

CATARINA GASPAR – SILVIA TANTIMONACO

RELATIVE PRONOUNS IN LIGHT OF EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE: THE PROVINCE OF LUSITANIA*

Summary: This paper focuses on the uses and forms of the relative pronouns as evidenced from the Latin epigraphy in Lusitania. Inscriptions are considered from the 1st to the 8th century AD, with special attention being paid to the future developments in the Portuguese language. To this purpose, other inscriptions or documents of a different nature dated to later chronologies are also considered as a point of comparison.

Key words: relative pronouns, epigraphy, vulgar Latin, Portuguese, Hispania, Lusitania

INTRODUCTION

Relative pronouns underwent complex changes during the shift from Latin into the Romance languages, which affected phonetics, morphology and syntax. A contrastive analysis of the evidence from antiquity to modern times allows us to track down the progressive development of these forms and to compare previous phases with the current state of Romance languages. In our case, we will focus on the relationship between the Vulgar Latin of the province Lusitania and the modern Portuguese language.

* This paper was prepared in the frame of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie project titled ‘VaLiD – Value to Linguistic Differences: Misspelled Inscriptions from Ancient Spain’ (H2020-MSCA-IF-2017-793808), which is associated to the ‘Lendület (‘Momentum’) Research Group for Computational Latin Dialectology’ (Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences) and to the project NKFIH (National Research, Development and Innovation Office) No. K 124170 titled ‘Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age’.

RELATIVE PRONOUNS IN PORTUGUESE:
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In Portuguese, relative clauses are usually introduced by the so-called ‘Q-morphemes’.¹ Just like in other Romance languages, relative pronouns can be divided between invariable and variable forms (Table 1).² In the first group we find *que*, whose origin is clearly Vulgar Latin *qui* – when the pronoun acts as subject – or Vulgar Latin *que(m)/quid* – when it stands for the direct object of a sentence.³ Also invariable is the form *quem*, which preserves the original Latin spelling of the masculine accusative; this is always preceded by a preposition (e.g. *com quem*) and is able to replace *que* when the antecedent is a human or animate referent. The last element of the group of invariable pronouns is *onde*, from Latin *unde*, that has a locative function and can also appear within prepositional syntagmata (e.g. *de onde*). On the other hand, the group of variable pronouns includes forms derived from Latin *qualis* – *o qual*, *a qual*, *os quais*, *as quais*, which can act in the phrase either as subject or as direct object –⁴ as well as from Latin *cuius* – *cujo*, *cuja*, *cujos*, *cujas*, which preserve the original meaning of belonging or possession. Other components of this group are *quanto*, *quantos* and *quantas*, from Latin *quantus*.⁵

Variable				Invariable
Masculine		feminine		
singular	plural	singular	plural	
<i>o qual</i>	<i>os quais</i>	<i>a qual</i>	<i>as quais</i>	<i>que</i>
<i>cujo</i>	<i>cujos</i>	<i>cuja</i>	<i>cujas</i>	<i>quem</i>
<i>quanto</i>	<i>quantos</i>	---	<i>quantas</i>	<i>onde</i>

Table 1. Relative pronouns in Portuguese (from CUNHA–CINTRA [n. 5] 342)

It is noteworthy that some of the above-quoted forms are identical with the interrogative pronouns – for instance, *que*, *qual*, *quanto* or *onde*. This observation can be related with the ‘overlapping system’ of interrogative and relative pronouns which developed in Vulgar and Late Latin, in consequence of phonetic and morphological

¹ ‘Constituintes relativos ou morfemas-Q’. Cf. BRITO, A. M. B. – DUARTE, I.: Orações relativas e construções aparentadas. In MATEUS, M. H. M. ET AL. (eds): *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa 2003, 653–694, here 661.

² Cf. POLETTO, C. – SANFELICI, E.: Relative Clauses. In DUFFER, A. – STARK, E. (eds): *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin – New York 2017, 804–838.

³ Cf. COHEN, M. A.: *Syntactic Change in Portuguese: Relative Clauses and the Position of the Adjective in the Noun Phrase*. Campinas 1990, 122.

⁴ *O qual* replaces *que* in restrictive prepositional relatives – indirect object – and in all appositive relatives. Cf. RINKE, E. – ASSMANN, E.: The Syntax of Relative Clauses in European Portuguese. Extending the Determiner Hypothesis of Relativizers to Relative *que*. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 16.4 (2017) 1–26, here 2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/jpl.172>.

⁵ Cf. CUNHA, C. – CINTRA, L.: *Nova Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*. Lisboa 2000, 342.

changes, such as the deletion of final consonants. These processes led to a morphological affinity between separated forms – for instance, between the relative pronoun *qui* and interrogative-indefinite pronoun *quis*, both of which converged into Portuguese *que*.⁶

The bonds connecting relative pronouns (Table 2) to their antecedents⁷ became weakened already in Vulgar Latin. According to Herman, ‘the masculine nominative form *qui* (“who”) and the masculine accusative *quem* came to be generally available forms that could be used after any antecedent, particularly if they were used to refer to people (...); on the other hand, the neutral form *quod* was often extended to both masculine and feminine antecedents, ‘particularly when the nouns are used to refer abstractions or to objects’.⁸

	Singular			Plural		
	Masc.	Fem.	Neuter	Masc.	Fem.	Neuter
Nom.	quī (quei)	quae	quod	quī (quei)	quae	quae
Acc	quem	quam	quod	quos	quas	quae
Gen.	cuius ⁵ (quoius)			quorum	quarum	quorum
Dat.	eui (quoi)			quibus (quis)		
Abl.	quō	quā	quō	quibus (quis)		

Table 2. Relative pronouns in Classical Latin (POLETTO – SANFELICI [n. 2] 802)

Early testimonies of Portuguese are unfortunately scarce,⁹ but they show a clear influence of Latin orthography in the spelling of some words. Inscriptions from the 12th and the 13th century were mostly written in Latin (Table 3), reflecting the new status acquired by epigraphy in the Middle Age. Indeed, inscriptions dated to this period are primarily related with the political and cultural elites. In such texts, relative pronouns usually appear in their extended form (without abbreviations) and are clearly deployed according to the norm of Classical Latin. They seem to be completely

⁶ Cf. COHEN (n. 3) 121. See also POMPEI, A.: Relative clauses. In: BALDI, PH. – CUZZOLIN, P. (eds): *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Vol. III. Berlin – New York 2011, 427–547.

⁷ On this topic, cf. PEREZ FERNANDEZ, J. M.: El pronombre relativo: su complejidad formal y funcional. In RODRÍGUEZ ADRADOS, F. (ed.): *IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 27 al 30 de septiembre de 1995)* III. Madrid 1998, 217–222.

⁸ Cf. HERMAN, J.: *Vulgar Latin*. Transl. by R. Wright. The Pennsylvania State University Press 2000, 66.

⁹ The earliest documents written in the so-called ‘galego-português’ language are dated to the 12th century: *Excerto do pacto de Gomes Pais e Ramiro Pais* (IAN/TT, Mitra de Braga, maço 1, n. 26/A) date: between 1173 and 1175; cf. SOUTO CABO, J. A.: *Documentos Galego-portugueses dos séculos XII e XIII*. Coruña 2008 – and *Notícia de Fiadores* (IAN/TT,CR, Mosteiro de S. Cristovão do Rio Tinto, maço 2, n. 10) date: 1175; cf. MARTINS, A. M.: Ainda “os mais antigos textos escritos em português”. *Documentos de 1175 a 1252*. In I. HUB FARIA (ed.): *Lindley Cintra. Homenagem ao Homem, ao Mestre e ao Cidadão*. Lisboa 1999, 491–534.

detached from the changes they had experienced in Vulgar and Late Latin, and come to be even more distant from the Romance system. In such cultivated contexts, Latin was used as an artificial means of expression – often in the frame of poetic compositions –, as a means of favouring linguistic correctness.

Nr.	Date / Place	Text
L1	1155 / Santa Cruz, Coimbra	HOC : IACET : IN PULCRO : RODERICUS : NEMPE : SEPULCRO . / QUI : DOMINO : CELI : SERVIVIT : CORDE : FIDELI : / NAMQUE : LOCO : XPISTO : TEMPLUM : CONSTRUXIT : IN ISTO / QUOD : BENE : DITAVIT : SACRIS : DONISQUE : BEAVIT / CLAUSTRI : STRUCTURAS : FUNDAVIT : NON : RUITURAS : / ATQUE : DOMOS : CUNCTAS : PER : CIRCUITUM : BENE : IUNCTAS : / SED : VIGILI : CURA : MISERIS : DANS : HIC : SUA : IURA : / TEMPORE : SUB : SCRIPTO : MIGRAVIT : PRESBITER : ISTO : / XVIII : KaLendas : SEPTEMBRIS : ERA : M : C : LXXXIII : /
L2	1173 / Igreja de St. ^a Maria de Geraz do Lima, Viana do Castelo	Era : M ^a : CC ^a : XI ^a : III ^o : K(a)L(endas) [maii] / DEDICATA : FUIT EC(c)L(esi)A [ista] / Q(ua)M FECIT : DEDI[care] / MARTINUS : P(res)B(i)T(e)R [...]
L3	1173–1181 / Capela de S. João, Montemor-o-Velho, Coimbra	HOC : IACET : IN TUMULO / Q(u)I : E(st) : IN MEDIO : PORTE : / PETRUS : ALFONSI : Q(u)I : OBIIT / VII ^o : K(a)L[endas :] SeTemBRIS : IN : / ERA : M : CC : X : I [...]
L4	1175 / Capela de S. Pedro de Fins, Sta. Maria dos Olivais, Tomar, Santarém	VII [sic] : NONAS : MA/GII : OBIIT : GARSIA : / VERMUDI : CUI : SI/T : BAETA : REQUIES : / E(ra) : M : CC : XIII : +:
L5	1181 / Igreja paroquial de S. Lourenço do Bairro, Anadia, Aveiro	SUB : HONORE : SANCTI : LAU/RENCII : PELAGIOLUS : P(res)B(ite)R : HANC : EDIFICAVIT : / ECCLESIAM : QUAM : CERO : PerFECTAM : VerMUDUS : / CONIMBRIANE : ECCLESIE : RELIGIOSUS : DE/DICAVIT : EPISCOPus : VIII ^o : KaLendas : N(ovem)B(e)R : Era : M ^a : CC X : VIII
L6	1239 / Sé Velha de Coimbra, Sé Nova, Coimbra	II : K(alenda)S : A(u)GUSTI : OB/IIT : SUERIUS : PE/TRI : MILES : CUIUS : /ANIMA : REQ(u)IES/CAT : IM [Sic] PACE : / : E(ra) : M : CC : [lxxvii]
L7	1285 / St. Maria de Celas, St. ^o António dos Olivais, Coimbra	LAUDE : NIMIS : DIGNA : SPECIOSA : PUDICA : BENIGNA : / PROVIDA : DISCRETA : FACUNDA : MODESTA : QUIETA : / MORIBUS : ORNATA : DE : CLARO : SANGUINE : NATA : / FAMA : DOTATA : VIRTUTIBUS : ASSOCIATA : / HARUM : PRELATA :

Nr.	Date / Place	Text
		CELLARUM : PRETITULATA : / LUX : PRELATARUM : CLARUM : SPECuLuM : MONACHARUM : / VULTUS : HONESTATI : FLOS : PURUS : VIRGINITATIS : / XPI : SERVORUM : MONIALIS : AMICA : MINORUM : / EST : ELVIRA : LUPI : QUAM : CERNIS : SUBDITA : RUPI : / CONSTAT i:IBI : CLAUDI : SIC : OMNIA : CONSONA : LAUDI : / LAUDES : ASCRIBI : QUECUNQUE : VALENT : MONIALI : / VENDICAT : ISTA : SIBI : MERITO : TITULOQUE : REALI : / POST : M : C : PARITER : TER : PONAS : X : BIS : ET : I : TER : / ILLIUS : ERA : NOTA : TALI : FIAT : TIBI : NOTA :
L8	1299 / Igreja de Sta. Maria da Al- cáçova, Monte- mor-o-Velho, Coimbra	MARTINUS : GONTINA : IACENT : SIMUL : HIC : VIR : ET UXOR : / CUM : KARIS : NATIS : DICTIS : IUSTAQUE : MARIA : / QUOS : HIC : CONIUNXIT : FERNANDUS : NATUS : EORUM : / : ELBORA : QUEM : TENUIT [Sic] : PATREM : PRO : Q(u)IS : DATUR : ALMA : / : HOSTIA : COTIDIE : IUSTE : FELICIS : IN ARA : / : CERNENTES : LAPIDEM : DICANT : DEUS : HIIS : MISERERE : / : NOSCENTES : VERE : QUOD : VENIENT : AD IDEM : / VI : KaLendaS : IUNII : OBIIT : MARIA : MARTINI : SOROR : FERNANDI : M(artini) : Era : M ^a : CCC ^a : III ^a / VI : IDus : MARCII : OBIIT : MARTINus : PeLAGII : PATER : FERNAnDI : M(artini) : Era : M ^a : CCC ^a : VIII ^a : / VIII : KaLendaS : NOVe(m)BRis : Obiit : IusTA : MARTINI : SORORum : FERNANDI : MAR(tini) : Era : M ^a : CCC ^a : NONA : / XVII : KaLendaS : IULII : OBIIT : GONTINA : PETRI : MATER : FER(nandi) : MARTINI : Era : M ^a : CCC ^a : XIX ^a : / HORUm : OSSA : TRAN(s)LATA : FUERUNT : VII ^o : IDUS : SEPTENBRIS : ERA : MILLESIMA : TRESCEntESIMA [Sic] : XXXVII : QUORUM : AnImE : REQUIESCANT : In : PACE : AME(n)
P1	[1294–1298] / Castelo do Alan- droal, Alandroal, Évora	QUANDO: QUISERES: FAZE/R: ALGUA : COUSA: CATA :O QUE / TE : EN : DEPOIS : VERA : E QUEN : DE T/I : FIAR : NO NO : ENGANES : LEALDADE / VENCE : TODALAS : COUSAS

Table 3. Relative pronouns in medieval inscriptions from Portugal (12th–13th century)¹⁰

¹⁰ Cf. BARROCA, M. J.: *Epigrafia Medieval Portuguesa (862–1422). Corpus Epigráfico Medieval Português*. Tomo I, vol. II. Lisboa 2000, 261–265 (L1), 384–387 (L2), 387–389 (L3), 404–407 (L4), 442–445 (L5), 778–780 (L6), 1046–1050 (L7), 1150–1156 (L8), 1118–1121 (P1).

In contrast, the principal tendencies of the romance system emerge in full force with the notarial deeds composed in Portugal during the same epoch. In those examples which are dated to the 13th century, for instance, the form *que* appears in place of *qui*, thus anticipating the development into Portuguese *que* [ke].¹¹ Genitive forms such as *cuius*, *cuia* and *cuum* are also recorded within these documents, where they are used as both relative and possessive pronouns; and, besides these, we can also find *quanto* and *qual*.¹²

However, extravagant uses of the relative pronouns are attested in even earlier documents from Portugal, for example in the *Liber Fidei*, written in Braga in the 11th century.¹³ This text contains several morphosyntactic variants, such as singular *quale* and plural *quales* or the merging of *que* ~ *qui* in the masculine nominative.

INSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE FROM THE PROVINCE LUSITANIA

In the province of Lusitania, whose territory corresponded to a great extent with central and southern Portugal, the modern region of Extremadura and parts of Castile and León and Castile-La Mancha, in Spain, deviant spellings of the relative pronouns tend to be more frequent in inscriptions produced in the Early Period (1st–3rd century AD), while they noticeably decrease in the Late Period (4th–8th century AD). In general terms, relative pronouns are not frequently attested on ancient inscriptions, due to the concise and standardized character of epigraphical texts. In most cases, they are inserted within funerary formulas such as *qui / quae uixit annis...* or *cum quo / cum qua uixit annis...*, where they are deployed in the singular forms.¹⁴ An exception to this general trend is represented by the so-called Visigoth Slates, which are documents of a mainly administrative content, dated from the 6th to the 8th century AD, and concentrated in the Spanish sector of our province corresponding to the modern towns of Salamanca, Ávila and Cáceres. Indeed, such documents, whose texts tend to be more elaborated from the syntactical point of view, provide the majority of data referred to the system of the relative pronouns in Late Lusitania recorded in the *Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age* (LLDB), which will be used in this chapter as a main source of information.¹⁵

¹¹ Cf. MAIA, C. A.: *História do Galego-Português. Estudo linguístico da Galiza e do Noroeste de Portugal desde o século XIII ao século XVI*. Lisboa 1997, 693.

¹² Cf. MAIA (n. 11) 694–697.

¹³ Cf. EMILIANO, A. H. DE A.: *Latim e Romance na segunda metade do século XI. Análise scripto-linguística de documentos notariais do Liber Fidei de Braga de 1050 a 1110*. Lisboa 2003, 264–265.

¹⁴ In the province of Lusitania, relative pronouns appear in less than 1% of the inscriptions (ca. 70 relative pronouns among ca. 7.500 total inscriptions according to EDCS in December 2018 – <http://db.edcs.eu>).

¹⁵ <http://lldb.elte.hu>. The data discussed in this paper reflect the state of work at 02/12/2018. We have not considered archaising spellings such as *QVOIVS* for *cuius* (cf. e.g. LLDB-71342, 71334 and 71332) or *QVEI* for *qui* (cf. e.g. LLDB-80917 and 80929). We have also omitted phenomena which

The Visigoth Slates display, for instance, a clear tendency towards the elimination of the labial trait from the labio-velar phoneme /k^w/, as is proven by the frequent spelling *COD/COT* for *quod*,¹⁶ as well as by other forms, such as *COR* for *quorum* (PizV 92, 1 = LLDB-48264) or *CAS* for *quas* (PizV 103, II, 2 = LLDB-59916).¹⁷ It might be observed that this phenomenon – which is to be found, for instance, in Dalmatia and Dacia already in the Early Period –¹⁸ seems not to have affected the system of relative pronouns for Early Lusitania.¹⁹

Another evident characteristic of the Visigoth Slates regarding the treatment of the relative pronouns is the devoicing of final *-d*, as according to the frequent spelling of *quod* as *QVOT* (or *COT*).²⁰ In the Early Period, such a confusion is well-attested in other provinces, such as Dacia, Dalmatia, Africa Proconsularis and Baetica.²¹

We cannot exclude that such a misspelling reflects a general confusion between the relative pronoun *quod* and the interrogative-indefinite pronoun *quot*. However, as for the Early Period, it seems more plausible that devoiced spellings of this type were influenced by the phonological context (*sandhi*) – such in the phrase *VOT(VM) QVOT FECIT* (IRCPacen 571 = LLDB-16420, AD 1-300) –²² or that they were intended as archaizing forms – such as in the expression *QVOT POTVIT PIETAS*, as is

might be explained as technical mistakes or which reflect orthographic habits, such as the use of *E* for *ae*, that mainly concerns the pronoun *quae*, often written as *QVE* (cf. e.g. LLDB-74822 and 74379). In doing so, we have rejected the possibility that *QVE* could be a misspelling of the masculine form *qui* due to the merge of *i* and *e*, or, alternatively, that it might correspond to the accusative *quem*, with loss of final *-m*. We have also excluded data labelled as *fortasse recte* and have only used dated inscriptions. Abbreviations of the epigraphic publications quoted can be consulted at LLDB's webpage.

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. PizV 4, I, 10 = LLDB-46844 (*COD FIAT* for *quod fiat*) or PizV 97, II, 2 = LLDB-59430 (*COT ISPENSVM EST* for *quod expensum est*).

¹⁷ Cf. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO, I.: *Las pizarras visigodas. (Entre el latín y su disgregación. La lengua hablada en Hispania, siglos VI-VIII)*. Burgos 2004, 532.

¹⁸ Cf. LLDB-5363, 14293, 33168, 34871, 34769 (Early Dalmatia) and LLDB-5723, 9145 (Early Dacia).

¹⁹ Nevertheless, in this phonological context such reduction is attested already in the times of Cicero, who refers to a play on words, *coque ~ quoque*, transmitted by Quintilian (Quint. inst. 6. 3), cf. VÄÄNÄNEN, V.: *Introducción al Latín vulgar*. Madrid 2003, 99–100 and ZAMBONI A.: Contributo allo studio del latino epigrafico della Regio X Augustea (*Venetia et Histria*). *Fonetica* (vocali in iato e consonantismo). In *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Classe di Scienze morali, Lettere ed Arti* 126. Venezia 1967–1968, 87–88. In Early Lusitania the reduction of the labio-velar phoneme /k^w/ is attested only before vowels such as *a* or *i*, as is proved by spellings such as *QADRATI* for *Quadrati* (CIRPSalamanca 136 = LLDB-32616, AD 191–210), *TRANQILLO* for *Tranquillo* (ERBeira 14 = LLDB-36775, AD 1–50) or *QINTO* for *Quinto* (CILCaceres 3, 1091 = LLDB-45776, AD 101–200).

²⁰ Cf. e.g. PizV 40, I, 7 = LLDB-82005 (*ADERATO ET [DEFE]NITO PRETIV COT INTER NOB[I]S BONE PACIS CONVE[NIT]* for *adaerato et definitio pretio quod inter nos bonae pacis conuenit*) or PizV 8, I, 5 = LLDB-46898 (*[DA]TO ET DEFENITO PRETIO QVOT INTE[R NOS]* for *dato et definitio pretio quod inter nos*).

²¹ Cf. LLDB-4166, 5745, 7568, 9146, 9791, 9875, 9878, 9886, 9887 (Early Dacia); LLDB-266, 14294, 34870 (Early Dalmatia); LLDB-43658, 50624, 51126, 54273, 65286, 82231 (Early Africa Proconsularis) and LLDB-22112, 25096, 26080, 74374 (Early Baetica).

²² See also, in Gallia Narbonensis: *QVOT TV NOBIS DEBIVISTI FACERE* (CIL XII 729 = LLDB-74066, 51–300 AD); or, in Dacia: *M[ONVMENTO] QVOT FRATRES M[EI]* (IDR 2, 62 = LLDB-4166, AD 171–250).

recorded in a verse inscription (ERA Emerita 140 = LLDB-60398, AD 151–200), i.e. in a text with literary connotations.²³ In the Late Period, the oscillation between *-t* and *-d* might reflect the instability of the final consonants, as has been correctly pointed out by Velázquez Soriano.²⁴ Indeed, in the province of Lusitania – but also in the Baetica – the loss of final *-d* is effectively attested with reference to the relative pronouns already in the Early Period.²⁵

However, it is also possible that, in those cases where *-d* is absent, we are dealing with a phenomenon not of a phonological but of a syntactical nature, that is, the confusion between the ablative (*quo*) and the nominative-accusative (*quod*). Examples of case merging in the domain of the relative pronouns are in fact attested in both Early and Late Lusitania. As for the Late Period, they mainly focus – once again – on the Visigoth Slates,²⁶ while outside of this specific context we can mention the sentence *EDIFICIV(M) S(AN)C(T)OR(VM) N(OMI)NE CEPTVM IVSTI ET PASTORIS MARTIRVM Q(V)OR(VM) CONSTAT ESSE SACRATVM* for *aedificium sanctorum nomine coeptum Iusti et Pastoris martyrum quibus constat esse sacratum* (CIPTP 161 = LLDB-31779, AD 628), which shows the interchange between the dative and genitive case, which is a typical phenomenon of Late Latin.²⁷

In general terms, the Visigoth Slates demonstrate a sort of ‘fixed use’ of the neuter pronoun *quod*,²⁸ which can alternatively replace a feminine form, such as in

²³ Moreover, it should be underlined that the spelling *QVOT* for *quod* often appears within formulas with a legal value, see e.g., in Baetica: *EX FVNER(ATICIO) QVOT SVPERF(VIT)* (CILA 2, 2, 455 = LLDB-22112, AD 101–200) or, in Dacia: *QVOT I(NFRA) S(CRIPTVM) EST* (IDR 1, 31/2 = LLDB-9791, AD 167).

²⁴ Cf. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO (n. 17) 502.

²⁵ Cf. LLDB-60217, 79892 (Early Lusitania); LLDB-26036 (Early Baetica). In Early Baetica, we also found a case of addition of a final *-d* to the relative pronoun *quo*: *QVO{D} BENEFICIO PRINCIPIS NOSTRI FRVI CONTIGIT* (CIL II²/5, 900, I, 11 = LLDB-74382, AD 19).

²⁶ As for Late Lusitania, data obtained from the Visigoth Slates are marked by a double asterisk (**): LLDB-16400, 41852, 60217, 79892 (Early Lusitania); LLDB-31779, 47062**, 59921**, 84279** (Late Lusitania). For this phenomenon in other provinces, cf. LLDB-22918, 24912, 25149, 25455, 25548, 74371, 74382 (Early Baetica); LLDB-51143, 52609, 52654, 60722 (Early Africa Proconsularis); LLDB-1662, 77673 (Early Gallia Narbonensis); LLDB-4124, 7645, 73855, 81902 (Late Gallia Narbonensis); LLDB-12389, 12484, 13102, 63908 (Late Venetia et Histria); LLDB-28910 (Early Dalmatia); LLDB-18212 (Late Dalmatia) and LLDB-9573 (Early Dacia). Both in early and late documents, a peculiar problem is represented by the interchange between the forms *QVI* and *CVI*, which might correspond to the merger of the nominative and the dative case of the relative pronoun but might also be considered as a mere orthographic issue. On this topic, cf. MORALES, J. L.: *Qui, cui y la interpretación fonológica de las labiovelares latinas. Excerpta philologica. Revista de filología griega y latina de la Universidad de Cádiz* 1.2 (1991) 521–528. See also HERNÁNDEZ PÉREZ, R.: *Qui exsistum parentes dederunt: una formulación en prosa del tópico de la immatura (praepostera) mors en una inscripción romana del Ager Tarraconensis* (Renau, Tarragona). *Habis* 47 (2016) 190–191.

²⁷ Cf. BASSOLS DE CLIMENT, M.: *Sintaxis latina*. Madrid 1992, 61.

²⁸ Cf. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO (n. 17) 288 *ad v.* 12 (“posible uso fijo de *quod*”). See also DÍAZ Y DÍAZ, M. C.: El latín de la Península Ibérica. Rasgos lingüísticos. In *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica*. Madrid 1960, 153–197, here 177. Several times in the Visigoth Slates, it seems difficult to recognize the value of *quod* and its linguistic referent, especially because of the fragmentary state of the text, cf. e.g. PizV 4, 93, 97, I, 5 and II, 6.

[N]OTITIA D VER[VELLAS?]²⁹ COT ISPENSAS SVNT for *notitia ueruellarum quae expensae sunt* (PizV 97, I, 2 = LLDB-59415), or which can even refer to a plural name, such as in *NOTITIA DE CEVARIA QVOT DEVES* for *notitia cibariorum quae debes* (PizV 52, I, 3 = LLDB-48073).³⁰ Conversely, the overlap of the masculine as the ‘universal gender’ in the domain of the relative pronouns is scarcely attested in Lusitania. On a private letter dated to the 3rd century AD that was rudely scratched on a shingle clay in *Emerita Augusta* (Mérida), we read the sentence *PVELLAM QVI IAM FETO TOLLERAT* for *puellam quae iam fetum tulerat* (Mallon p. 550 = LLDB-45890), where the nominative masculine pronoun *qui* is used to refer back to the feminine noun *puella*. In later times, on a paleo-Christian verse epitaph from Portugal, we find the constructions *ILLA (...) QVEM* for *illa (...) quae* and *ME MISERAM QVI* for *me miseram quae* (CIPTP 3 = LLDB-29903 and 29915). In other provinces, this phenomenon is instead more widely reported, both in the Early Period – particularly in Africa Proconsularis and Dalmatia – and in the Late Period – especially in Gallia Narbonensis, Venetia et Histria and Dalmatia.³¹

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, epigraphic materials from different periods allow us to reconstruct the evolutionary process that led to the progressive disintegration of the Classical Latin system of the relative pronouns. The first hints of such an evolution are visible in the documents of the province of Lusitania and date to the Roman age and Late Antiquity. The subsequent adoption of Latin as a cultivated language and the elitist use of inscriptions in medieval times led to a sort of ‘re-normalization’ of the epigraphic

²⁹ For the use of the accusative case in this construction (that should be *de* + ablative, replacing a regular genitive) as according with the situation attested in other Slates, cf. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO (n. 17) 350.

³⁰ As for the confusion between singular and plural, one might point to the convergence of the singular and the plural forms of the masculine, *qui*, and that of the singular and the plural forms of the feminine, and also of the plural of the gender neutral, *quae*, which is attested in some juridical texts from Baetica, cf. e.g. *EOS (...) QVI PRAESSENT (...) ATQVE (...) DEDISSET* (CIL 2, 3, 927, III 24–25 = LLDB-22741), *AB EO QVI (...) MVNICIPES (...) ERIT* (CIL 2, 4, 1201, XIII, 11 = LLDB-25108) or *EA SACRA QVAE IN EA COLON ALIOVE QVO LOCO COLONORVM NOMINE FIAT* for *ea sacra quae in ea colonia aliove quo loco colonorum nomine fiant* (CIL II²/5, 1022, XX 22 = LLDB-74370).

³¹ Cf. LLDB-45042, 53782, 53954, 54721, 54814, 54821, 82016 (Early Africa Proconsularis); LLDB-999, 79271 (Early Gallia Narbonensis); LLDB-1644, 4253, 4256, 4273, 4389, 4400, 4402, 4712, 5460, 6449, 6995, 7009, 7747, 7752, 10113, 10121, 10124, 10263, 12769, 13097, 13707, 13709, 13776, 26307, 26352, 73758, 73850, 73856, 73916, 74732, 74733, 74737, 74745, 75272, 75406, 75412, 77712, 77793, 77987, 78025, 78766, 78794, 79279 (Late Gallia Narbonensis); LLDB-12531, 12993, 23875 (Early Venetia et Histria); LLDB-11922, 11938, 11945, 12182, 12221, 12269, 12296, 12304, 12328, 12483, 12504, 12565, 12576, 12969, 12971, 13106, 20924, 23439, 62854, 62933 (Late Venetia et Histria); LLDB-5864, 14351, 29452, 30504, 30603 (Early Dalmatia); LLDB-9404, 10914, 14138, 14157, 14278, 18418, 18701, 18694 (Late Dalmatia). In the Venetia et Histria, such a phenomenon is already attested in an inscription dated to the years AD 9–43 (CIL V 4923 = LLDB-23875: *CANGINAI QVEM* for *Canginae quam*).

language, including the system of the relative pronouns. Nevertheless, complementary documents of a different nature, such as non-epigraphic texts from the Middle Ages, provide us with a wider panorama over the phenomena of linguistic change. By the 11th century AD, the system of relative pronouns of the Portuguese language had already taken its basic shape.

Catarina Gaspar
Departamento de Estudos Clássicos
Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa
Portugal
cgaspar@fl.ul.pt

Silvia Tantimonaco
MTA Research Institute for Linguistics
Budapest
Hungary
silvia.tantimonaco@nytud.mta.hu

Open Access. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, a link to the CC License is provided, and changes – if any – are indicated. (SID_1)