

3.2 Sentence appositions

Non-defining relative clauses need not provide further information on one
single noun phrase; they can also modify an entire clause or a larger chunk
of a clause, in which case we traditionally speak of sentence appositions. Pre-
scriptive school grammars tell us to use *id quod* or *quae res* in such instances,
but even in classical Latin we also find plain and simple *quod*.

In our sample, eleven such sentence appositions are plain statements in
the indicative; three examples should suffice (53–55):

(53) *Nunc ibo ut uisam, estne ita aurum ut condidi,*
      quod me sollicitat plurumis miserum modis. (*Aul.* 65–6)
      'Now I'll go and see if the gold is still as I've buried it. Poor me! This
      worries me dreadfully.'

(54) *Cultrum, securim, pistillum, mortarium,*
      quae utenda uasa semper uicini rogant,
      fures uenisse atque apstulisse dicito. (*Aul.* 95–7)
      'As for knife, axe, pestle, mortar, the utensils neighbours always want
      to borrow, say thieves have come and taken them away.'

(55) *Flere omitte, istuc quod nunc agis.* (*Merc.* 624)
      'Stop crying, as you are now.'

In such appositions in the indicative, *quod* predominates; we can see it in (53), but also in seven other instances.[17] (54), with *quae … uasa*, could either be treated as an apposition, as I have done, or as a head-internal maximalizing relative clause on a par with the four preceding nouns ('knife, axe, pestle, mortar, and whatever utensils …').[18] In (55), the sentence apposition is introduced by *istuc quod* rather than *id quod*; the line is generally considered a post-Plautine addition.[19]

Sentence appositions are formally subordinate clauses, but semantically they are closer to main clauses than many other subordinate clause types. This semi-independent status means that they can easily take subjunctives for independent reasons, just as non-restrictive relative clauses modifying a head noun. In (56), introduced by *quae res*, the subjunctive is used because the sentence apposition is a wish:

(56) *Minis uiginti tu illam emisti (quae res tibi uortat male!):*
   argenti tantum dabitur. (Ad. 191–2)
   'You bought the girl for twenty minas – and much good may it do
   you! We'll give you the same amount for her.'

In our sample, there are six such appositions that are wishes. In addition to (56), four others are introduced by *quae res*,[20] while only one has *quod*.[21] However, since these wishes are formulaic, we should not conclude that the choice between *quod* and *quae res* is driven by the choice between indicative and subjunctive; rather, *quod* seems to have no restrictions and can be used in statements as well as wishes, while *quae res* is idiomatic with *bene / recte / male uortat* + dative.

3.3   Relative sentence connections

Our next category consists of relative sentence connections (for classical Latin see Menge, Burkard & Schauer 2000: 870–2). In the obvious instances of this phenomenon, the relative pronoun stands at what is the beginning of a new sentence and establishes a close connection with a referent in the preceding sentence. However, since the types of punctuation in modern editions are the

---

17 *Aul.* 344, *Curc.* 169 and 434, *Men.* 445, *Merc.* 403 and 599, and *Ad.* 17.
18 A similar apposition with a neuter plural *quae* is found in *Aul.* 169.
19 Enk (1932: *ad loc.*) considers 619–24 an addition by a later choreographer who wanted to replace 615–18 and 625–37; 620–24 had already been deleted by Ritschl. Enk cannot find precise parallels for *istuc quod* in sentence appositions, but compares *illud quod* from Seneca and *hoc quod* from Livy.
20 *Aul.* 218 and 787–8 and *Curc.* 273 and 729.
21 *Aul.* 147–8.

choice of the editor, in practice the distinction between relative sentence connections and other non-restrictive relative clauses is often hard to draw. I have classified twenty relative clauses in my sample as relative connections; others might come up with a greater or smaller figure, depending on their criteria. Given how untypical relative connections are of relative clauses in general, it should come as no surprise that the choice of moods is driven entirely by factors that have nothing to do with the nature of the antecedent or the relationship between antecedent and relative clause. I use some relative sentence connections combined with the indicative to show what I have classified as sentence connections rather than regular relative clauses (57–60):

(57) *Nunc hinc parasitum in Cariam misi meum*
      petitum argentum a meo sodali mutuom.
      quod si non affert, quo me uortam nescio. (*Curc.* 67–9)
      'Now I sent my hanger-on off to Caria to ask a friend of mine to lend
      me the money. If he doesn't bring it, I don't know where to turn to.'

(58) *Non ego item facio ut alios in comoediis*
      <ui> uidi amoris facere, qui aut Nocti aut Dii
      aut Soli aut Lunae miserias narrant suas:
      quos pol ego credo humanas querimonias
      non tanti facere, quid uelint, quid non uelint. (*Merc.* 3–7)
      'I'm not behaving the same way that I have seen others behave in
      comedies through the force of Love; they tell their troubles to Night
      or Day or Sun or Moon. I don't believe that these care much about
      human lamentations, what they want and what they don't want.'

(59) *Quid fecit? — Quid ille fecerit? quem neque pudet*
      quicquam neque metuit quemquam neque legem putat
      tenere se ullam. (*Ad.* 84–6)
      'What's he done? — What's he done? A boy who has no shame or
      fear and believes he's above the law?'

(60) *Quae me clam ratus sum facere, ea omnia fecit palam*
      parasitus qui me compleuit flagiti et formidinis,
      meus Vlixes, suo qui regi tantum conciuit mali.
      quem ego hominem, siquidem uiuo, uita euoluam sua. (*Men.* 900–3)
      'My hanger-on revealed everything which I thought I was doing in
      secret. He filled me with shame and fear, this Ulysses of mine, who
      stirred up so much trouble for his king. As truly as I live, I'll send
      him spinning out of his life.'

Fourteen of the twenty relative sentence connections are combined with indicatives. (57) is one of the clearest examples of a relative sentence connection; traditional German grammars speak of 'relative Verschränkung': the relative pronoun is followed immediately[22] by a subordinator like *postquam* or *si* and fulfils a syntactic function in this subordinate clause (see also Menge, Burkard & Schauer 2000: 872–7). Thus, in (57), *quod* is the object of *affert*, which is the verb in the conditional clause; it fulfils no function in the main clause or the indirect question dependent on it.[23] In (58), there is no 'relative Verschränkung', but the connection of the relative pronoun to what precedes feels rather loose, not least because it is followed by two Wackernagel clitics, *pol* and *ego,* which normally come after the initial word of a new sentence; moreover, the relative pronoun fulfils a syntactic role in the following accusative-and-infinitive construction.[24] (59) and (60) exemplify other weak connections. In (59), there is an interesting switch of construction: impersonal *pudet* requires the accusative of the pronoun referring to the person feeling shame, but both *metuit* and *putat* need nominative subjects (here understood from context). If *quem* were to introduce a 'genuine' relative clause, the switch of construction would be quite harsh, because we would then have to understand *qui* with *metuit* and *putat*, and such ellipses of relative pronouns are most unusual. However, if *quem* is merely a relative connection, it is functionally equivalent to a demonstrative or anaphoric pronoun, and a switch from *hunc* to *hic* is less problematic, as ellipsis of demonstratives or anaphorics is easier than ellipsis of a relative pronoun. In (60), the rationale for taking *quem* in the last line as a relative connection is even weaker; but perhaps the clitic pronoun *ego* can suffice for this analysis.[25]

Six of the clauses introduced by a relative connection are in the subjunctive. Three examples will suffice (61–63):

(61) *Curate. ego interuisam quid faciant coqui;*
      quos pol ut ego hodie seruem cura maxuma est. (*Aul.* 363–4)
      'Take care of it. I'll check what the cooks are doing. It's my greatest
      worry that I can keep watch over them today.'

(62) *Quas si autumem omnis, nimis longus sermo est.* (*Men.* 760)
      'If I were to speak about all of them, my talk would be far too long.'

---

22 Or almost immediately; clitics like *pol* or unemphatic *ego* may intervene.
23 Similar instances are found in *Curc.* 595 (with *ubi*) and *Merc.* 262 (with *postquam*).
24 We may also compare *Aul.* 561–2 and *Ad.* 826.
25 With (59) and (60) we may also compare *Curc.* 619 and *Ad.* 306–7, 563, 625–6, 743–4, and 859.

(63) *Conuicium tot me annos iam se pascere;*
       quod nisi puderet, ne luberet uiuere. (*Merc.* 59–60)
       'He'd been feeding me, a disgrace, for so many years already; if I
       didn't feel any shame for this, I shouldn't want to live.'

In (61), the relative pronoun fulfils the function of object in an *ut*-clause, and it
is the *ut*-clause that is responsible for the subjunctive. In (62), *quas ... omnis* is
again an object, this time in a conditional clause; since the conditional clause is
counterfactual, the subjunctive is used.[26] And finally, in (63) *quod* is the sub-
ject of *puderet*, in a conditional clause. Here the subjunctive can be explained
in two ways that are not mutually exclusive: the conditional clause could be
treated as counterfactual, but at the same time we are also in a context of in-
direct speech, as a young man is quoting his father, and the subjunctive could
also be considered quotative.

3.4 'Restrictive' relative clauses ('insofar as')

We can now look at 'restrictive', hedging relative clauses, whose relative pro-
noun is invariably the neuter accusative singular *quod*, and which can usu-
ally be translated with 'insofar as' (for classical Latin see Menge, Burkard &
Schauer 2000: 889–90). Our sample contains thirteen of these restrictive rel-
ative clauses; eight of them are in the subjunctive (six in Plautus and two in
Terence), and three are in the indicative (all in Terence). Here are four exam-
ples of the subjunctival relative clauses (64–67):

(64) *Vigilo hercle equidem quod sciam.* (*Men.* 503)
       'I am awake, as far as I know.'

(65) *Dic mihi: enumquam intestina tibi crepant, quod sentias?* (*Men.* 925)
       'Tell me, do your intestines ever rumble, as far as you know?'

(66) *Neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adulescentem filium*
       quin amet et scortum ducat, quod bono fiat modo. (*Merc.* 1021–2)
       'And from now on let no one prevent his young son from being in
       love and hiring a prostitute, so long as it happens in moderation.'

(67) *Quod cum salute eius fiat, ita se defetigarit uelim*
       ut triduo hoc perpetuo prorsum e lecto nequeat surgere. (*Ad.* 519–20)
       'As long as he doesn't come to any harm, I'd like him to get himself so
       exhausted that for the next three days he can't get out of bed at all.'

---

26 With (62), we may compare *Aul.* 555, *Merc.* 383, and *Ad.* 524.

And here are the three attestations of relative clauses in the indicative (68–70):

(68) *Et quod queo*
conseruis ad eundem istunc praecipio modum. (*Ad.* 423–4)
'As far as I can, I instruct my fellow slaves on the same principles as yours.'

(69) *Bono animo fac sis, Sostrata, et istam quod potes*
fac consolere. (*Ad.* 511–12)
'Don't worry, Sostrata, and comfort your daughter as best you can.'

(70) *Prodidisti te et illam miseram et gnatum, quod quidem in te fuit.* (*Ad.* 692)
'You've betrayed yourself and the poor girl and the child: you couldn't have behaved worse.'

Quod sciam in (64) is clearly an idiomatic collocation, as it has four other attestations in our sample[27] and survives into classical Latin. However, as (65–70) demonstrate, the subjunctive is not restricted to fixed expressions. And even though all three attestations of the indicative are from Terence, it is also unlikely that we are dealing with a diachronic replacement process in such relative clauses here; the reason is that there is a clear semantic difference between the examples in the subjunctive and those in the indicative: the instances in the subjunctive are all hedges, restricting the truth or applicability of the main clause, and as such the subjunctive expresses some hesitation;[28] whereas the instances in the indicative all express ability, and no hesitation at all, but rather, they indicate that people put in a very real effort.[29]

3.5 Causal relative clauses

We are now turning to a problem area. In classical Latin, non-defining relative clauses can be in the subjunctive to indicate that they have a special nuance, a nuance the readers or listeners are meant to figure out for themselves. Thus, such relative clauses may be considered causal or concessive:

(71) *Me, qui ad multam noctem uigilauissem, artior quam solebat somnus*
complexus est. (Cic. *rep.* 6.10)
'Since I had stayed up late into the night, sleep embraced me more tightly than usually.'

---

27 *Men.* 297 and 500, *Merc.* 642, and *Ad.* 641.

28 Cf. also Pinkster (2021: 377), who describes this subjunctive as potential.

29 Pinkster (2021: 278) states that such clauses express the 'degree of realization'.

(72) *Ego, qui sero Graecas litteras attigissem, tamen, cum Athenas uenissem,*
complures ibi dies sum commoratus. (Cic. *de orat.* 1.82)
'Even though I had made a start in Greek literature late in life, I still
spent several days in Athens when I got there.'

I have translated these relative clauses with 'since' and 'even though' to show
the nuances intended. In terms of mood, these relative clauses pattern with
subordinating *quom*, etymologically connected with relative pronouns; when
this subordinator is purely temporal ('when'), it takes the indicative in clas-
sical Latin, but when readers or listeners are meant to infer further nuances,
be they causal or concessive or something else, the subjunctive is used:

(73) *Cum uita sine amicis insidiarum et metus plena sit, ratio ipsa monet*
amicitias comparare. (Cic. *fin.* 1.66)
'Since life without friends is full of risks and fear, reason itself urges
us to establish friendships.'

(74) *Socrates, cum facile educi e custodia posset, noluit.* (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.71)
'Even though Socrates could easily have been led out of captivity, he
did not want to.'

Again my translations with 'since' and 'even though' indicate the nuances
intended.

The situation is quite different in early Latin. Here, the default mood for
quom-clauses is the indicative, even if they can be interpreted as causal or
concessive:

(75) *O multa tibi di dent bona,*
quom hoc mi optulisti tam lepidum spectaculum! (*Poen.* 208–9)
'Oh! May the gods give you many good things for bringing me such
a lovely sight!'

(76) *Ten asymbolum uenire unctum atque lautum e balineis,*
otiosum ab animo, quom ille et cura et sumptu apsumitur!
(*Phorm.* 339–40)
'You come oiled and washed from the baths, without contributing a
thing and without a care in the world, while he's consumed with
worry and expense.'

(75) contains a causal *quom*-clause, and (76) contains a concessive one. How-
ever, the subjunctive in relative clauses is already common. The standard
example quoted in grammar after grammar comes from the *Miles gloriosus*:

(77) *Amant ted omnes mulieres neque iniuria,*
qui sis tam pulcher. (*Mil.* 58–9)
'All women are in love with you, and rightly so, since you're so handsome.'

Pinkster (2021: 539–40) discusses a Plautine near-minimal pair of 'causal' relative clauses, *Men.* 309 in the indicative (my example 81 below), and *Men.* 312–13 in the subjunctive; he argues that the indicative is assertive, while the subjunctive expresses a milder assertion, to be paraphrased as 'the sort of person who does X'. Thus, for Pinkster the 'causal' relative clauses need not be taken as causal *per se*, but rather, causality is an interpretation that arises from various other factors, such as subjective judgment or first and second person pronouns as antecedents (which automatically make relative clauses non-restrictive). Unfortunately, these other factors are rather vague, and so it remains unclear why some relative clauses should be less assertive than others; concluding that they are less assertive because the subjunctive is used feels circular: we are assuming that less assertive relative clauses take the subjunctive, but then interpret subjunctival relative clauses as less assertive even when we do not have any independent evidence as to why they should be less assertive. Since this kind of reasoning does not get us very far, I want to take a different approach.

For me, a comparison between early and classical Latin raises four questions:

 (i) The subjunctive is obligatory in classical *quom*-clauses that are to receive a causal or concessive interpretation; but in relative clauses with such interpretations there is still a choice. How common exactly is the subjunctive in such relative clauses?

 (ii) How common is the subjunctive in early relative clauses if they can receive a causal or concessive interpretation? Is it obligatory, frequent, or rare?

(iii) It is perhaps a natural assumption that subjunctives should first arise in temporal clauses if they receive further interpretations, and that they should spread to relative clauses with special interpretations only later, by analogy. This assumption is not borne out by the facts. Why?

(iv) If the subjunctive did not spread to causal (and concessive) relative clauses from *quom*-clauses, but the other way round, are there any synchronic patterns in early Latin that could give us a hint as to how the subjunctive arose in such causal and concessive relative clauses in the first place?

I cannot answer the first question in this contribution, but I do have preliminary answers for the other three. Let us begin with the question of frequency patterns before we turn to the last two questions, which are closely connected with each other.

3.5.1 Some figures

In our sample, there are eighteen relative clauses which can be interpreted as causal and which are in the subjunctive. I have counted twenty-seven relative clauses which could be treated as causal and which are in the indicative; however, this figure of 27 may be an over-estimate: if a relative clause stands in the subjunctive, we know that a special meaning of some sort is intended, but if it stands in the indicative, a causal connection may exist in the real world without the author wishing to make it explicit. Thus, my twenty-seven relative clauses in the indicative *could* all be interpreted as causal, but it is unclear whether Plautus and Terence *wanted* us to see them that way. This means that the subjunctive is used in at least 40% of the cases in which Plautus and Terence wanted to make a causal relationship explicit; if some of the relative clauses in the indicative are not meant to be seen as causal, the percentage of subjunctival clauses rises further. But even a figure of 40% is substantial, especially when compared with the minute figure for subjunctival *quom*-clauses.[30]

In my search for further patterns, I noticed that all subjunctival relative clauses in my sample have the relative pronoun in the nominative. However, this finding is not quite as exciting as it may seem at first sight; of the twenty-seven relative clauses in the indicative, twenty-three have their relative pronouns in the nominative as well. Similarly, in relative clauses in the subjunctive, the head nouns are most commonly in the nominative (14 out of 18 tokens); but much the same can be said about relative clauses in the indicative (16 out of 27 head nouns in the nominative).[31] A more baffling finding is that twelve out of the eighteen relative clauses in the subjunctive are in the second person (with five in the first person and only one in the third); among the twenty-seven relative clauses in the indicative, the second person is uncommon, with four occurrences, while the first person occurs twelve times, and the third person, eleven times. Person should not be directly connected with mood; but there is an indirect connection which we will revisit. Let us

---

30 Some data on causal relative clauses in the subjunctive can also be found in Bennett (1910: 137–8, 292–4); but Bennett's figures do not allow us to draw a comparison between indicative and subjunctive.

31 The frequency of first and second person pronouns as antecedents in Plautine causal relative clauses in the subjunctive was also noticed by Pinkster (2021: 539), who does not, however, compare causal clauses in the indicative.

now turn to a more fine-grained analysis that may help us to answer the question how the subjunctive spread within relative clauses, and then from there to *quom*-clauses.

3.5.2   Reasons for what?

We might make more progress if we look at what sort of events or situations our relative clauses give reasons for. If the relative clause is in the indicative, a reason is most commonly given for an action or event (15 attestations):

(78) *Namque incubare satius te fuerat Ioui,*
auxilio tibi qui in iure iurando fuit. (*Curc.* 266–7)
'It would have been better if you'd slept in Jupiter's temple, who helped you when you gave an oath.'

(79) *Num istaec mulier illinc uenit quae te nouit tam cate?* (*Men.* 413)
'Has that woman come from there since she knows you so well?'

In (78), the relative clause provides a reason for why the addressee should have slept in Jupiter's temple rather than in the sanctuary of Aesculapius ('who helped you' = 'because he helped you').[32] (79) is slightly different: the relative clause gives us the reason why the speaker is asking this question.[33]

The twelve remaining clauses in the indicative are different. Here, the main clause is some kind of evaluation of a mental state ('I am wretched', 'you must be stupid'), and the relative clause provides a justification for making such a judgment:

(80) *Sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere?* (*Merc.* 588)
'Aren't I a wretch? I can't find a good rest anywhere.'

(81) *Insanit hicquidem, qui ipse male dicit sibi.* (*Men.* 309)
'He's mad: he's cursing himself.'

(82) *Homine imperito numquam quicquam iniustiust,*
qui nisi quod ipse fecit nil rectum putat. (*Ad.* 98–9)
'There's nothing more unreasonable than a man with no experience of the world who doesn't think anything right except what he's done himself.'

---

32 We can compare *Aul.* 64, 75, and 786, *Men.* 586, 597–7a, and 663, *Merc.* 151, and *Ad.* 215, 402, 815, and 881.

33 Compare also *Aul.* 463 and *Merc.* 178.

In (80), the mental state is one of unhappiness; this is attested five times.[34] In (81), we are dealing with madness; we find this four times.[35] And finally, (82) is about unfairness; we can see this three times in total.[36]

It is instructive to compare the main clauses associated with relative clauses in the subjunctive. There is only one which refers to an action, and it is not unproblematic. We will return to it after the other main clauses. Interestingly, all of these other main clauses refer to mental states. The most common of these is madness or stupidity:

(83) *Sanus tu non es qui furem me uoces.* (*Aul.* 769)
       'You aren't in your right mind, calling me a thief.'

(84) *Sanun es qui istuc exoptes aut neges te umquam pedem*
       in eas aedis intulisse ubi habitas, insanissume? (*Men.* 818–19)
       'Are you in your right mind, wishing for this or denying that you
       ever set foot into the house where you live, you complete madman?'

(85) *Ego stultior*
       qui isti credam. (*Merc.* 920–1)
       'I'm a fool to believe him.'

These are just three out of ten examples, a remarkable figure if we consider that there are only eighteen causal relative clauses in the subjunctive. The adjective involved is most commonly (negated or questioned) *sanus*,[37] but we also find *stultus*,[38] *inscitus*,[39] and the phrase *quod te urget scelus*.[40]

Other mental states are combined with the subjunctive significantly more rarely:

(86) *Iniuriu's*
       qui quod lenoni nulli est id ab eo petas. (*Curc.* 65–6)
       'It's unfair of you to demand from him what no pimp has.'

(87) *Miserior mulier me nec fiet nec fuit,*
       tali uiro quae nupserim. (*Merc.* 700–1)
       'No woman will be or has ever been more wretched than me because
       I married such a husband.'

---

34 Compare also *Aul.* 732, *Curc.* 215, *Men.* 852, *Merc.* 205.
35 See also *Men.* 203, 904, and 937–8.
36 Compare also *Men.* 827 and *Merc.* 873.
37 *Curc.* 655, *Men.* 313 and 374, and *Merc.* 293.
38 *Curc.* 551.
39 *Men.* 443.
40 *Men.* 323.

(88) *Fortunatu's qui isto animo sies.* (*Ad.* 852)
      'You're lucky to be in that frame of mind.'

(89) *Nimium scis sapere ruri quae non manseris.* (*Merc.* 686)
      'You've shown that you behave wisely by not staying on the country
      estate.'

In (86), the addressee is accused of being unfair, which also happens in two
other places.[41] In (87), the speaker is feeling miserable. In (88), the addressee
is lucky or happy, with only one parallel elsewhere.[42] And finally, in (89) the
addressee is called wise.

   Given that all these instances refer to mental states or capacities, our final
example is somewhat problematic:

(90) *Mihi, qui id dedissem consilium, egit gratias.* (*Ad.* 368)
      '[He] thanked me for suggesting the whole idea.'

Egit gratias refers to an action, not a mental state, although there is an under-
lying mental state of gratitude; is this the reason why the subjunctive is used?
Perhaps. But perhaps we should simply take *dedissem* as quotative: Micio is
thanking Syrus because of his advice, but Syrus does not confirm that he gave
the somewhat controversial advice and merely quotes Micio as saying so.

   We should now revisit the standard example of a causal subjunctive in
Plautus (77 above). Is this a genuinely causal subjunctive, or should it also be
taken as quotative? In the latter case, the women love the soldier Pyrgopolin-
ices because they consider him beautiful, and the hanger-on is merely quoting
them; the logical connection between main and subordinate clause is still one
of action and reason for the action, but the subjunctive is not used because a
reason is given, but because the women are quoted: 'all the women love you,
and rightly so, you who are so beautiful (according to them).' This does not
make the hanger-on less of a flatterer, and perhaps even increases his flattery;
after all, whether he as a man finds the soldier handsome is utterly irrelevant,
but the opinion of females matters.

3.5.3   A potential explanation for our distribution patterns

We have seen that subjunctival relative clauses are disproportionately fre-
quent with statements of the type 'you are stupid'. It should now be obvi-
ous why all of the relative pronouns in subjunctival relative clauses are in the

41 *Men.* 495 and 806.
42 *Ad.* 268.

nominative and why the second person predominates in these subordinate clauses. The statement 'you are stupid' is naturally more common in comedic dialogue than 'I am stupid' or 'he / she is stupid', although they do occur;[43] and if these are combined with a causal relative clause, then we need a nominative relative pronoun and the same subject as in the main clause in order to express 'because you have done X' (or, more rarely, 'because I have / he or she has done X'). Neither the nominative pronouns nor the second person verbs are responsible for the choice of the subjunctive; rather, they are side effects of the types of statements we are dealing with.

But what is not obvious is why the subjunctive should be particularly suitable for 'you are stupid because X'. Insults of this kind are of course common currency in comedy, but the subjunctive is not simply common because these insults are frequent; the indicative is disproportionately rare. On the other hand, 'I am feeling miserable' is not uncommon, but prefers the indicative. The proportions of subjunctive to indicative are 10:4 for 'stupid' and 1:5 for 'miserable'.

As Pinkster (2021: 539) rightly points out in the discussion of such relative clauses, the Latin subjunctive is not causal *per se*; it mostly has epistemic and deontic functions. In the realm of epistemic modality, it indicates a reduced speaker commitment and marks events as merely possible or as counterfactual. When it comes to deontic modality, its most common functions are marking obligation and purpose. Historically, then, we need to derive 'causal' subjunctives from some of these more basic functions. Is there anything about being stupid, but not about being miserable, that can be connected with epistemic or deontic functions?

Such a connection can indeed be established. Latin purpose clauses have a variety of functions apart from marking straightforward purposes:

(91) *Carthagini ego sum gnatus, ut tu sis sciens.* (*Poen.* 1038)
       'Just so that you know, I was born in Carthage.'

(92) *Viuat et, ut Bruti procumbat uictima, regnet.* (Luc. 7.596)
       'May he live and may he reign, just so that he shall fall as a victim of Brutus.'

(91) contains what we call a pseudo-final clause; this clause does not give us the purpose of the main clause, but the reason for uttering it. Sentences like (92) are described in Nisbet (1923); here a later, unforeseen and unwished-for event is ironically presented as an intended consequence. Nisbet speaks

---

43 First person: *Merc.* 921; third person: *Men.* 374.

of *uoluntas fati*, 'the will of fate', because the event is described in a final *ut*-clause, but the agent of the main clause does not aim for it in any way.

Our causal clauses could have started as yet another type of final clauses, comparable to what we say in English and several other languages:

(93) *You must be really stupid (in order) to pass your house keys to a complete stranger.*

Here, the speaker wants to say something along the lines of 'if you want to / intend to pass your house keys to a complete stranger, then you must be really stupid'. However, the way it is formally expressed is as if passing the keys were the intended consequence of being stupid. But from here it is only a small step to reanalysing a final clause of this type to a causal clause: 'you must be stupid to pass your keys to a stranger' → 'you must be stupid because you pass your keys to a stranger'.

The analysis I propose here has a predecessor in Hale's ideas (1887–1889), picked up two decades later by Hornor (1913: 43–5). Both of them realized that causal relative clauses in the subjunctive are particularly common if the main clause contains an adjective. However, while this is not incorrect, it is not any kind of adjective. Such purpose clauses are less common with other mental states; 'you must be really miserable' combines less easily with a purpose clause. But once the reanalysis of 'you must be stupid to do X' to 'you must be stupid because you do X' has taken place, or is at least in progress, the subjunctive can spread to relative clauses dependent on other mental states to mark them as causal, and from there it can also spread to relative clauses that provide reasons for actions. This final step has barely begun in Plautus and Terence.

Only after this would the subjunctive spread to *quom*-clauses that are to be interpreted as causal; this only really happens after Plautus and Terence. If my analysis is correct, it would explain why the subjunctive is more common in some causal relative clauses than in others, and why it spreads from relative clauses to *quom*-clauses and not the other way round.

I will end this discussion on a note of caution. The situation in Plautus and Terence is not fully clear. Are our relative clauses still considered purpose clauses? Or have they been reanalysed completely? Some of the clauses involved can no longer really be purpose clauses, so reanalysis has either happened or it is still in progress; but how far along we are on this grammaticalization path is unclear.

3.6   Concessive relative clauses

If my explanation of the data is correct and the subjunctive is not yet normal in all relative clauses that can be interpreted as causal, we would also expect that it has not yet spread to concessive relative clauses, at least not to any significant extent. This is indeed the case. There are 23 relative clauses that can be given a concessive interpretation. 21 of them are in the indicative. Here is a selection of such clauses in the indicative:

(94)   *Sed quid currentem seruom a portu conspicor,*
quem naui abire uotui? (*Merc.* 109–10)
'But why do I see my slave running from the harbour? I forbade him to leave the ship.'

(95)   *Egon ab lenone quicquam*
mancupio accipiam, quibus sui nihil est nisi una lingua
qui abiurant si quid creditum est? (*Curc.* 494–6)
'I should take anything formally from a pimp? They have nothing of their own except for the bare tongue with which they swear off if anything's been entrusted to them.'

(96)   *Illa abducta est, tu auferere hinc a me, si perges mihi*
male loqui, profecto, quoi ego nisi malum nil debeo. (*Curc.* 569–70)
'The girl has been *led* away, and you will be *carried* away from me if you continue to insult me, mark my words; I owe you nothing except a beating.'

(97)   *Quid sit me rogitas? qui mihi omnis angulos*
furum impleuisti in aedibus misero mihi,
qui mi intro misti in aedis quingentos coquos
cum senis manibus, genere Geryonaceo;
quos si Argus seruet, qui oculeus totus fuit,
quem quondam Ioni Iuno custodem addidit,
is numquam seruet. (*Aul.* 551–7)
'You're asking me what's the matter? You've filled every nook and cranny of my house with thieves, poor me, by sending hundreds of cooks into my house, with six hands each, of Geryon's race. If Argus were to try watching over them, who was completely covered with eyes and whom Juno once assigned to be Io's guard, he would never succeed.'

(98) *Tun cyathissare mihi soles, qui ante hunc diem*
      Epidamnum numquam uidi nec ueni? (*Men.* 305–6)
      'Are you regularly ladling out wine for me? I've never seen or set foot
      in Epidamnus before this day.'

(99) *In ipsa turba atque in peccato maxumo,*
      quod uix sedatum satis est, potatis, scelus,
      quasi re bene gesta. (*Ad.* 773–5)
      'Amidst all this mess and when all this terrible wrongdoing has
      scarcely been put right, you go drinking, you villain, as if to celebrate
      some great achievement.'

The concessive nuance is perhaps particularly noticeable in (94). In (95), it is
the clause introduced by *quibus* that can be seen as concessive; note also the
fossilized ablative *qui*, here referring to a feminine antecedent, even though
qui was originally a masculine / neuter form. (96) works on the assumption
that insulting someone is an acceptable means to get back money one is owed;
the reference is to the *pipulatio*. (97) contains four relative clauses that could
be taken as concessive; they are introduced by *qui* (three times) and *quem*; *quos*
is a relative connection and irrelevant to our present discussion. In (98), the
contrast is between the addressee's claim that he has often served the speaker
wine, and the speaker's statement that he has only just arrived in Epidamnus,
where the comedy is set. (99), from Terence, assumes that a celebration of a
misdeed is never appropriate, but that it is particularly inappropriate when
the bad behaviour is recent. In all these instances, the relative clause stands
in the indicative; my sample contains twelve further comparable examples.[44]

    There are only two concessive relative clauses in my sample that stand in
the subjunctive:

(100) *Animule mi, mi mira uidentur*
       te hic stare foris, fores quoi pateant,
       magis quam domus tua domus quom haec tua sit. (*Men.* 361–3)
       'My sweetheart, it seems strange to me that you're standing outside
       here: the door stands open for you, since this house is more yours
       than your own house is.'

---

44 *Aul.* 437–8, 574, 701, 724–4a, and 797, *Curc.* 119 and 616, *Men.* 302–3, 380–1, 493, and 732–3,
   Ad. 179.

(101)   *O facinus indignum et malum,*
        Epidamnii ciues, erum
        meum hic in pacato oppido
        luci deripier in uia,
        qui liber ad uos uenerit! (*Men.* 1004–6)
        'An unworthy and evil crime, citizens of Epidamnus: my master's
        being dragged off in the street in broad daylight, here in a city that is
        at peace. He came to you as a free man!'

In both cases, it could be argued that the subjunctive is used because these relative clauses are to be taken as concessive; they could thus mark the beginning of the spread of the subjunctive to concessive clauses. However, both relative clauses come after accusative-and-infinitive constructions, which also count as 'attraction contexts', so that it is at least equally likely that the subjunctive here is simply the result of mechanical attraction. In (100), the attraction would spread from the accusative and infinitive to the relative clause, with the subjunctive *pateant*, and from there to the following *quom*-clause, with the subjunctive *sit*. It is time to wrap up.

4   Conclusions

In this article, we have looked at the relative clauses in four plays by Plautus and one by Terence, examining the contrast between indicative and subjunctive. The rules for modal usage in these early authors are remarkably similar to those in classical Latin. However, there are some divergences that are of particular interest.

In defining relative clauses, classical Latin requires the subjunctive whenever an antecedent is both indefinite and non-specific; this usage survives into modern Romance. In Plautus and Terence, however, the situation is more complex: in presentative constructions of the type *sunt qui dicant* 'there are people who say', the subjunctive is virtually obligatory, just as in the classical period; but elsewhere, the indicative is remarkably common. I hypothesized that the subjunctive is not original in this indefinite, non-specific context, but that when it started to spread, it affected presentative constructions first, and reached other constructions only later.

In non-defining relative clauses, the biggest differences from classical Latin are in those clauses which may receive a causal or concessive interpretation. In classical Latin, the subjunctive is always an option when such a causal or concessive interpretation is possible, and is in fact common, regardless of the meaning of the superordinate clause. In Plautus and Terence, on the other hand, the subjunctive is only common in causal relative clauses, yet virtu-

ally non-existent in concessive ones. In causal clauses, however, there are restrictions that no longer exist in the classical period: if the superordinate clause expresses an action or event, causal subjunctives are very rare; but they are common if the superordinate clause expresses some judgment based on a mental state. Subjunctives are particularly frequent after phrases of the type 'you are stupid' or 'you are mad'.

I suggested that originally these causal subjunctives were actually subjunctives of purpose. 'You must be stupid to do X' was reinterpreted to 'you must be stupid because you do X', and from there the subjunctive spread to other predicates expressing judgments based on mental states. The spread to other causal relative clauses, and to concessive ones, is still in its infancy in Plautus and Terence.

One might have expected that *quom*-clauses with causal and concessive interpretations, which in classical Latin always take the subjunctive, would be the source of the subjunctive in causal and concessive relative clauses, but this is chronologically impossible. In Plautus and Terence, such *quom*-clauses are regularly in the indicative; it is only after our two authors that they are commonly combined with subjunctives. The influence thus went in the other direction: *quom*-clauses were not the source of the subjunctive in causal and concessive relative clauses, but instead acquired the subjunctive by analogy with such relative clauses.

REFERENCES

Barsby, J. 2001. *Terence* (2 vols.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bennett, C. E. 1910. *Syntax of Early Latin*, vol. 1. Leipzig / Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Burton, P. 2016. Analytic passives and deponents in classical and later Latin. In J. N. Adams & N. Vincent (eds.), *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?*, 163–179. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enk, P. J. 1932. *Plauti Mercator cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico*. Leiden: Sijthoff.

Grosu, A. 2004. The syntax-semantics of modal existential wh constructions. In O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, 405–438. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hale, W. G. 1887–1889. *The* cum-*Constructions: Their History and Functions*. Ithaca, NY / Cambridge, MA: Cornell University Press.

Hornor, A. L. 1913. *Relative Clauses in Ten Plays of Plautus*. Lawrence, KS University of Kansas MA thesis.

Lavency, M. 1996. Rex qui fuit – rex qui esset – rex cum esset. In R. Risselada,

J. R. De Jong & A. M. Bolkestein (eds.), *On Latin: Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Harm Pinkster*, 91–103. Amsterdam: Brill.

Lehmann, C. 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Tübingen: Narr.

de Melo, W. D. C. 2011–2013. *Plautus* (5 vols.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Menge, H., T. Burkard & M. Schauer. 2000. *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Nisbet, R. G. 1923. *Voluntas fati* in Latin syntax. *American Journal of Philology* 44. 27–43.

Pinkster, H. 2021. *The Oxford Latin Syntax, Vol. 2: The Complex Sentence and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pompei, A. 2011. Relative clauses. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax, Vol. 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology*, 427–547. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter.

Probert, P. 2015. *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vester, E. 1989. Relative clauses: a description of the indicative-subjunctive opposition. In G. Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin: Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, 327–350. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wolfgang D. C. de Melo
University of Oxford
Faculty of Classics
Ioannou Centre
66, St. Giles'
Oxford OX1 3LU
United Kingdom
wolfgang.demelo@classics.ox.ac.uk