Chapter 38: Relative Clauses of Characteristic, Relative Clauses of Purpose and Subordinate Clauses in Indirect Discourse

Chapter 38 covers the following: relative clauses of characteristic and purpose (RCC/RCP); subordinate clauses in indirect discourse (SCID); the datives of reference and purpose; and at the end of the lesson we'll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There are four important rules to remember in this chapter: (1) Relative clauses with subjunctive verbs show "characteristic" or "purpose." (2) Subordinate clauses in indirect discourse often have subjunctive verbs. (3) The dative case shows reference. (4) The "double dative" consists of a dative of reference, plus a dative of purpose.

Relative Clauses of Characteristic. You remember what relative clauses are, right? Clauses that begin "who, which, what, that," as in "These are clauses which begin with relative pronouns like 'who, which, what, that.'" And do you remember the term for the noun outside the relative clause to which the relative pronoun refers? Yes, its antecedent. When a relative clause has a clear and specific antecedent ─ that's the sort of antecedent we've been dealing with ever since you learned about relative clauses in Chapter 17 ─ the verb in the relative clause is indicative, which makes perfect sense. If something seems clear and factual to the speaker, it's only logical to use the indicative. But what if the antecedent's not clear? Relative clauses can also describe a type of person or thing, as in "Here's the type of person who would have done it." He didn't necessarily do it but he's that sort of person. [Look at that sneer. He's totally evil.] So what do you do in Latin when the antecedent isn't specific? What mood of verb should the relative clause use? The subjunctive, of course, which in this case generalizes the antecedent. It can also show purpose as we'll see in a second. Generalizing the antecedent is a natural extension of the subjunctive's basic sense of uncertainty.

Let's look into this type of syntax a little more closely. In a regular relative clause, one that uses the indicative, the antecedent is specific, a clear, real thing you can point at. For instance, "Here's the poem which you like." In Latin, the verb "like" will be indicative, because the poem under discussion is a real and specific one. *The Aeneid*, for instance. If you haven't read it already, you're going to love it. Everyone does. But make the verb in the relative clause subjunctive and the antecedent is no longer specific. For instance, "I know the type of poem which you like." I'm not thinking about a specific one. I just know you like sonnets. Here's a book of sonnets by Shakespeare. I'll bet you love them, too. [You better! They're great!] Let's look at what this will look like in Latin. A regular relative clause, like "He is the man who did it," will be *Vir est qui id fecit*. The verb *fecit* is indicative, indicating that he's the man who actually did it. A relative clause of characteristic ─ let's call them "RCC's" for the sake of brevity ─ an RCC like "He is the type of man who would have done it," will have a subjunctive verb and look like this: *Vir est qui id fecerit*. By changing the verb into the subjunctive *fecerit*, the meaning of the sentence changes, too. Now it means he's the type of person who would have done it, but whether or not he actually did this exact particular thing is not clear. What the relative clause is saying now is, "I don't have solid evidence he did it, but he can't be counted out as a suspect."

There is another type of relative clause that also uses the subjunctive: the relative clause of purpose (RCP). Regular positive purpose clauses, as we saw back in Chapter 28, use *ut*, for example, *Virum misi ut tecum loqueretur*, meaning "I sent a man to speak with you." RCP's make one simple change. They replace *ut* with a relative pronoun form like *qui*, for instance, *Virum misi qui tecum loqueretur*, meaning basically the same thing: "I sent a man to (lit. who was to) speak with you." Since Wheelock doesn't discuss RCP's at all in his textbook, let's look at a few examples of this construction. You are responsible for knowing it in this class. First sentence: *Quosdam misit qui hostes interficerent*, meaning "He sent some men to kill the enemy." Literally "… who would (were to) kill the enemy." Here's another example: *Haec habebat quae de senectute diceret*, meaning "He had these things to say about old age." Literally "… which he would (wanted to) say about old age." And a third example: *Dignus est qui exercitui imperet*, meaning "He is worthy to command an army." Literally, "He is a worthy man who would (could) command an army." One minor point: if an RCP has a comparative form in it, Latin uses *quo*, as in *scutum deiecit quo celerius fugeret*, meaning "He threw down his shield in order to run away faster," literally "… by which the faster he might run away."

Note that both RCC's and RCP's are similar in another respect: they both build on the subjunctive's original sense of uncertainty. That is, he's the "type" of person who would have done it (maybe he did, maybe he didn't, but you can't count him out) or he's the person I sent "to do" it (but I'm not saying he actually completed the task). Both show uncertainty.

There is yet a third kind of relative clause which takes a subjunctive verb but this one doesn't reflect uncertainty. Instead, it incorporates the newer use of the subjunctive in classical times, to show subordination. This type occurs when a relative clause is embedded within another clause or construction. This syntax-inside-syntax situation happens most often when the antecedent of a relative clause is some component of indirect discourse. In this case, there is not necessarily anything "uncertain" about the information in the relative clause ─ the antecedent isn't being generalized; the outcome of the verb's action is not questionable in any way ─ the verb is subjunctive because the larger grammar around it, the syntax it's inside, is complicated. Students in past classes of mine jokingly referred to this as the subjunctive in "deep syntax." Inelegant but not inaccurate.

Underlying this phenomenon is a principle called "hypercorrection," in which speakers import a linguistic rule or feature associated elsewhere with "good grammar" into a context where it does not apply and often produces bad grammar. The classic example in English is "between you and I." "Between you and me" is correct in that the preposition "between" calls for the objective case, as is easily seen when the pronouns are reversed. Few English speakers would say "between I and you." One factor driving hypercorrection is the speaker's wish to sound "correct," and knowing that other uses of "me," such as "Me and him went home," are looked down on as substandard speech, some English speakers will use "I" instead of "me" broadly, even when the objective form "me" is, in fact, called for. Hypercorrection is also probably a major factor, if not the major factor, driving "Subordinate Clauses in Indirect Discourse" in Latin [Let's make our lives easier and call that SCID.] As subordination and complex syntax began to develop in Latin, some Romans made verbs subjunctive when there was no need or precedent to do so, because, well, lots of smart people were using subjunctives in fancy-shmancy new-fangled clauses, so subjunctives obviously made you sound hip and besides everything around the clause

is subjunctive anyway, so "Come on, Mom, all the cool verbs are doing it." Peer pressure can be a mighty force, which raises an important issue: if a clause is inside some sort of construction which doesn't have an indicative verb, should the clause be non-indicative too? Should it be subjunctive just because its immediate neighbors are? Just exactly this happens sometimes in Latin, a principle grammarians call "subjunctive by attraction," almost certainly another factor driving SCID's and indeed the whole shift in the use of the subjunctive as a way of indicating subordination, not just uncertainty.

While Wheelock doesn't address SCID's as such in the main part of his textbook, he does include them in the Supplementary Syntax on page 378. Let's look at the examples he provides there. Please remember you're responsible for knowing this type of subordinate clause which shows up not at all infrequently in Latin. The first sentence at the top of page 378 contains a regular relative clause: *Legit libros quos miseras*, meaning "He read the books which you had sent." *Miseras* ("you had sent") is indicative, the way you would expect a verb in a relative clause to be. You actually sent the books ─ there's nothing uncertain about that ─ so, of course, the verb is indicative. But put the relative clause inside more complicated syntax, like "*Dixit se legisse libros quos misisses*,"meaning "He said that he had read the books which you had sent," and the verb *miseras* will become subjunctive (*misisses*) just because the clause is now inside indirect statement. There's still nothing uncertain about your having sent the books. The only difference between the regular relative clause and the SCID is that the grammar around the SCID is more complicated, and "complicated" grammar has begun to be associated with "subjunctive" in the Roman mind.

Here's another example of a SCID. First, the regular form of the relative clause: *Ei mali qui in urbe manent infirmi erunt sine duce*, meaning "Those evil men who remain in the city ─ n.b. *manent* ("remain") is indicative ─ will be weak without their leader." Now here's the SCID form of the relative clause: *Puto eos malos qui in urbe maneant infirmos futuros esse sine duce*, meaning "I think that those evil men who remain in the city will be weak without their leader." Now "remain" is subjunctive (*maneant*) because the relative clause is inside another construction, indirect statement again. While SCID's are often relative clauses, that's not the only type of construction which can be hyper-corrected into the subjunctive. Conditions can, too. For instance: *Si id credet*, *errabit*, meaning "If he believes this, he will be wrong." This is a standard condition, a future-more-vivid, in which the future indicative is used in the protasis (*credet*). But put the condition inside indirect statement and it becomes a SCID. For example, *Dico si id credat eum erraturum esse*, meaning "I say that, if he believes this, he will be wrong." Now the verb in the protasis is subjunctive (*credat*). Note the sense of this condition is not changed into future-less-vivid ("should … would"), the type of condition which uses the present subjunctive normally, which means sometimes it's hard to tell exactly how to read the subjunctive. Is the subjunctive here saying flv or SCID? Or both? When this sort of thing happens in a real Latin text, different scholars will explain the mood of the verb different ways. But know this: in this class if you ever provide a correct possible explanation, you will always receive full credit. I will never deduct points from your score if you disagree with me, only with the rules, and when the rules are not completely clear, you get to choose whichever right answer you find most appealing.

The upshot of all of this is that, when a Latin verb is subjunctive, there are three new answers to the question "what mood and why": RCC (relative clause of characteristic), when the antecedent of the relative pronoun is generalized (i.e. "the type who"); RCP (relative clause of purpose), when the relative pronoun is used in place of *ut* in a purpose clause; and SCID (a subordinate clause in indirect discourse), when the clause is embedded in some sort of other subordinate construction and there's no other reason like a sense of uncertainty for the verb to be subjunctive other than it's in "deep syntax."

To end the grammar in this chapter, let's take a final look at the dative case and its usages. As we bring our study of Latin grammar to a close, what we're really doing here is mopping up the last little bits of syntax involving the cases of nouns. We're done with the nominative and accusative ─ we've looked at all their major uses ─ and in the last chapter (Chapter 40) we'll clean up the genitive and the ablative. Here we'll finish up the dative. When it all comes down to it, if there's one guiding sense that underlies all datives, it's reference. "Reference" is the dative's basic use. All datives fundamentally one way or another show reference, that is, the perspective from which an action or thought is seen. Indirect objects, for instance, show from whose perspective there was "benefit" in some act of giving. "She gave me a gift" means her giving of the gift was a benefit from my perspective because I was the recipient of her largesse. Likewise, datives with certain adjectives show who is affected by the adjective, as in "She was kind to me" ─ or true or loyal ─ she may have been a complete monster to others, but seen from my reference point she was always really kind. Even the dative of possession can be viewed this way. "There is a book to me" means at heart that the book exists as far as I'm concerned because I own it and I can use it any way I like, so for me it's a real thing. Since it's not yours, it really doesn't exist for you, or at least it doesn't matter whether it exists or not from your perspective, because you can't use it. It's mine, which is good "for me," the dative of advantage, and bad "for you," the dative of disadvantage. Those are two other usages of the dative.

But sometimes the relationship between the dative and the rest of the sentence isn't easy to put into any clear category. There's no word like "give" or "good" to tie the dative to. Sometimes the dative just shows the way someone sees something, for instance, "It looks fine to me." It's not that it's fine *for me*. "Fine" is just the way I see it, or hear it: "It sounds right to me." That doesn't necessarily mean I like it, only that I don't see any problem with it. From my vantage point, it seems right. That's the dative in its purest form, the so-called "dative of reference," which should only ever be used as a term if there's no other way to classify a dative noun: advantage, disadvantage, possession, with certain adjectives, with special verbs, and of course, indirect object. If none of those apply, you can say "dative of reference," since all datives fundamentally show reference, but only when you're that desperate can you use the term "reference" and be correct. When you can be more specific about the dative's use or connotation, then don't say "reference," except in one construction, when it's paired with the dative of purpose, another important use of the dative, which Wheelock includes in the Supplementary Syntax (page 375). The "dative of purpose" shows the reason someone did something or what the goal of some action was, for instance, "He went to the store for ice cream." "For ice cream," a dative, states the goal of the action, the reason he went to the store. In sense, it's the equivalent of a purpose clause. He went to the store in order that he purchase ice cream," or "for the purpose of buying ice cream." Quite often the noun used as a dative of purpose is an abstract

noun, as in "We did it for profit, for pleasure, for fun, for love," for instance, "We dated for fun but married for love."

And that's the way you'll see it in one of its most important applications in Latin, the "double dative," a combination of the dative of purpose and the dative of reference. For example, the way the Romans would have said "Money is a concern to a fool alone" is "Money is for/as a care to a fool alone." In Latin that would be: *Pecunia est curae stulto soli*. Both *curae* and *stulto* are dative. *Curae* ("a concern"), an abstract noun, is a dative of purpose, and *stulto* ("fool") is the dative of reference. In the "double dative" the dative of reference is almost always a person or persons. Here's another example of the double dative: *Venerunt auxilio mihi*, meaning "They have come to give help to me," literally "… as a help/for help to me." Here, *auxilio*, the abstract noun, is the dative of purpose, and *mihi*, the person, is the dative of reference. One last thing to note about this construction, it's rare to see the double dative used with verbs other than some form of *esse* ("to be") or a verb of motion. And that is as an end to the grammar in this chapter.

Now all that remains for you is the vocabulary, to which the first word is *consul*, *consulis*, m., meaning "consul," a third-declension (non-*i*-stem) noun. In antiquity, a consul held the consulship, the highest executive office in the Roman government, the top of the *cursus honorum*, "the path of public offices." It was a seat sought by many ambitious Romans until Augustus turned Rome into an empire, stripping all elected offices of any real power. Then being consul was still an honor, but a *honor sine potestate*.

The next word is *dolor*, *doloris*, m. Remember all third-declension nouns that end *-or*, *-oris* ─ like *amor, amoris* ─ are masculine. *Dolor* means "pain, grief," another third-declension non-*i*-stem noun, and was what many lovers of republican government in Rome felt when Augustus did what he did.

What they really felt was *odium*, *odii*, n., meaning "hatred, boredom," a second-declension noun.

Here comes a very important word: *opus*, *operis*, n., meaning "work, task, deed, accomplishment." It's a third-declension neuter noun. It isn't *i*-stem either. *I*-stems so far are batting zero here. *Opus* is part of an idiom seen widely in Latin: *opus est*, meaning "there is need," literally "there is work," in other words "there's work to be done here," i.e. "you need to get on it." *Opus est* is usually followed by one of two constructions: a dative plus an infinitive, for instance, *opus est ei abire* ─ literally, "there is need for him to depart" ─ or a subjunctive (without *ut*!), as in *opus est abeat*, meaning basically the same thing as its dative-plus-infinitive counterpart: "There is need (that) he depart," that is, "It's time for him to scram!" Note that this subjunctive alternative is at heart a paratactic construction, literally "There is need. Let him depart." The subjunctive was originally a jussive. Note also it will follow sequence of tenses. Make it past and the subjunctive verb will have to become imperfect: *opus erat abiret*, "there was need that he depart."

Next up is *quāre*, meaning "wherefore, why." It can function as an adverb or a conjunction. Literally, it means "because of which (*quā-*) thing (*-re*)." It was originally an ablative of cause. [Sit back down! We'll get to that eventually.] *Quāre* often introduces questions, both direct and indirect, and also relative clauses, in which case you should translate it as "for which reason." If

so, it's functionally the equivalent of "because." And let's be clear about one thing here that has nothing to do with Latin. The English word "wherefore" does not mean "where." It means "why." It's the correlative of "therefore." "Wherefore? … Therefore!," meaning "Why? … Because!" So when Juliet in Shakespeare's masterpiece asks herself, "O Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou, Romeo?," she's not asking *where* he is ─ she doesn't know he's lurking in the garden below at that very moment listening to her ─ she's asking herself *why* he has the name Romeo, because their names are really all that stand between them and love's blessed bliss. Wheelock would probably have been wiser just to say *quāre* means "why" and leave it at that. I love teaching Latin. English drives me crazy.

Here's a verb, *consumo*, *consumere*, *consumpsi*, *consumptum*, meaning "consume, eat up." It's third-conjugation, a compound of *con-* ("with," here in the sense "completely") and *-sumo* ("take"), which is the next word, *consumo*'s base verb: *sumo*, *sumere*, *sumpsi*, *sumptum*, meaning (as I just said) "take." It's third-conjugation, Be sure you learn *sumo*. Not only is it commonly used in Latin, but it also produced a raft of compounds which, in turn, produced a boatload of English derivatives, like *resumo*: "take back, recover, resume"; *praesumo*: "take before, take for granted, presume"; and *assumo* (*ad* ["to"], plus *sumo*): "take to, take up, adopt, assume." The *-p-* in the perfect forms of *sumo* (*sumpsi*, *sumptum*) ─ which shows up in *consumo*'s perfect, too ─ is there just to ease pronunciation. It's hard to say **-sumsi* without inserting a *-p-* (*sumpsi*).

Here's another verb, *defendo*, *defendere*, *defendi*, *defensum*, meaning "ward off, defend, protect." It's a third-conjugation verb. Note that its base is the same in the present and perfect, and since it's also third so its thematic vowel is *-i-*, some of its forms will look the same in these tenses. So what does *defendit* mean? Or, should I say, what do *defendit* mean? "He defends" or "he (has) defended." And *defendimus*? "We defend" or "we (have) defended." So what about *defendet*? [What does *-e-* mean in third? I know you know this by now. Come on! It's future. So?] "He will defend."

Now here's a really interesting verb: *dubito* (1), meaning "doubt, hesitate." It's made up of *dub-* ("two") and *-ito*, a type of verbal suffix called a "frequentative," which adds a sense to the verb's basic action that it's happening frequently or repeatedly. So *dubito* means literally "go in two directions back and forth." Is that not a perfect way to describe hesitation? "I'll go that way. No, wait, I should go this way. But doesn't that way make more sense? Still, this way would be faster. Faster's better, right? No, right's righter. Let's do this right. Or left. Maybe I should just sit here a while and dubitate." Latin is replete with frequentatives, an increasingly popular form as Latin evolved after the Classical Age. And what's most wonderful about them is they're almost all first-conjugation and regular: *-ito*, *-itare*, *-itavi*, *-itatum*. Learn that pattern and you've mastered a hundred verbs, such as *agito*, *agitare*, *agitavi*, *agitatum*, meaning not just to *agere* ("to do, drive"), but "to be busy with, hunt, vex," literally "drive back and forth, do over and over"; or *ventito*, meaning not just "come" but "keep coming"; *cursito*, "run up and down"; and *factito*, "do often," often with the sense "practice as a profession." Not all frequentatives are regular, however. For instance, some frequentatives based on deponents created deponent frequentatives, especially those verbs which were very commonly used and heard often as deponents, like *loquor* which spawned a frequentative *loquitor*, *loquitari*, "talk a lot, chatter," and *sector*, *sectari*, "run after, harass, stalk," the frequentative of *sequor*.

6

It's often the case that these frequentatives, popular as they were in later Latin, were handed down to the Romance languages in place of their base verbs. From there the frequentative, not the base verb, entered English. Such is the case with two terms we've previously encountered: "dubitative" and "factitive," both of which, no doubt, caused you some "agitation." Why frequentatives were so popular and sometimes displaced their base verbs, the linguist L.R. Palmer explains: "… colloquial language is characterized, of course, by its preference for colourful and drastic expressions which with the change of generations lose their force and emphasis. A child who first and constantly hears 'mug' (for 'face') will in all innocence use it as the normal expression." Indeed, according to some scholars, "mug" derives from drinking vessels shaped with grotesque faces, a novelty item popular in the nineteenth century. This joking use of "mug" for "face" was given new life in the 1950's with the expression "mugshot," a police photograph of a criminal, typically an unflattering one.

Here's a verb, *metuo*, *metuere*, *metui*, meaning "fear, dread," a third-conjugation verb. There's no fourth principal part for this verb because it has no true passive. Make note that it often is followed by a fearing clause, the type of *ne/ut*-clause I introduced in Chapter 36, but which you haven't been able to practice much, because Wheelock doesn't formally introduce this construction in the main part of his textbook. So let's practice your fearing clauses again. How would Latin say "They feared that I might not come." [Don't forget the *ne* and *ut* situation with fearing clauses. Which means "that," and which means "that … not"? They're reversed! So which do you want here, in this negative fearing clause? *Ut*, that's right. And do fearing clauses follow sequence of tenses? Yes, they do. So the answer is …] *Metuerunt* (or *Metuebant*) *ut venirem*. Imperfect subjunctive showing contemporaneous action in secondary sequence. Remember the paratactic origin of fearing clauses. Early Romans would have heard this sentence as "They were afraid. (How they wished) that I might come."

The next word, *fatum*, *fati*, n., meaning "fate," is a second-declension noun. It's actually the perfect passive participle of a deponent verb we haven't studied ─ but probably should have, seeing as it's very widely used in Latin ─ *for*, *fari*, *fatus* (*sum*), meaning "speak." You've seen the base *fa-* in *fama* ("rumor") and *fateor* ("confess"). So *fatum* (neuter singular) is literally "the thing having been spoken," i.e. "that which was said," with the implication "said by the gods." If the gods say it, it's going to happen. That's just the way it works, in the Roman mind at least. What would be the accusative plural of *fatum*? Good for you! It's neuter. *Fata*.

And the last word on this vocabulary list, *pes*, *pedis*, m., meaning "foot." It's a third-declension, masculine noun. And is it *i*-stem? No, it's not! It is monosyllabic, but there's only one consonant at the end of the base. So that's three strikes for *i*-stems in this vocabulary. Actually four! "I" is out of the game. What would be the English cognate of this base? Remember Grimm's Law? Latin /p/ is equal to English /f/, like *pater* and "father." Latin /d/ is equal to English /t/, like *dent-* and "tooth." So change /p/ to /f/ and /d/ to /t/ and you get … "foot"! You probably don't need that to remember what *pes, pedis*, means, but isn't it nice to know? How would Latin say "on foot"? [What does "on foot" mean? You're using your foot, right? So what case in what usage shows the instrument employed to do something?] The ablative of means, of course. So "on foot" in Latin is … *pede*. [No preposition!] Done and done!

Do the rules that were cited at the beginning of this chapter now make sense to you? If not, please review this presentation. If so, please proceed to the next slide.

For the next class meeting, please bring in a copy of the P&R sentences for Chapter 38 on pages 184-185 of Wheelock's text.

Quos di ament, Latinae student.