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Problem

The purpose in undertaking this study was to determine more exactly the contemporary usage of the Spanish relative pronouns, thus making it possible (1) to supplement existing descriptions of the usage of the relative pronouns, and (2) to restate contemporary usage.

Method

For this study, representative works of the best contemporary Spanish and Spanish-American authors were used, employing Keniston's sampling technique. Three passages of ten pages each were selected from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the work in question. All examples found were recorded individually for analysis, thus making possible a study of a much larger number of actual examples than are available from the Keniston study.

Conclusion

A. The following findings which have been established in this thesis in some cases supplement existing descriptions by
the authorities and in others, are at variance with them.

1. *que* is not frequently replaced after *con* by *el cual* to avoid confusion with *conque*.

2. *que* does not necessarily follow its antecedent immediately. In fifteen per cent of all cases observed *que* was removed from its antecedent in such a way that determination of its antecedent was difficult.

3. *que* does on rare occasions as object of a preposition refer to a person.

4. *quien* is frequently used to distinguish a person from a thing as antecedent.

5. *quien* as a substantive refers more frequently to indefinite persons than *el que*.

6. *quien* as a substantive is used almost exclusively after *como* (meaning "as one who").

7. *el que*, as well as *el cual*, is regularly removed from its antecedent by a comma (or similar punctuation, and/or one or more words.)

**B. Restatement of Contemporary Usage**

1. **In a restrictive clause**
   a. The subject is regularly *que* for persons and
things.

b. The object is usually **que** for persons and things. **Quien** is used with "personal a". **Al cual** and **al que** are rarely so used.

2. **In a non-restrictive clause**
   a. The subject is usually **que** for persons and things, but may be **quiern**, **el cual**, and to a lesser extent, **el que**.
   b. The object is usually **que** for persons and things; **quiern** is used frequently with "personal a"; **al cual** or **al que**, rarely.

3. **Object of a** (exclusive of "personal a"), **en**, **de** and **con**
   a. Referring to persons, **quiern**, **el cual** or **el que** are used. In non-restrictive clauses **quiern** is most frequently used.
   b. Referring to things, **que**, **el cual** or **el que** are used. **Que** is normal in restrictive clauses; **que**, **el cual** or **el que** in non-restrictive.

4. **Object of por, sin and tras**
   a. **El cual** or **el que** are used; possibly, **quiern**.

5. **Object of dissyllabic prepositions**
   a. **El cual** or **el que** are normally used.
6. **Object of compound preposition**
   a. *El cual* is normally used; *el que*, rarely.

**NOTE:** Where there are choices in the usage indicated throughout Section B to this point, variety, rhythm and euphony are considerations. However, the choice of *quien*, *el cual* and *el que* to avoid ambiguity must be particularly borne in mind.

7. **Lo cual and lo que as restrictive and non-restrictive relatives**
   a. After monosyllabic prepositions both are used.
   b. After dissyllabic and compound prepositions, only *lo cual* is used.

8. **Quien and el que as substantive relatives**
   a. As object of a preposition, *quien* and *el que* are both used, the latter more frequently.
   b. Referring to indefinite persons, *quien* is used more frequently.
   c. Referring to definite persons, *el que* is used more frequently.
   d. After *como* (meaning "as one who") *quien* is used.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of the problem. The purpose in undertaking this study was to determine more exactly the contemporary usage of the Spanish relative pronouns. Much has been written on the relative pronouns during the past seventy-five years, some of it original, and some not. Unfortunately, much of that which is not original has been based on the results of investigations which used nineteenth century writings for their research material. Furthermore, the investigations that have been carried out to date have left unanswered various problems of usage. From the study made by the present writer, it has been possible (1) to supplement existing descriptions of the usage of the relative pronouns; and (2) to restate contemporary usage.

B. Past investigation. Before describing the method of the present study, a brief survey will be made of the work that has been done to date.

The nineteenth century grammarian, Andrés Bello, has probably given us the most comprehensive and dependable description of the use of the relative pronouns, in his Gramática de la Lengua Castellana (1847). Bello's work has the advantage of having been written by one who is dealing with his native tongue. However, it is now about one hundred years old, and for this reason one may ask the question
whether its description is wholly applicable to contemporary usage. Furthermore, complete as it is, it does not answer all the problems.

Ramsey\textsuperscript{1} seems to follow Bello's description closely, although using variations in terminology. Most of the grammars written subsequently follow the dictates of these early authorities, and consequently, they neither throw new light on the subject, nor present a necessarily adequate or valid description of the language to-day, as Professor Spaulding points out in an article on the relative pronouns. In the introduction he writes:

Our investigation of the subject was undertaken in the suspicion that some of the traditional pronouncements on \ldots{} the use of \textit{el que}, \textit{el cual} and \textit{quien} would not bear scrutiny through the lens of practice. (Robert K. Spaulding, "Notes and Queries on the Relative Pronouns in Modern Spanish," \textit{Hispania}, vol. XVIII, May 1935, p. 161.)

His study is suggestive as to trends in more modern usage, but is limited in its scope.

The importance of Dean Keniston's \textit{Spanish Syntax List}\textsuperscript{2} cannot be over-emphasized. This is a statistical analysis of Spanish syntax which uses examples gathered from the works of sixty outstanding contemporary writers representing all parts of Spain and Latin-America. The study indicates the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Marathon M. Ramsey, \textit{A Text-Book of Modern Spanish} (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1946.)
\item \textsuperscript{2} Hayward Keniston, \textit{Spanish Syntax List} (Henry Holt and Company, 1937.)
\end{itemize}
frequency of the functional patterns established by usage. Under the main classification of "Relative Pronouns" there are three sub-classifications: "Restrictive Relatives", "Parenthetical Relatives" and "Substantive Relatives". These are again sub-divided into other classifications, each of which deals specifically with one of the relative pronouns as used in a given functional pattern; for example, the relative used as subject, or object, or object of a preposition, and so on. By a comparison of the frequencies of the various relatives in a given pattern, the characteristic usage may be easily determined. Keniston's method is strictly objective. No attempt is made to correlate the statistics into a comprehensive statement of the usage of the relatives in relation to one another.

C. The present investigation. For this study, representative works of the best contemporary Spanish and Spanish-American authors were used, employing Keniston's sampling technique. Three passages of ten pages each were selected from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the work in question. Actually to equalize for variations in the number of words on a page, a page of usual size was considered to consist of approximately 400 words. All examples found were recorded individually for analysis, thus making possible a study of a much larger number of actual examples than are available from the Keniston study. In setting down the results of this present investigation, Keniston's findings were used for
comparison wherever possible. An example of these findings, taken from the Spanish Syntax List, under the classification "Substantive Relatives," is:

**el que** Referring to definite persons or things. (54-438)

This means that **el que** was found used in this way a total of 438 times by fifty-four of the sixty authors used in the investigation. It should be noted that Keniston used three times the number of works employed in this present study, and therefore, his frequencies should be three times as large. For example, in the case quoted above, the corresponding frequency for this study would be approximately 145. At times Keniston's frequency seemed low; this may be explained by the fact that one half of the works used by him were dramas, in which far fewer cases of relative pronouns would be found.

The grammars of Bello, Ramsey, and Harmer and Norton which have been used for comparison are prescriptive rather than statistical. In this present study, which is statistical, the odd case was found whose limited occurrence would not justify inclusion in such grammars. However, in spite of difference in object, this study does give new light on relative pronouns for prescriptive purposes.

The data found, and the conclusions reached have been organized on the following pages according to the outline in the Table of Contents.
II. THE INDIVIDUAL RELATIVE PRONOUNS

A. Que

1. As subject or object of its clause

a. In a restrictive clause: Que was found to be used almost exclusively with either a person or a thing as its antecedent. In this present study que was found to be used in this way in 1337 cases. Examples:

Viajé en el expreso que corre de París a Lisboa;
... (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 14)

Nada me importa ni me aflige el ruin concepto que formes de mí. (Valera, Juanita la Larga, p. 87)

Keniston's frequency: subject (60-2820); object (60-1224)

b. In a non-restrictive clause: Que was again found to be the relative pronoun most used as subject or object, with either a person or a thing as antecedent. Que was found used in this way in 1141 cases.

Acabó de vestirse, y al salir al huerto halló a Tasarin que estaba regando los rosales. (León, El Amor de los Amores, p. 125)

Sacó el brazo de la cama, lo alargó como para bendecirla, y poniéndole la mano sobre la cabeza, que ella inclinó con los claros ojos empañados, le dijo: ... (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 135)

Keniston's frequency: subject and object (60-1354)
2. As object of a preposition

a. As object of the monosyllabic prepositions a, en, de: Table I, which shows the frequency of que as object of the prepositions a, en, de, and con, is based on the findings of the present investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrict.</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrict.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate that the frequency of que after the prepositions a, en, de, and con, is much higher in restrictive clauses than in non-restrictive clauses. (There were 211 cases of a, en, de, and con in non-restrictive clauses; 223 cases in restrictive clauses.) Keniston classifies them together as monosyllabic prepositions, but his figures indicate the same total results; restrictive clauses (60-420); non-restrictive clauses (18-42). These findings agree with Bello's statement:

Después de las preposiciones a, de, en, en proposiciones especificativas, es mejor que: (Gramática, sect. 1078)

b. As object of con: Bello writes in his next section:
Después de con se emplea a menudo que, pero tiene bastante uso el cual (y no tan bien, a mi juicio, el que), sobre todo en las proposiciones explicativas [non-restrictive], y particularmente si son algo largas o cierran el periodo. (Gramática, sect. 1079)

The inference of his two sections would seem to be that que is the usual choice after the prepositions en, de, and a in restrictive clauses; and that after con, que is frequently replaced by el cual (or possibly el que), especially in non-restrictive clauses. Is this statement still true in reference to contemporary usage? In the cases studied it was found that que was used more frequently after the preposition con, than after the prepositions a or de in both restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. (See Table I.) Furthermore, it was discovered that el cual and el que were used much less after con than after a, en, or de (see C,5,d.). These observations show that que is not frequently replaced to-day by el cual after con, and it must be concluded that the distinction made by Bello between a, en, de and con is not valid for contemporary usage.

c. As object of por, sin, tras: In the passages read, no cases were found in which que was employed as object of por, sin or tras. Keniston gives no examples.

d. As object of dissyllabic prepositions: Only one case was found were que was used as object of a dissyl-
labic preposition, namely, after the preposition sobre.

Example:

...; la ciudad es monasterio, convento de solitarios; aquí la tierra, sobre que casi se acuestan, los une y los animales son otras tantas serpientes del paraíso ... (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 81)

This conforms in general to Keniston's findings, in which no cases are shown of que used as object of a dissyllabic preposition; and also to Bello's statement:

Después de preposiciones de más de una sílaba tiene poco uso que ... Difícilmente se tolerarían la ciudad hacia que, la Corte ante que; ... y si después de estas preposiciones quisiése variarse el cual, se preferiría más bien el que. Pero después de bajo, desde, para y sobre se extrañaría quizás menos el relativo simple [que]. (Gramática, sect. 1081)

e. As object of compound prepositions: In the present investigation no cases were found in which que was used as object of a compound preposition, examples of which are, en frente de, acerca de, por medio de. Keniston also lists no cases.

f. As object of a preposition, referring to persons: May que refer to persons when it is object of a preposition? Two examples uncovered in the present study are pertinent to this question. Examples:

Para el cronista francés y los hombres de que nos habla, es el mundo una realidad espléndida dotada de facetas innumerables: ... (Ortega y Gasset, España Invertebrada, p.820)
Antonio, a su vez, tuvo cuatro hijos, todos tejedores o sastres, de que algo se hablará más adelante. (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p.47)

In both of these cases, *que* referring to persons is used as object of a preposition. Contemporary grammarians hardly allow for these examples. The statement of Harmar and Norton is typical of most grammars:

> When the relative is governed by a preposition *que* cannot be used to refer to persons, its place being usually taken by *quién*. (*A Manual of Modern Spanish*, p. 36)

Similarly, but less inclusive, Keniston:

> Only after a preposition, with a personal antecedent, it is [*que*] regularly replaced by *quien* ... (*Spanish Syntax List*, p. 90)

Bello, however, does not exclude the possibility of *que* after prepositions referring to persons:

> En lugar de *que* o el cual, cuando se trata de personas, se dice frecuentemente *quien*; ... (*Gramática*, sect. 1085)

Spaulding quotes the statement of Tarr and Centeno:

> ... *que* may be used (a) referring to persons after the prepositions *de* and *con*.

In his own statement, Spaulding tends to compromise:

> Although this use is sufficiently ancient that in "Exemplo X" of the Conde Lucanor Patricio says "vio un hombre cabo del ..."
e era aquel de que vos fable de suso," no one, I suspect, even at this late date will naturally say "Juan, de que quería hablarte"; nor "mi hermano, con que viajábamos por España." Would it not have been better to restrict the rule [of Tarr and Centeno] to cases in which the "personality" of the noun is weak? (Hispania, vol. XVIII, May 1935, p.163)

However, it is not necessary to go back to mediaeval literature to find such cases. Keniston³ gives examples from sixteenth century writings:

... es bien que informéis de ... las personas con que lo hacen. (Jiménez de Cisneros, Cartas dirigidas a don Diego López de Ayala, p. 115)

... les embió más gente con que hizieessen lo que hizieron. (Valdés, Alfonso de, Diálogo de las Cosas Ocurridas en Roma, p. 113)

... los autores en que yo he leído. (Valdés, Juan de, Diálogo de la Lengua, p. 349)

The similar occasional use of que in contemporary literature, as in the first examples given in this section, is apparently a survival of the earlier usage, and it may be that que, referring to persons, is used not only after con and de as Tarr and Centeno state, but also after a and en. It is questionable whether its use is limited to cases where the "personality" of the antecedent is weak as Spaulding suggests.

³ Hayward Keniston, The Syntax of Castilian Prose (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.)
Further research must be carried out before these questions can be satisfactorily answered.

3. **The position of que in relation to its antecedent:**

   a. Must *que* follow its antecedent immediately as many grammarians conclude? The findings of this investigation which are relevant are shown below in Table II. The frequency with which *que* was employed in any given position is listed separately for each work used in this study. Using the title *Cristián y Yo*, for example, under the symbol I (for "immediate") is the number 128. This means that in the cases observed in this book, *que* was found immediately after its antecedent 128 times. Under the symbol R, is the number 14. This signifies that fourteen cases were found in which *que* was removed from its antecedent by a comma, and so on.

   It will be seen from the following table that the position of *que* falls into two main groups. In the first group, which comprises about 85 per cent of all cases, *que* either follows its antecedent immediately or is removed from it by some element which will not cause ambiguity; for example: a punctuation mark, an adjective, a preposition, or some combination of an adjective or preposition with a comma. In the second group, comprising some 15 per cent of the examples, *que* was found to be removed from its antecedent by some element or combination of elements which could cause ambiguity in
### TABLE II
THE POSITION OF QUE IN RELATION TO ITS ANTECEDENT

**KEY TO SYMBOLS**

- **I** = que follows antecedent immediately
- **R, =** que removed from antecedent by a comma
- **Ra =** que removed from antecedent by an adjective
- **R(,)prep =** que removed from antecedent by a comma and a preposition or only by a preposition
- **R app =** que removed from antecedent by a noun in apposition or by an appositional phrase
- **Rpp =** que removed from antecedent by a prepositional phrase
- **Rpp, =** que removed from antecedent by a prepositional phrase and a comma
- **Rc =** antecedent is a compound: e.g. "un vaso de agua"
- **Rcl =** que removed from antecedent by one or more clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Halmar, Cristián y yo</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valera, Juanita la Larga</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icaza, Huasi Fungo</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amadeo, Vidas Argentinas</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reyles, El Terruño</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basco Ibáñez, Sangre y Arena</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiroga, Anaconda, etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdés, José</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegos, Doña Barbara</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galdós, Misericordia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega y Gasset, España invertebrada</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereda, Peñas Arriba</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera, La Vorágine</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menéndez Pidal, Rodrigo el Último Godo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azorín, Los Clásicos Redivivos...</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamuno, La Tía Tula</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>León, El Amor de los Amores</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gúiraldes, Don Segundo Sombra</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rojas, Retablo Español</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determining the antecedent.

i. In the non-ambiguous group it was found that:

1) In 50 per cent of all cases examined in the study, que followed immediately after its antecedent. Example:

Los marineros que estaban en el pueblo habían acudido todos a la ribera. (Valdés, José, p. 147)

2) In 35 per cent of all cases que was removed from its antecedent by some element which would not cause ambiguity, for example, an adjective, a punctuation mark, a preposition, or some combination of an adjective or preposition with a comma: Examples:

Abajo queda el valle en silencio, repleto de luz crepuscular que empequeñece la figura entumecida de las chozas; ... (Icaza, Huasi Pungo, p. 17)

Una copiosa fuente, que nacía no lejos de allí, ... (León, El Amor de los Amores, p. 12)

Las especies materiales, que Sarmiento llamaba "civilización", pueden trasplantarse a otros continentes, ... (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 354).

La distancia a que le veíamos disminuía las proporciones de su persona. (Azorín, Los Clásicos Redivivos, p. 25)
ii. In the second group of examples (where ambiguity is likely) comprising about 15 per cent of all cases, it was found that:

1) There were approximately 12 cases in which que was removed from its antecedent by a noun in apposition, or by an appositional phrase. Example:

Ejemplo de los admirables efectos de la voluntad humana en el gobierno de las grandes como de las pequeñas agrupaciones de seres, era Juliana, mujer sin principios, que apenas sabía leer y escribir ... (Galdós, Misericordia, p. 2040)

2) In a large proportion of the second group of examples, more than two hundred cases, que was separated from the antecedent by a prepositional phrase. In many of these it was difficult to determine the antecedent. Examples:

Luz de sol meridiano, como el de Misiones, en que las camisas de los dos hombres deslumbraban. (Quiroga, Los Fabricantes de Carbón, p. 113)

Galicia ha producido hombres y mujeres notables en arte, ciencia, política, armas y negocios, que dieron prestigio al nombre regional. (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 345)

Acabó la escena, como tantas otras del teatro en que se fingen estos pasajes de la vida humana, ... (Pereda, Peñas Arriba, p. 636)

De mis petizos mis tías prestaron uno al hijo del tendero Festal, que yo aborrecía por orgulloso y maricón. (Guiraldes, Don Segundo Sombra, p. 19)
...; esta leyenda debía ser substancialmente la misma que la de Rodrigo y la hija de Julián ultrajada por fraude que conocía el Silense hacia 1115; ... (Menéndez Pidal, Rodrigo, p. LVI)

3) Some 75 cases were found in which the antecedent was of the type: un vaso de agua, in which neither vaso nor agua alone is the antecedent, but the entire phrase un vaso de agua. The presence of two nouns sometimes caused ambiguity.
Example:

Dejó el barril de raba que había comprado en manos de otro caminante ... (Valdés, José, p. 155)

4) In approximately 75 cases que was removed from the antecedent by one or more clauses.
Example:

..., ya por un mastín corpulento y poderoso que hay en casa de ellas, que inspira terror a las visitas, que parece capaz de derribar a un hombre de un manotazo y de destrozarle de un mordisco, y que, sin embargo, se echa con la mayor humildad a las plantas de su ama, ... (Valera, Juanita la Larga, p. 85)

5) In a number of cases que was greatly removed from its antecedent. Examples:

...; y por último, un curioso documento, sin fecha ni firma, sobre el problema de la mano de obra india, que se cree haber sido remitido al Cardenal Cisneros hacia 1517 por un fraile jerónimo, en cuyo primer párrafo se lee la siguiente afirmación ... (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 482)
La próxima vez que divisamos al joven aprendiz por entre las rendijas que nos abren los papeles, es ya Doménico un maestro de su oficio, un hombre hecho que alquila una casa y un terreno en el Vico dell'Olivella, ya desaparecido por el crecimiento y transfiguración de la gran ciudad genovesa, pero que, al decir de los competentes, era entonces una calle muy animada ... (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 48)

Sé de muchos hombres que no se han equivocado, y sé de otro en particular cuya elección ha sido un verdadero hallazgo, que me hizo esta profunda observación ... (Quiroga, Miss Dorothy Phillips, Mi Esposa, p. 201)

111. On the basis of these findings, one may say that que does not always immediately follow its antecedent. In many cases it is removed in such a way as to make identification of the antecedent difficult.

b. Does this conclusion agree with the statement of contemporary grammarians? Ramsay writes:

Que follows close after its antecedent, so that, although it is invariably in form, we are at no loss to see what it refers to. A preposition may intervene when it refers to things; ... (A Text-Book of Modern Spanish, sect. 680)

Willis K. Jones says:

Que must follow its antecedent closely, even if the sentence has to be recast. (Hispania, Vol. XXXI, No. 4, 1948)

And Lastly, the statement of Harmer and Norton:

As subject or object it [que] must immediately
follow its antecedent. When que is governed by a preposition the latter immediately follows the antecedent, and que the preposition. (A Manual of Modern Spanish, p. 36)

These statements are not a complete description of contemporary usage, in that they do not account for many of the cases. The statement of Harmer and Norton only accounts for 50 percent of the examples. Ramsey only accounts for 85 percent of the cases.

B. Quien as a restrictive and non-restrictive relative

1. As subject of its clause

a. As subject of a restrictive clause quien is not used.

No cases were found in this study, nor does Keniston list any. Bello writes:

Cuando quien no lleva en sí mismo su antecedente, no puede ser sujeto de una proposición especificativa: no se podría pues decir, el hombre quien vino. Sirve sí a menudo de sujeto en las proposiciones explicativas:... (Gramática, sect. 331)

The findings of this investigation indicate that Bello's statement is still applicable to contemporary usage.

b. As subject of a non-restrictive clause: Of the 98 cases of quien found in this investigation, 11 were cases in which quien was subject of a non-restrictive clause. Example:
18.

Ramiro Estévanez, quien debe a la condescendencia del capataz su actual descanso, ... (Rivera, *La Voragine*, p. 240)

Keniston's frequency: (15-28)

2. **As object of monosyllabic prepositions**

a. **In restrictive clauses:** There were 17' cases of **quien** as object of a monosyllabic preposition in a restrictive clause. Example:

   Haz lo que quieras, desventurado, que has de verte peor que esos idiotas a quienes persiguen los rapaces con injurias ... (León, *El Amor de los Amores*, p. 293)

Keniston's frequency: (23-37) and (15-20); total: 57 cases.

b. **In non-restrictive clauses:** In 68 of the examples **quien** was object of a monosyllabic preposition in a non-restrictive clause (86 per cent of the total number of occurrences of **quien**). Examples:

   ..., un gomero del Ecuador a quien llamábamos El Presbítero.... (Rivera, *La Voragine*, p. 157)

Keniston's frequency: **quien** (36-83); quienes (5-8); total: 91 cases.

c. **The frequency of quien after a, en, de and con:**

   Table III shows the frequency of **quien** after the individual monosyllabic prepositions:
TABLE III
QUÉN AS OBJECT OF THE MONOSYLLABIC PREPOSITIONS A, EN, DE, AND CON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrict.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrict.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Object of dissyllabic and compound prepositions:
In only one case was quien used as object of a dissyllabic preposition. Example:

A ella, a Gertrudis, ante quien sin saber por qué temblaba,... (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 89)

There were no cases with compound prepositions. Keniston has no examples of either dissyllabic or compound prepositions.

4. Used with a personified antecedent: Bello writes:

Quien, sin embargo, no se limita hoy tan estrictamente a personas, que no se refiera alguna[s] veces a cosas, cuando en éstas hay cierto color de personificación, por ligero que sea. (Gramática, sect. 330)

Two examples of personification were found in the present study. Examples:

Habréis notado en ambos rostros una fealdad risueña, del más puro Madrid, en quien el carácter arquitectónico y el moral se aúnan maravillosamente. (Galdós, Misericordia, p. 1925)
Pero el patito siente la nostalgia de nadar y se lo confiesa a la gallina, quien se horripila de lo que ella llama fantasías de la ociosidad. (D'Halmar, Cristián y Yo, p. 41)

5. **Distinguishes between persons and things:** In order to make the antecedent clear, it is necessary, in certain sentences to distinguish between a person and a thing. *Quien* was used in 31 such cases. This is about 31 per cent of the total number of examples of *quien*, which demonstrates that this is an important function of *quien*.

Examples:

Así lo confirma además el testimonio de Zurita, por quien sabemos que ... (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 339)

... pueda entrar en posesión de la herencia de la madre, de quien no se han vuelto a tener noticias, ... (Gallegos, Doña Barbara, p. 198)

En general, eran apólogos de propósitos morales o cuentos satíricos, y especies análogas se hallan en el Infante don Juan Manuel, en quien hay influencias... (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 179)

La mujer gris era el único ser de los que habitábamos la casona, en quien no había estampado alguna roncha ... (Pereda, Peñas Arriba, p. 314)
C. *El cual* and *el que* as restrictive and non-restrictive relatives

1. **Relative frequency:** In the present investigation it was found that *el cual* was favored over *el que*. *El cual* was used in 108 cases, *el que* in 74 cases.

2. **Refers to things more than to persons:** 67 per cent of the cases of *el cual* referred to things (71 cases); 79 per cent of the cases of *el que* referred to things (57 cases).

3. **As subject or object of its clause:**
   a. **In a restrictive clause:** Neither *el cual* nor *el que* were used as subject or object referring to persons or things, in a restrictive clause. Keniston found no examples. Bello says:

   "Para preferir *el cual* [to *que*] es preciso que alguna circunstancia lo motive; como la distancia del antecedente o la conveniencia de determinarlo por medio del género y número: "La definición oratoria necesita ser una pintura animada de los objetos, *la cual*, presentándolos a la imaginación con colores vivos, entusiasme y arrebate" (Gil y Zárate). Algunos dirían *la que*, y así lo hace el mismo escritor en casos análogos. (Gramática sect. 1076)

   Is this true for contemporary usage? Although the findings of the present study and those of Keniston were negative, they are not conclusive. It seems probable that *el cual* and *el que* would be used on
rare occasions today in such an example as that from Gil y Zárate which Bello quotes above.

b. **In a non-restrictive clause:**
   
i. As subject referring to persons and things
   
el cual was used in 30 cases (20 of which referred to persons), and el que in five cases (three of which referred to persons). Examples:
   
   Fué tan profundo el pinchazo emocional que lo obligó a saltar sobre el Andrés, el cual, perdiendo el equilibrio, se hundió con pies y manos en el barro. (Icaza, Huasi Pungo, p. 15)
   
   ... rienzi se apresuraba a hacer las paces con la chica, la cual festejaba en cuclillas la cara lavada ... (Quiroga, Los Fabricantes de Carbón, p. 120).
   
   De aquí salió después Don Diego, conquistador de América, el que murió en Santiago del Estero, ... (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 18)
   
   ii. As object referring to a person, el cual was used in one case. There were no cases in which el que was used.
   
   ..., Julian se sentía incitado por el rencor de su hija violada, la cual el rey Rodrigo le había arrebatado arteramenta... (Menéndez Pidal, Rodrigo, El Último Godo, p. L)

Keniston's frequencies for subject and object combined: el cual referring to persons (14-22); to a thing (10-12); (total, 34 cases); and el que referring to
persons and things (21-26).

c. The findings of the present study which are presented above are in accord with the statement of Harmer and Norton:

As subject, referring to persons or things - in which case **el cual** is nearly always preferred to **el que** - and as object, referring to things, they usually introduce non-defining [non-restrictive] clauses. (A Manual of Modern Spanish, sect. 169)

4. As object of a preposition:

a. Referring to persons: The following table shows how **el cual** and **el que** were used as objects of a preposition, referring to persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL CUAL AND EL QUE AS OBJECTS OF A PREPOSITION, REFERRING TO PERSONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A DE EN CON SIN POR TRAS SYLL. POUND TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El cual</strong>        2  9 - -  1 - -  2  1                  15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El que</strong>         10  1 - -  1 - -  2 -                  15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table that **el cual** and **el que** are not used to any great extent as objects of a preposition when referring to persons. While there would seem to be a difference in the use of **el cual** and **el que** with the prepositions **a** and **de**, there are not
enough cases to make the individual figures very significant. Of the ten cases of *el que* after the preposition *a*, five were drawn from Blasco Ibáñez, in his *Sangre y Arena*. Spaulding points out that Blasco Ibáñez shows a preference for *el que* after monosyllabic prepositions where *quien* would normally be used.

b. **Referring to things:** The following table gives the details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>SYLL.</th>
<th>FOUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>El cual</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>El que</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show that *el cual* and *el que* were used in the majority of cases to refer to a thing, as object of a preposition. There was no significant distinction in the use of *el cual* and *el que* after monosyllabic or dissyllabic prepositions.

c. After compound prepositions *el cual*, (referring to both persons and things) was definitely favoured, indicating that Bello's statement is still true in reference to contemporary usage. He states:
Si a la preposición precede algún adverbio o complemento, la forma que generalmente se prefiere es el cual. Se dirá, pues, acerca del cual, enfrente de la cual, por medio del cual, alrededor de la cual. (Gramática, sect. 1082)

Under his classification of restrictive clauses, Keniston combines dissyllabic and compound prepositions, but under the classification of non-restrictive clauses, he lists the compound prepositions separately: el cual (9-11); el que: no cases. This agrees with the findings of the present investigation.

d. A comparison of the use of el cual and el que in restrictive and non-restrictive clauses as object of a preposition.

i. Attacking the problem from a different point of view, Tables VI and VII below, based on the findings of this present study, show how el cual and el que were used in these two types of clauses, as object of a preposition.

TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>DIS-</th>
<th>COM-</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El cual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El que</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VII

**EL CUAL AND EL QUE AS OBJECT OF A PREPOSITION, IN NON-RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>SYLL.</th>
<th>COM-</th>
<th>POUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El cual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El que</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. From the tables above, it may be noted that:

Both *el cual* and *el que* had a low frequency in restrictive clauses. Both had a high frequency in non-restrictive clauses. Keniston:

- **in restrictive clauses:**
  - *el cual* (27-47); *el que* (22-41)

- **in non-restrictive clauses:**
  - *el cual* (55-125); *el que* (37-125)

Compared with each other, in restrictive clauses, however, *el que* was somewhat more common. But in the Keniston study, *el cual* is used slightly more: *el cual* 128 (composite total); *el que* 105 (composite total).

Both *el cual* and *el que* in restrictive and non-restrictive clauses, were used less as object of *con* than as object of *a, de* or *en*. This is significant since Bello and many of those who have written subsequently state that *el cual* often replaces *que* as object of *con* in order to avoid
confusion with *conque* (See A, 2, b). Such is apparently not the case in contemporary practice.

5. *El cual* and *el que* refer to the more remote of two or more possible antecedents

In this present study, many cases were found in which both *el cual* and *el que* referred to a remote antecedent: *el cual* in 28 per cent of its cases (30 instances); *el que* in 36 per cent of its cases (27 instances).

Examples:

...; la vaca lamía al ternero atado a una de sus patas delanteras, *el cual* tenía el hocico y la frente blancos de espuma; ... (Reyles, *El Terruno*, p. 23)

Así se echa de ver en la carta que los Reyes escriben a Colón, en *la cual*, y no en las que... (Madariaga, *Cristóbal Colón*, p. 352)

Hay guías para los viajeros de Cook, *las que*, como el excelente Baedecker, han de usarse en tales andanzas,... (Rojas, *Retablo Español*, p.11)

Su memoria era rico arsenal o archivo de coplas, tiernas o picantes, en *la que* la casta... (Valera, *Juanita La Larga*, p. 12)

6. General comments on *el cual* and *el que*

In the foregoing discussion it was seen that *el cual* and *el que* were used interchangeably in most of the classifications, although *el cual* was favored numerically. There were, however, two marked differences. First,
el cual was used almost exclusively after compound prepositions (see C, 4, c); secondly, as subject of a non-restrictive clause, el cual was definitely favored over el que (see C, 3, 6).

What observations do grammarians make? Bello in discussing the problem quotes the following example:

"Aparece con toda claridad establecido desde entonces el gusto a esa clase de diversiones" (dramáticas); "el cual continuó luego sin interrupción y con creces, como se echa de ver á cada paso, registrando las obras subsistentes de aquellos rudos tiempos" (Martínez de la Rosa). (Gramática, Sect. 1077)

Then referring to the example quoted, he says:

El cual es la forma relativa que mejor se adapta a las circunstancias, porque señalándose con ella número singular y género masculino, no vacila el entendimiento entre los sustantivos gusto, clase, y diversiones, y reconoce por antecedente el primero, aunque es el más distante de los tres. La perspicuidad requiere que cada palabra sugiera, si es posible, en el momento mismo en que la proferimos, su sentido preciso, y no dé lugar a juicios anticipados, que después sea menester corregir. En los dos últimos ejemplos [the last of which is cited above] hubiera podido ponerse el que por el cual conforme a la práctica modernísima, que según hemos dicho, no carece de inconveniente. (Gramática, sect. 1077)

Bello prefers el cual to el que under all circumstances, possibly because of the fact that:
...: los que, sustituido a los cuales, ofrecería, aunque no fuese más que momentáneamente, un sentido algo ambiguo, por la doble significación de aquella frase [referring to a previous example] en que, como hemos visto (secciones 165, 166, 167), el artículo puede ser o una mera forma del relativo o su antecedente. (Gramática, sect. 1075).

Ramsey states:

The two do not differ in meaning, and may be used as subject or object relating either to persons or things; but el cual belongs rather to a studied or oratorical, and el que to a more easy and off-hand, style — just the difference between which and that in English. (A Text-book of Modern Spanish, sect. 686)

Harmer and Norton make no distinction between them. (op. cit.). Spaulding says:

One of the most recent and most important contributions to the subject is found in the Graded Spanish Review Grammar of Tarr and Centeno.... Here finally the distinction between the written and the spoken language is taken into account. (Hispania, May, 1935, Vol. XVIII, p. 162)

D. Lo cual and lo que as restrictive and non-restrictive relative pronouns:

1. Lo cual and lo que are neuter relative pronouns which have as antecedents ideas or statements:

Examples:
Es inteligente, de genio vivo y emprendedor, astuta y habilidosa, por lo cual lleva casi siempre la dirección de la familia. (Valdés, José, p. 13)

Y hasta alguna vez se burlaban de ella, por ciertas maneras de hablar, lo que la ponía de grana. (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 89)

2. **Relative frequency of usage:** Lo cual was used considerably more than lo que. Lo cual was observed in 38 cases, lo que in 26 cases. Keniston shows more cases of lo cual than lo que, but the total for the various classifications is not clear.

3. **As object of monosyllabic prepositions:** Lo cual was used in 23 instances, lo que in 17. Keniston's frequencies seem very low under this classification: lo cual (9-12); lo que (8-9). Table IX below gives the particulars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lo cual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo que</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a noticeable difference in usage after a and
por. Apparently lo que is preferred after a, and lo cual after por. Of the nine cases above of lo que as object of a, seven referred to a statement and two cases to an idea. Example:

... le impulsó a preguntar: "¿dónde vive?", a lo que el canto amante contestó:... (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 40)

The observation made before this last example indicates that lo que was preferred to lo cual referring to statements. Only two cases of the latter were found in which it referred to a statement. There are not, however, enough examples to draw definite conclusions.

4. As object of dissyllabic and compound prepositions: Lo cual was object of a dissyllabic preposition in three cases, and of a compound preposition in two cases. There were no cases of lo que with either type of preposition. Keniston does not give particulars. Bello says:

...después de las preposiciones de más de una sílaba, o de preposiciones precedidas de adverbios o complementos, lo cual debe preferirse a lo que: para lo cual, según lo cual, mediante lo cual, acerca de lo cual. (Gramática, sect. 1083)

On the basis of the present study it seems that this statement remains valid for contemporary usage. By way of comparison it is to be noted that el cual was preferred to el que only after compound prepositions. With
dissyllabic prepositions there was no difference in the use of el cual and el que. (See C, 4, c).

E. Quien and el que as substantive relatives referring to persons

1. Description of substantive use: Quien and el que have been discussed as simple relatives, that is, as relatives which do not include their antecedents. Now they will be discussed as substantive relatives which include their own antecedents:

Example:

Hay quien sale del dilema rechazando de golpe los documentos genoveses como otras tantas falsificaciones. (Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 42)

Los ciegos solemos tener algo de músicos, poetas y trovadores, y aun los que son pobres e incultos distraen el ánimo propio... (León, El Amor de los Amores, p. 28)

Quien refers only to persons, el que to both persons and things. At this point el que will be discussed only as it refers to persons.

2. Relative frequency of usage: El que referring to persons was used more frequently than quien. El que referring to persons was found to be used in 149 cases. Quien was found used in 98 cases.

Since Keniston does not make a distinction between
persons and things when dealing with el que, his figures cannot be used here for comparison.

3. As object of a preposition: In the examples gathered, there seems to be no definite distinction in the use of quien and el que after the different prepositions, except that el que was used more frequently. Table IX gives the particulars:

**TABLE IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE SUBSTANTIVE RELATIVES QUIEN AND EL QUE AFTER PREPOSITIONS, REFERRING TO PERSONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El que</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Used as subjective complement: In this present study, quien was found to be used much more frequently as subjective complement than el que. There were 22 cases of quien, and 13 cases of el que.

Ella era quien desnudaba, vestía y cuidaba al niño. (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 39)

El segundo Garcilaso es el que se ha desenmuelto a la vista de los hombres,... (Azorín, Los Clásicos Redivivos, p. 29)
5. Referring to indefinite persons: **quien** was found to refer to indefinite persons more often than **el que**; it was used in this way in 53 cases, in other words, in 54 per cent of all cases of **quien**. **El que** referred to an indefinite person in 47 cases, that is, in 32 per cent of all cases of **el que**. (The remaining 45 cases of **quien** and the 102 other cases of **el que** refer to definite persons.)

Mi tropilla se había alejado caminando con cautela de quien está revisando campo para comprar... (Guíraldes, *Don Segundo Sombra*, p. 162)

Zoraida, el que dijera que has cambiado conmigo, tendría razón,... (Rivera, *La Vorágine*, p. 239)

Keniston does not give comparative figures on this point for contemporary usage. However, he states elsewhere, referring to sixteenth century usage:

In general, the forms composed of a demonstrative and a relative [**el que**, etc.] are regularly used to indicate specific, definite individuals, while **quien** regularly refers to indefinite individuals. (*Syntax of Castilian Prose*, p. 177)

This statement would have to be modified to reflect contemporary practice properly. Although **quien** is favoured for indefinite persons, it is certainly used today to refer to definite persons also as the figures above indicate. **El que** on the other hand, although tending to
favour specific persons, is used often to refer to indefinite persons.

6. After como: A definite difference was noticed in the use of quien and el que referring to indefinite persons after como, (meaning "as one who"). No cases of el que were found. Quien was used in 15 cases.

Examples:

Es porque le hablas como quien no quiere la cosa. (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 27)

Todo se acaba, Señor, hasta "el fruto de la festividad" o, como quien dice, la "pobreza honrada." (Galdós, Misericordia, p. 1926)

This follows traditional usage. In his Syntax of Castilian. Prose (16th Century), Keniston says:

After como, quien is far more frequently used [than el que].

Keniston again does not give comparative figures for contemporary usage, but for 16th century usage his frequencies are: quien (13-24); el que (1-1).
F. El que as a substantive relative used non-personally:

1. Refers to things: There were 70 cases found in which el que was used as a substantive relative referring to things.

La propia espontánea inspiración es la que ha de guiarle. (Azorín, Los Clásicos Redivivos, p. 31)

Keniston combines his figures for persons and things, and therefore they cannot be used for comparison.

2. Is equivalent to "the fact that": This type of construction is relatively rare. Only five such cases were found:

..., y Tocles comprendió presto, que en medio de todo, no era poca fortuna el que sus colegas sintiesen con fuerza, al menos, la ambición bruta de riquezas. (Reyles, El Terruño, p. 115)

Pero ¿cómo explicarle el que la antigua criada se sentara a la mesa a comer con los de casa? (Unamuno, La Tía Tula, p. 95)

..., las señoras tomaron a sacrilegio el que la iluminación fuese de velones como sólo se había visto una vez. (D’Halmar, Cristián y Yo, p. 370)

Bello deals with this usage as follows:
El que anunciativo [conjunctive] se junta a veces, según ya hemos notado, con la terminación masculina del artículo, como cuando dice Villanueva "No podía yo mirar con indiferencia el que se infamase mi doctrina." Los dos elementos no forman entonces una palabra indivisible; el artículo adjetivo conserva su naturaleza de tal, como en el infamar o la infamia; y sin embargo ambos pertenecen a una misma proposición, como siempre lo hacen el sustantivo y su artículo.

(Gramática, sect. 326)

G. Lo que as a substantive relative:

1. Lo que as a substantive relative contains its own antecedent. In this present investigation more than 400 cases were observed.

Example:

Es que tenía el instinto y la comprensión de las cosas grandes; oía lo que otros no oyen. (Amadeo, Vidas Argentinas, p. 160)
III. COMPARISON OF THE RELATIVES
ACCORDING TO FUNCTION

Although the findings of this investigation agreed, on the whole, with the statements of the best grammars, there were occasional cases in which there was variance, and in others it was possible to supplement existing grammars. The divisions have been made according to function to bring together the various relatives used in each category.

A. Restrictive and non-restrictive relatives

1. As subject or object of its clause
   a. In restrictive clauses:
      Que is regularly used as subject or object. Practically speaking, it alone is used as subject of a restrictive clause in current Spanish. Frequency: 1337.
      Examples:
      
      Viajé en el expreso que corre de París a Lisboa;... (Rojas, Retablo Español, p. 14)

      Nada me importa ni me aflige el ruin concepto que formes de mi. (Valera, Juanita La Larga, p. 87)

      Kêniston's frequency: subject (60-2820); object (60-1224); Total: 4044.
      According to Bello, el cual, or el que may be used as subject or object of a restrictive clause if some
circumstance such as distance from the antecedent, necessitates it. No such cases of *el cual* and *el que* were found in this investigation and Keniston gives none; although rare examples similar to Bello's might occur today. (See II, C, 3,a).

*Quien* is not used as subject of a restrictive clause. It is used as object only following personal *a*, which cases have been included under prepositions.

b. **In non-restrictive clauses:** Here there is wider latitude for other relatives, although again *que* is by far the most commonly used, for both subject and object. Frequency: 1141. Examples:

> Acabó de vestirse, y al salir al huerto halló a Tasarin que estaba regando los rosales. (León, *El Amor de los Amores*, p. 125)

> ... y poniéndole la mano sobre la cabeza, que ella inclinó con los claros ojos empañados, le dijo:... (Unamuno, *La Tía Tula*, p. 135)

Keniston's frequency: subject and object (60-1354)

In non-restrictive clauses, *el cual*, and to a much lesser extent, *el que*, are used as subject, especially in cases where it is necessary to refer back to a remote antecedent. In the present investigation, *el cual* was found used as subject of a non-restrictive clause in thirty cases, twenty of which referred to persons.
There were only five cases of *el que*.

Examples:

Así existen en el Sudán ciudades de hasta doscientos mil habitantes -- Kano, Bida, por ejemplo -- *las cuales arrastran* ... (Ortega y Gasset, *España Invertebrada*, p. 823)

Hay guías para los viajeros de Cook, *las que*, como el excelente Baedeker, han de usarse en tales andanzas,... (Rojas, *Retablo Español*, p. 11)

*El cual* and *el que* are seldom used as object of a non-restrictive clause. No cases of *el que* were found, and only one case of *el cual*:

Julián se sentía incitado por el rencor de su hija violada, *la cual* el rey Rodrigo le había arrebatado arteramente... (Menéndez Pidal, *Rodrigo, El Último Godo*, p. L)

Keniston's frequency for subject and object combined: *el cual* referring to persons (14-22); to things (10-12); total: 34 cases; *el que* referring to persons and things (21-26).

When the antecedent is a person, *quien* is used somewhat less than *el cual* as subject of a non-restrictive clause. *El cual* was used in twenty such cases, *quien* in eleven cases. Examples:

entre los hortelanos y verduleras, *quienes* solían enviar... (Valera, *Juanita La Larga*, p.9)

Ni una chispa de viento movía la arboleda, *la cual* proyectaba grandes y fijas sombras. (Reyles, *El Terruño*, p.8)
Este Conde de las Escalas se batió muy bien, hasta el punto de merecer elogios especiales de Hernando del Pulgar, quien relata como...
(Madariaga, Cristóbal Colón, p. 29)

Keniston's frequency for **quien**: (15-28)

In circumstances in which the neuter relative is required, **lo cual** is used more often than **lo que** as subject or object of a non-restrictive clause. In the present study, **lo cual** was used as subject or object in sixteen cases; **lo que** in nine cases. Examples:

Rocío no es gentil, pero es sublime, **lo cual** importa más. (Valdés, José, p. 8)

Roca..., instalándose en las tierras conquistadas, **lo que** no había podido hacer el dictador,... (Amadeo, Vidas Argentinas, p. 19)

2. **As object of prepositions.**

a. As object of the prepositions a, de, en, con:
   i. In restrictive clauses: **Que** is used almost exclusively in restrictive clauses when the antecedent is a thing. Of such cases, 188 were found in the present study. Example:

Una y otra evocaron recuerdos de la tierra andaluza en **que** habían nacido, ...
(Galdós, Misericordia, p. 1987)

Keniston's frequency: (60-420)

When **que** is the object of a preposition it rarely
refers to persons. However, contrary to the state-
ments of many grammars, que is used this way
occasionally. Two examples which bear this out
were found. (See II, A, 2, f.)

Quien most frequently replaces que as object of a
preposition when the antecedent is personal. In
this study, quien was found used as object of a,
en, con, de in 17 cases. Example:

La inesperada ocurrencia de aquella mujer,
delante de Litucá en quien tenía yo puestos
los ojos. (Pereda, Peñas Arriba, p. 633)

Keniston: quien (23-37); quienes (15-20) Total:
57 cases.

El cual and el que had relatively little use in
restrictive clauses as object of a, en, con, de.
El cual was used in five cases, one of which re-
ferred to persons.

...buscando vanamente, en su feroz ceguera,
el bulto al que acometía... (Blasco Ibáñez,
Sangre y Arena, p. 280)

¿puedo yo representar intereses en los cuales
no creo? (Reyles, El Terruño, p. 210)

ii. In non-restrictive clauses:

When referring to things: Que was somewhat the
most frequent: 54 cases.
After con, que is used more than el cual or el que in both types of clauses. This again is contrary to traditional statements. (See II, A, 2, b and II, C, 4, d, ii).

El cual and el que were used often also with these propositions. Frequency: el cual, 37; el que, 32.

When referring to persons: Quien is the usual choice, as in restrictive clauses: 68 cases. El cual and el que are also often used: el cual, 10 cases; el que, 9 cases.

When referring to an idea or statement: Lo que was definitely favored over lo cual after a.

b. After sin, por and tras:

When referring to things: El cual and el que are used. No cases of que were found.

When referring to persons: El cual, el que or quien may be used.

When referring to an idea or statement: Lo cual was found much more than lo que after por.

(This cannot be considered conclusive, however, because of the small number of cases.)
c. As object of dissyllabic prepositions:
El cual and el que are used as object of a dissyllabic preposition, referring to either a person, or to a thing. No cases of quien were found in the present study, and only one case of que after sobre. Bello says that que could be used with less difficulty after sobre, para, bajo and desde.

When a neuter relative is used, lo cual is definitely preferred to lo que. No cases of lo que used as object of a dissyllabic preposition were found in the present study.

d. As object of a compound preposition:
El cual is the usual choice referring to both persons and things. In the present study only one case of el que was found, and no cases of quien.

Lo cual is definitely preferred to lo que. No such cases of lo que were found in the present investigation.

B. Substantive relatives

NOTE: This material has already been covered for quien, el que and lo que. (See p. 32-37.)
IV OTHER FACTORS: AMBIGUITY AND POSITION

In the preceding paragraphs, frequency of occurrence in various categories has been stressed. Other factors will now be considered. When there is a possibility of alternatives, why does a writer choose one relative in preference to another? Variety, rhythm and euphony may influence his choice. However, ambiguity and position are the most important factors.

A. Ambiguity

This study has demonstrated that in spite of frequent carelessness on the part of many writers, there is a definite pattern of practice in contemporary Spanish to avoid confusion in the identity of antecedents. *Quien* was used in 31 per cent of the total number of its occurrences to distinguish a person from a thing among possible antecedents. *El cual* and *el que* were often used to refer back to the more remote of two or more possible antecedents. In the study, *el cual* referred to a more remote antecedent in 28 per cent of all cases (30 instances); *el que* in 36 per cent of all cases of *el que* (27 instances). Examples:

...entra en la taberna con violencia
la hermana de nuestro marinero, *la que*
acababa de quedar viuda,... (Valdés, José p. 160)
El centro de propagación de la leyenda local de Viseo fué probablemente el monasterio de Lorván, cerca de Coimbra, gran oficina de falsificaciones legendarias, y en el cual sabemos que se escribió... (Menéndez Pidal, Rodrigo, El Último Godo, p. lxxxv)

B. Position

Position of relative pronouns has been studied systematically in the examples gathered for this thesis. It has been demonstrated that in 85 per cent of the examples, que occurred virtually immediately after its antecedent, which was non-ambiguous. However, in the remaining 15 per cent of the cases, ambiguity was possible, and actually not uncommon. Writers often depend, not too successfully, on the reader being able to identify one of a number of possible antecedents readily.

However, where greater precision is desired, el cual (la cual, los cuales, las cuales) and el que (la que, los que, las que) with their varying forms which indicate gender and number, are often used. This is particularly true where the antecedent is far removed from the relative, and occurs among a number of possible antecedents. Indeed, the examples collected revealed that both el cual and el que are regularly removed from their antecedent by a comma, and/or one or more words. Bello recognized this for el cual.
(Gramática, sect. 1077). The pause which comes logically and in speech in the use of el cual and el que must be considered as a necessary factor in their usage.
A. The following points which have been established in this thesis supplement existing descriptions of the relative pronouns by the authorities in some cases, and in others, are at variance with them.

1. *Que* is not frequently replaced after the preposition *con* by *el cual* (or *el que*) to avoid confusion with *conque*.

2. *Que* does not necessarily follow immediately after its antecedent. In 15 per cent of all cases observed, *que* was removed from its antecedent in such a way as to make determination of its antecedent difficult.

3. *Que* on occasion as object of a preposition refers to a person. Instances are rare.

4. *Quien* is frequently used to distinguish a person from a thing as antecedent (in 31 per cent of all occurrences of *quien*).

5. *Quien* as a substantive relative is used more frequently than *el que* to refer to indefinite persons.

6. *Quien* as a substantive relative is used almost exclusively after *como* (meaning "as one who"). No cases of *el que* with this meaning after *como* were found.

7. *El que*, as well as *el cual*, is regularly removed from its antecedent by a comma (or similar punctuation), and/or one or more words.
B. The practice of modern Spanish in regard to the relative pronouns may be summarized as follows:

1. The subject of a restrictive clause is regularly que for both persons and things.

2. The object of a restrictive clause is usually que for both persons and things. Quien may be used with "personal a" (especially to distinguish a person from a thing).\(^1\) Al cual and al que are rarely so used. The relatives were found used as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{que} & \quad \ldots \quad 100\text{'s of cases} \\
\text{a quien} & \quad \ldots \quad 15 \text{ cases} \\
\text{al cual} & \quad \ldots \quad \text{no cases} \\
\text{al que} & \quad \ldots \quad 2 \text{ cases}
\end{align*}
\]

3. The subject of a non-restrictive clause is usually que, but it may be quien. El cual and, to a much lesser extent, el que (both of which distinguish number and gender) are also used. They were found used as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{que} & \quad \ldots \quad 100\text{'s of cases} \\
\text{quien} & \quad \ldots \quad 11 \text{ cases} \\
\text{el cual} & \quad \ldots \quad 30 \text{ cases} \\
\text{el que} & \quad \ldots \quad 5 \text{ cases}
\end{align*}
\]

4. The object of a non-restrictive clause is usually que referring to both persons and things. Quien is frequently

---

\(^1\) In sections II and III no distinction was made between "personal a" and other prepositional uses of a, but for purposes of describing usage those cases of "personal a" must be treated separately. Relatives used with "personal a" will be classified here as object of the verb, and not as objects of the preposition a.
used with "personal a". Rarely are al cual or al que so used. The frequencies were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100's of cases</th>
<th>46 cases</th>
<th>2 cases</th>
<th>8 cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a quien</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al cual</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al que</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As was noted before the figure for al que is higher than normal because of the particular style of Blasco Ibáñez. See sec. II, 4, a).

5. As object of a, en, de and con

a. Referring to persons

(1) In restrictive clauses. This pattern does not often occur. Quien, el cual, or el que are used. In this study they were found used as follows:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td>(de 2 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el cual</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>(de 1 case)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el que</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>(con 2 cases)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These figures do not include the cases of "personal a" which have been already classified above.)

(2) In non-restrictive clauses, quien is used most frequently. El cual is also used and to a much lesser extent, el que. Following are the statistics as found in the study.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 cases</td>
<td>(en 6 cases, de 7, con 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el cual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 cases</td>
<td>(de 8 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>(de 1 case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These figures do not include the cases of "personal a" which have been already classified above.)
b. Referring to things

(1) In restrictive clauses *que* is normally used; *el cual* and *el que* infrequently. Statistics:

*que*...... 188 cases (a 10 cases, en 120, de 12, con 46)
*el cual*..  4 cases (a 2 cases, en 2)
*el que*... 11 cases (a 4 cases, en 3, de 3, con 1)

(2) In non-restrictive clauses, *que* is used slightly more frequently than *el cual* or *el que*. Statistics:

*que*...... 54 cases (a 4, en 33, de 8, con 9)
*el cual*.. 37 cases (a 9, en 14, de 9, con 5)
*el que*... 32 cases (a 7, en 18, de 4, con 3)

c. Summary

Some generalizations can be made regarding the usage of the relatives with the prepositions, *a, en, de* and *con*:

Referring to persons

*quien, el cual* or *el que* are used, but not *que*
(except as was noted in sect. II, A, 2, f).

Referring to things

*que, el cual* or *el que* are used. *Que* is normally used in non-restrictive clauses; *que, el cual* and *el que*, in restrictive clauses.
6. As object of por, sin, and tras

Referring to persons, quien, el cual or el que are used. Referring to things, el que or el cual. Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quien</td>
<td>no cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el cual</td>
<td>5 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el que</td>
<td>4 cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. As object of dissyllabic prepositions

Normally el cual or el que are used. Que is rarely so used. Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>que</td>
<td>1 case (sobre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el cual</td>
<td>9 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el que</td>
<td>7 cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. As object of compound prepositions

Referring to both persons and things, el cual is normally used. El que is rarely so used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quien</td>
<td>no cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el cual</td>
<td>8 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el que</td>
<td>1 case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Where there are choices in the usage indicated throughout Section B to this point, variety, rhythm and euphony are considerations. However, the choice of quien, el cual and el que to avoid ambiguity must be particularly borne in mind.
9. **Lo cual** and **lo que** [restrictive and non-restrictive] after prepositions

After monosyllabic prepositions either **lo cual** or **lo que** are used. Statistics:

- **lo cual**: 23 cases (a 1 case, en 2 cases, de 3, con 8, por 8, tras 1)
- **lo que**: 17 cases (a 9, en 1, de 2, con 3, por 2)

After dissyllabic and compound prepositions **lo cual** is used. No cases of **lo que** were found so used.

10. **Substantive relatives, quien and el que**

a. As object of a preposition either **quien** or **el que** are used but the latter is more frequent.

- **quien**: 29 cases (a 14 cases, de 10, con 2, dissyllabic 3, compound nil)
- **el que**: 49 cases (a 20 cases, de 22, con 1, dissyllabic 5, compound 1)

b. Referring to indefinite persons, **quien** is used more frequently than **el que**. Statistics:

- **quien**: 53 cases, (54 per cent of cases of **quien**)
- **el que**: 47 cases, (32 per cent of cases of **el que**)

c. After **como** (meaning "as one who") **quien** is used exclusively.

- **quien**: 15 cases
- **el que**: no cases
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