

THE EFFECT OF EMPHASIS
ON THE
POSITION OF THE ATTRIBUTIVE

by

Ada K. Wiley

A.B., University of Kansas, 1930

Submitted to the Department of
Latin and Greek, and the
Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Kansas
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts.

APPROVED BY:

A. T. Walker
Instructor in Charge.

October 8, 1932

Head or Chairman of Dept.

Table of Contents:

Part I	Page 1
Part II	" 19
Unclassified Adjectives	" 20
Numeral	" 24
Possessive	" 27
Proper	" 31
Pronominal	" 33
Demonstrative	" 35
Relative	" 39
Intensive	" 40
Interrogative	" 41
Adjectives of Quantity	" 41
Comparative Adjectives	" 44
Contrasting	" 46
Superlative	" 48
Indefinite	" 38
Part III	" 52

Part I Introduction and General Statistics

The question of the position of the adjective with respect to its noun has been discussed a great deal, and recently has been to some extent scientifically investigated.

Miss Mabel Merryman, in her master's thesis at the University of Kansas (1916), studied the position of attributive adjectives in the seven books of the Gallie War and seven speeches of Cicero, which included the Catilinarian orations, and those for Archias, the Manilian Law, and for Marcellus. She found that 80.67% of all the adjectives and pronouns in the Gallie War precede the nouns. In the orations of Cicero which she studied she found a percentage of 68.52 preceding, taking into account the stereotyped expressions such as res publica. Omitting stereotyped phrases, she found a percentage for Cicero of 74.13 preceding. Miss Merryman did not consider the effect of emphasis on the position of the adjectives.

Professor B. L. Ullman, in the Classical Journal, V. XIV, 7, discusses word order. Several theses were written under his direction concerning the position of the possessive. These investigations showed, in his opinion, that the preceding position was more emphatic than the following, but when the preceding possessive is a separating word, it is unemphatic.

He says the demonstrative is naturally emphatic, and, therefore, regularly precedes the noun. But later he says that constant use of the emphatic position tends to weaken emphasis. The demonstrative is not used as a stop-gap as often as the possessive because it (the demonstrative) is

more emphatic. When the demonstrative is so used, the preceding word may be very emphatic. (As to his statement that the demonstrative precedes the possessive because it is more emphatic, one would say that a more natural explanation is that it precedes through sheer force of habit. His belief that when the demonstrative does follow an adjective, the preceding word is likely to be emphatic bears this out. My own study will tend to show this in the case of idem and omnis, which Professor Ullman suggests as examples.)

He believes that when ille follows the noun, as in Africanus ille, the noun is made more emphatic. Antipater ille Sidonius throws the emphasis on Sidonius, and could be made, in his opinion, more emphatic by reversing the order.

The grammars do not agree on the position of the emphatic adjective. First place, however, is favored.

Hale-Buck:

(1) Adjectives normally follow their nouns. Ullus and nullus normally precede.

(2) Determinatives and intensives, adjectives of quantity and precision normally precede, some forming (as hic) a constituent part of the thought, others being naturally emphatic. Ille, meaning that famous, usually follows.

(3) Possessives and indefinites, and ordinal numerals normally follow.

(4) Modifier is separated from the noun if a phrase depends on one or the other.

Special emphasis may be gained by

(1) Reversing normal order.

(2) Juxtaposing like or contrasting words.

(3) Postponement to produce suspense.

A modifier may be made emphatic by separating it from noun by a governing word. Contrast between pairs of words is shown by parallel or cross order.

Gildersleeve:

When the attribute is emphatic it is commonly put before the substantive; otherwise in classical Latin ordinarily after it.

Superlatives denoting sequence in time and space generally precede the substantive: Summus mons, primo vere, vere primo.

In another section he says, "An adjective usually precedes, but often follows the word to which it belongs;" I cannot reconcile this statement with his first rule.

Demonstratives and cardinals regularly precede.

Possessives and ordinals regularly follow.

A following adjective (as homo bonus) originally (not always, but often in classical period) had restrictive force-- "a man who is good." This adjective seems emphatic to me, and a refutation of Gildersleeve's general statement at first.

General rules for emphasis are similar to Hale's.

(1) Reversing normal position.

(2) Approximation of similars or opposites.

(3) Separation.

Bennett:

"No general rule can be laid down for the position of

the adjective. On the whole, they precede the noun oftener than they follow it."

(1) Quantity (including numerals), demonstratives, relatives, interrogatives regularly precede. Ille, "that well-known" regularly follows.

(2) Possessives and indefinite pronouns usually follow. For contrast, possessives often stand first. (The underscorings are mine.)

(3) Superlative denoting place precedes; pure superlative follows. For sake of emphasis the normal order is often abandoned and emphatic word is put at the beginning, less often at end of the sentence.

Allan and Greenough:

Numeral adjectives, adjectives of quantity, demonstratives, relatives, interrogatives tend to precede; because such words are usually emphatic. Often words connected with them are more so, and, in such cases, the pronouns, etc. yield the emphatic places.

The more important word is never placed last for emphasis.

According to the Allan and Greenough theory a sentence is like a dying echo, the first word or phrase most emphatic, the second next in emphasis, and so on.

Roby:

Adjectives usually follow, but they frequently have the reverse order, which is the rule in the case of

demonstratives and adjectives of number and quantity.

Any word which is to be made emphatic is placed at or near the beginning of the sentence, or sometimes, if not the primary predicate, at the end.

An unemphatic word between a pair of connected words is used to give emphasis to the first.

Chiasmus is used for contrast. Anaphora is used for cumulative effect.

Harkness:

Adjectives may stand either before or after. When emphatic they generally stand before.

Any word except the subject may be made emphatic by being placed at the beginning of the sentence. Any word except the predicate may be made emphatic by being placed at the end of the sentence.

Two words naturally connected, as a noun and its adjective, are sometimes made emphatic by separation.

Anaphora and chiasmus make two groups of words emphatic.

Possessives generally follow. Other pronominals precede. Ille, "that well-known," usually follows if not accompanied by an adjective.

Sloman:

(1) Numerals, Quantity, demonstratives, interrogatives, precede.

(2) Possessives usually follow.

(3) Ordinary adjectives may follow or precede.

(4) A word or phrase qualifying or governing a noun with an attribute usually stands between.

Attributive adjectives or genitives have a tendency to follow.

Emphasis may be given by

(1) Placing a word first when natural position is elsewhere.

(2) Inversion of normal order

(3) Juxtaposition of similar or contrasted words.

(4) Separation of words naturally connected.

(5) Deferring word to be emphasized.

Madvig:

Adjectives usually stand after the substantive, but may stand before it where we wish to give particular prominence to the definition contained in the genitive (for the sake of antithesis or any other reason.)

Demonstrative pronouns stand before the substantive if no particular emphasis is to be laid on the latter.

Definitions belonging to the substantive or to the adjective may stand between.

The adjective may be separated from the substantive and made more emphatic.

Kühner:

Namentlich ist die Nachstellung des Adjektivs häufig, wenn es betont ist. Denn die alter Regel, wonach das betonte Adjektiv voranstehen muss, ist durchaus hinfällig; zur besonderen Hervorhebung eines Wortes

dient die ungewöhnliche Stellung. Daher werden Adjektive, die gewöhnliche voranstehen, wenn sie betont sind, nachgestellt.

Most of the grammars evidently favor the first place as more emphatic. No one of them, however, distinguishes clearly between emphasis by contrast and emphasis without contrast. Bennett indicates that there may be a difference when he says, "For contrast, the possessive often stands first." But he does not make a clear distinction in so many words. If the adjective stands first when it is contrasting, as one would naturally expect it to do, we still have no proof that other kinds of emphasis have the same effect. No work which can be considered statistically thorough has been done on adjectives as a whole, and one cannot draw conclusions from what has been done on the possessive, because the emphasis of this type of modifier is so obviously contrasting. It is plain that not all emphasis is contrasting. For instance, one may take two sentences containing exactly the same words, both showing considerable emphasis, but meaning not at all the same thing. I have used underscorings to show where the stress would be placed:

"This is a beautiful country." (Implying that some

1. The contrasted word comes first to the speaker's mind. We find a similar phenomenon in the fact that the first word in a sentence frequently indicates a break in the continuity of thought and the introduction of a new topic.

other country is not beautiful.)

"This is a beautiful country." "There is no contrast here in the speaker's mind, but his voice might show strong feeling in pronouncing the word "beautiful.") (1)

Several of the grammars suggest that the separated position is emphatic. None, of course, gives statistical evidence. This theory will be considered in the following figures.

It has been consistently overlooked that a word may be emphatic in one position or another, but that this does not prove the particular position to be emphatic. Comparative percentages must be worked out in order to make a definite statement as to the emphatic position.

These are some of the questions to be considered if any clear idea about emphasis is to be gained.

In this study I have examined all the attributive adjectives in Books I and II of Caesar's Civil War, keeping in mind the question of emphasis and its influence on the position of the modifier.

1. I have frequently called non-contrasting emphasis "sonorous." This term is not insisted upon as an infallible one, because, conceivably, it may designate only one kind of non-contrasting emphasis. The word as used in this study may be considered merely as a convenient handle. I also have often used "not contrasting" and "non-contrasting" when "emphatic, but not contrasting" was to be understood.

General Table of Adjectives

<u>Type</u>	Preceding		Unemphatic
	Emphatic Contr.	Not Centr.	
Unclassified	63	9	141
	8	14	34
Numeral	36	8	92
	8	5	12
Possessive	40		31
	5		9
Proper	7		9
	2		
Pronominal	3	3	32
	2	5	12
Demonstrative	11		158
	14		33
Indefinite			8
	1		11
Relative			68
			21
Intensive			15
			5
Interrogative			2
			3
Quantity	13	9	169
	6	13	46
Comparative	42		21
	8	2	2

Contrasting	33		22
	6		4
Superlative	2	10	52
	1	2	10

Following

	Emphatic Contr.	Not. Contr.	Unemphatic
Unclassified	15	14	38
	2	6	8
Numeral	11	9	51
	5	8	19
Possessive	5		31
	2		4
Proper	1		19
	2		
Pronominal		1	1
	1		
Demonstrative			4
Indefinite			5
Relative			
Intensive	1		
Quantity	5	5	14
	1	5	5
Comparative	3		7
	3	1	1

Interrogative			
Contrasting	1		
Superlative	2	3	3
		1	1

Figures in upper left-hand corner of squares are for adjectives immediately juxtaposed; in lower right-hand, for separated adjectives.

Table I. Totals

	Preced.	% across	% down	Follows	% across	% down
Emph.	391	77.58	27.67	113	22.42	54.88
Unemph.	1022	82.89	72.33	211	17.11	65.12
	1413	81.35		324	18.65	

Table II. Interrogatives, Demonstratives and Relatives Omitted.

Emph.	366	76.41	33.18	113	23.59	35.51
Unemph.	737	78.07	66.82	207	21.92	64.69
	1103	77.51		320	22.49	

Table III. Adjectives Separated from Noun.

Contr.	61	79.22	20.07	16	20.78	21.33
Not Contr	41	66.13	13.49	21	33.87	28.0
Unemph.	202	84.17	66.44	38	15.83	50.67
	304	80.21		75	19.79	

Table IV. Adjectives Immediate to Noun

Contr.	250	85.04	22.54	44	14.96	17.67
Not Contr	39	54.93	3.52	32	45.07	12.85
Unemph.	820	82.68	73.94	173	17.42	69.48
	1109	81.66		249	18.34	

Table V. Comparison of Contrasting and Non-Contrasting Emphasis.

Contr.	311	83.83	79.54	60	16.17	53.1
Not Contr	80	60.15	20.46	53	39.85	46.9
	391	77.58		113	22.42	

Table VI. Same as Table I with emphasis differentiated. Percentages are of total preceding or total following.

	Preceding	% down	Following	% down
Contr.	311	22.01	60	18.52
Not Contr	80	5.66	53	16.36
Unemph.	1022	72.33	211	65.12
	1413		324	

Table VII. Same as VI, with demonstratives relatives, interrogatives omitted.

Contr.	286	25.93	60	18.75
Not Contr	80	7.25	53	16.56
Unemph	737	66.82	207	64.69
	1103		320	

Table VIII. Same as Table VI. Percentages are of total contrasting, total not contrasting, and total unemphatic.

	Preceding	% across	Following	% across
Contr.	311	83.82	60	16.18
Not Contr	80	60.15	53	35.85
Unemph	1022	82.89	211	17.11
	1413	81.35	324	18.65

Table IX. Same as VIII, with demonstratives, relatives, and interrogatives omitted.

Contr.	286	82.66	69	17.54
Not Contr	80	60.15	53	39.85
Unemph.	737	78.07	207	21.93
	1103	77.51	320	22.49

Analysis of Tables I to IX.

In Table I we find that 81.35% of all the adjectives precede and 18.65% follow. If emphasis made no difference at all in position, it would be expected that the same proportion--81.35%--of all the emphatic adjectives would precede. If placing an adjective before its noun tended to make it emphatic we should expect a percentage greater than 81.35% to precede. What we actually find is that 77.58% of all the emphatic adjectives precede and 22.42% follow. This fact obviously indicates that it is the following position which tends to be emphatic. Another way of looking at the same fact is to examine the proportions of the total preceding and total following divisions. In this case we find that a higher percentage (34.88) of the following adjectives is emphatic than of the preceding (27.67%). In addition, it must be remembered that these figures make no distinction as to kinds of emphasis.

In Table II the interrogative, demonstrative, and relative adjectives have been omitted. This was done in order to prevent a possible unfairness in counting adjectives which are placed first almost mechanically. Nevertheless, although 77.51% of all the adjectives precede, 76.41% of the emphatic adjectives precede, and about 2% more of the following modifiers are emphatic than of those which precede.

In Table III adjectives separated from the noun are treated. 80.21% of all separated adjectives precede, (1) but 79.22% of the contrasting and 66.13% of the "sonorous" separated modifiers are preceding. Thus a slight advantage for contrasting and a decided one for sonorous emphasis is shown for following separated adjectives. Looking, however, at the third and sixth columns of this table, we find that both preceding and following separated modifiers are more emphatic than adjectives immediately juxtaposed to their nouns: 33.56% and 49.33% (combining contrasting and non-contrasting emphasis), against 26.06% and 30.52% . (Table IV.)

Table IV tabulates exclusively the adjectives which are immediate to their nouns. In this table some advantage is apparent for immediately preceding adjectives so far as contrast goes--the reverse being true for adjectives which are emphatic, but not contrasting--; i.e., 81.66% of all immediate adjectives precede, 85.04% of contrasting adjectives precede, and 22.54% of all preceding, as against 17.67% of all following adjectives, are contrasting. There is however, a decidedly stronger advantage for the immediately following adjectives with respect to sonorous words: 18.34% of all immediate adjectives follow, but 45.07% of the sonorous, immediate adjectives follow.

1. Adjectives have been considered separated if any word except another adjective stood between them and the nouns they modified, and except et when there were two adjectives.

Table V compares contrasting and non-contrasting emphasis. The percentage of 83.83% (when the preceding proportion of all emphatic adjectives equals 77.58%) for contrasting emphasis accounts for the common belief that the preceding position is emphatic. But one cannot defend that statement because the word "emphatic" is too general. What one can say is that the preceding place is often used when the element of contrast enters in. When the emphasis is not contrasting the following position is even more frequently used for sonorous emphasis than the preceding place is used for contrast: 22.42% of all emphatic adjectives follow, but 39.85% of all sonorous adjectives follow. Turning the figures around, we find that, while the majority of the emphatic adjectives are contrasting in the case of both preceding and following modifiers, the majority for the preceding words is much greater (79.54% preceding; 53.1% following). Most emphasis is seen to be contrasting, and this, probably, is especially true of the kind of literature on which this study is based.

Tables VI to IX are elaborations of Tables I and II, differentiating between the kinds of emphasis. They are useful in accounting for the fact that the following adjectives, when no distinction concerning emphasis is made, have an emphasis percentage which is greater than that percentage would be if emphasis made no difference

in word order. In Table VIII, for instance, it is seen that 83.82% of contrasting modifiers precede, while 81.35% of all modifiers precede. It is the abnormally large proportion of following sonorous adjectives which brings down the total emphasis percentage of preceding adjectives. It is not surprising, in view of the type of adjectives he discusses, that Prof. Ullman decided that "emphatic" adjectives tend to precede. In Table VI we see that 22.01% of the preceding, 18.52% of the following modifiers are contrasting; that 5.66% of the preceding, 16.36% of the following adjectives are sonorous. It is to be observed that the contrasting percentages in this table are closer together than the non-contrasting percentages; that is, one is more likely to find a contrasting word following than a sonorous word preceding.

The following general statements may be made, based on the foregoing statistics.

1. In general, the most emphatic position is the separated, or most unusual (most unusual in the sense that there are fewer separated adjectives in the preceding and following groups, respectively, than there are immediate adjectives) position.

2. Adjectives which follow the noun, being the second "most unusual", are more often, proportionately, emphatic than are preceding adjectives.

3. More than three-fourths of preceding emphasis is due to contrast. The preceding position is slightly more often used than the following for contrast.

4. For emphasis which is not contrasting, the following position is more frequent. (And the following position is more likely to be used for contrast than the preceding position for sonorous emphasis.)

Part II. Classification of Adjectives

Certain categories have been made, because of the nature of this study, which are not usual in classifying adjectives; some of them would be, indeed, worthless for any other purpose. At the risk of causing confusion, I have called one group "contrasting." It includes adjectives of a kind of "dual" nature, such as Alter. The comparatives and superlatives also have been treated separately. The proper adjectives, too, were separated because they, like the possessives, are so often contrasting. These unusual groups were made in order to clarify the work done, and to decrease to some extent the element of subjectivity, which, in a study of this kind, must necessarily be great. There is also a group of "unclassified" adjectives which I saw no point in dividing further.

Unclassified Adjectives

These include all the adjectives which did not fit easily into any other group.

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Non-Contr	Unemph	Contr	Non-Contr	Unemph
Immed.	63 29.58%	9 4.23%	141 66.19%	15 22.39%	14 20.9%	35 56.71%
Separ	8 14.29	14 25.0	34 60.71	2 12.5	6 37.5	8 50.0
	71 26.39	23 8.55	175 65.06	17 20.48	20 24.1	46 55.42

Total, 352

Total preceding, 269 = 76.42%

Total following, 83

Total emphatic = 131

Preceding emphatic = 94 = 71.76%

Total Contrasting = 88

Preceding contrasting = 71 = 80.68%

Total emphatic, not contrasting = 43

Total preceding emphatic, not contrasting = 23 = 53.49%

The proportions for this type of adjective are similar to those of the tables in which the totals have been shown. 20.9% of immediately following adjectives are emphatic, but not contrasting, as against 4.23% of the preceding. Contrasting adjectives tend to precede.

Adjectives in this group are:

Tribunicus, perniciosus, semenster, aequus, finitimus, falsus, nocturnus, certus, remissus, languidus, vetus, novus, communis, levis, expeditus, nobilis, barbarus,

mutuus, cotidianus, subitus, posterus, medius, apertus, instructus, declivis, eximius, repentinus, honestus, exercitatus, peritus, humidus, celer, idoneus, absens, auxiliaris, triplex, militaris, contumeliosus, necessarius, creber, pristinus, praetorius, novus, iniquus, sarcinarius, nimius, pedalis, publicus, ferreus, dexter, eminens, mollis, quadratus, supplex, diutinus, meridianus, traversarius, diuturnus, par, bonus, turbidus, eminens, longus, relictus, paternus, turpis, nefarius, perterritus, captus, nocturnus, iustus, pristinus, propositus, transversus, praesens, liber, equester, onerarius, varius, obliquus, miser, sinister, difficilis, arduus, civilis, occultus, divinus, humanus, privatus, perpetuus, actuarius, transmarinus, extraordinarius, legitimus, impar, gravis, tenuis, angustus, futurus, onerarius, secundus, alarius, inusitatus, incognitus, domesticus, externus, longinquus, publicus, directus, pedester, mediocris, exiguus, notus, longus, similis, delectus, navalis, latericius, fiduciarius, quietus, facilis, peritus, recens, congesticius, gravis, adversus, alienus, incommodus, tenuis, infirmus, scutatus, cetratus, impar, legionarius, urbanus, caccus, duplex, praeacutus, adolescens, excelsus, ancorarius, bipedalis, constrata, oneratus, oppidanus, triremis, campestris, senatorius, pontificus, asper, montanus, angustus, montuosus, consanguineus, imperitus, doctus, corruptus, adversus, insolens, tutus, deceptus, distans, patens, comitialis, praeruptus, inauditus, integer.

Examples will illuminate the use of this kind of adjective.

1.8 "Semper se rei publicae commoda privatis necessitudinibus habuisse potiora." Privatus is contrasted, with anaphora, with rei publicae.

1.40 "Ita congressus impari numero magnos impetus legionum equitatusque sustinet." Impari and magnos are contrasted. Anaphora is again the arrangement used.

1.75 "Quicumque accidisset casus hunc quieto et aequo animo ferret." Sonorous emphasis in immediately preceding adjectives.

1.41 Possibly the desire for euphony is seen in the following "triplici instructa acie ad Ilerdam proficiscitur." Triplici acie would have been rather unpleasant.

1.32 "Tenuis atque infirmi haec animi videri." Sonorous emphasis.

1.34 "Pompeius erat adhortatus ne nova Caesaris beneficia veterum suorum beneficiorum in eos memoriam expellerent." Anaphora. Both qualifying words of beneficia are contrasted with those of beneficiorum.

1.83 "Sagittarii funditoresque media continebantur acie equitatus latera cingebant." Contrast with latera.

2.1 "longam et difficilem habet oppugnationem." Sonorous emphasis.

2.20 "Tanta ac tam secunda in Caesarem voluntas provinciae reperiebantur." Sonorous emphasis.

1.2 "Dicuntur sententiae graves;" Decidedly
sonorous.

1.20 "Cato in Sicilia naves longas veteres reficie-
bat, novas civitatibus imperabat." Contrast.

2.24 "Id autem est iugum directum eminens in mare,
utraque ex parte praeruptum atque asperum." Sonorous.

Numeral Adjectives

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph
Immed	36 26.47%	8 5.88%	92 67.65%	11 15.49%	9 12.68%	51 71.83%
Separ	8 32.0%	5 20.0%	12 48.0%	5 15.62%	8 25.0%	19 59.38%
	44 27.33%	13 8.07%	104 64.6%	16 15.53%	17 16.51%	70 67.96%

Total preceding, 161 = 60.98%

Total following, 103 = 39.02%

Total emphatic, 90

Preceding emphatic 57 = 63.33%

Following emphatic 33 = 36.67%

Total contrasting, 60

Preceding contrasting, 44 = 73.33%

Following contrasting 16 = 26.67%

Total sonorous, 30

Preceding sonorous 13 = 43.33%

Following sonorous 17 = 56.67%

It is interesting to see that when the percentage of adjectives preceding (60.98%) decreases, the number emphatic is larger (63.33%). It may be said that there is a definite tendency for the emphatic adjective to be placed first when contrasting. The 60.98% of the total and the 73.33% of contrasting modifiers show this.

Separated preceding adjectives have the highest percentage for contrast, separated following for non-contrasting emphasis. The preceding adjectives have

slightly higher percentage of emphasis than the following adjectives (35.4 to 32.04).

Cardinals and ordinals are compared in the following tables.

Cardinals.

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph
Immed	22	8	61	10	9	42
Separ	5	3	10	3	8	17
	27	11	71	13	17	59

Ordinals.

Immed.	11	0	24	1	0	9
Separ.	3	1	1	2	0	2
	14	1	25	3	0	11

Too few distributives were found for conclusive computation. They all preceded their nouns.

Cardinals

Total preceding 109 = 55.05%

Total following 89 = 44.95%

Ordinals

Total preceding 40 = 74.07%

Total following 14 = 25.93%

Cardinals

Total emphatic, 68

Preceding emphatic, 35 = 55.88%

Following emphatic, 30 = 44.12%

Ordinals

Total emphatic 18

Preceding emphatic, 15 = 83.33%

Following emphatic, 3 = 16.67%

A much greater percentage of ordinals precedes their nouns than of ordinals. A better way of putting it would be that the ordinals precede in about the normal number of cases while the percentage for cardinals is much below normal, the proportion being nearly half-and-half. The preceding ordinals are more likely to be emphatic than the following, but it should be noted that seventeen out of eighteen emphatic ordinals are contrasting.

The following position remains important with the cardinals for expressing emphasis which is not contrasting.

Possessive Adjectives

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Contr	Unemph
Immed	40	--	31	5	--	31	
Separ	5	--	9	2	--	4	
	45		40	7		35	
	52.94%		47.06%	16.67%		83.33%	

Total number, 127

Number preceding, 85 = 66.92%

Number following, 42 = 33.08%

Total emphatic, 52

Emphatic preceding, 45 = 86.54%

Emphatic following, 7 = 13.45%

Possessive adjectives are contrasting when they are emphatic. "My" is, for instance, set off against "your," or "his" against "your." The percentages given indicate rather definitely that contrasting possessives tend to precede.

The immediately following possessives were examined particularly to discover whether their nouns were not frequently contrasted with other words.

1.7 "Conclamant. . .sese paratos esse imperatoris sui tribunorumque plebis iniurias defendere." This forms a kind of anaphora in meaning, but there is no sharp contrast.

1.8 "Caesarem quoque pro sua dignitate debere et studium et iracundiam suam rei publicae dimittere." Both anaphora and contrast.

1.20 "obsideri se a Caesare, opera munitionesque prope esse perfectas; ducem suum Domitium, cuius spe atque fiducia permanserint proiectis omnibus fugae consilium capere." The soldiers describe their trouble, and then say, in effect, "But our leader, the man we have trusted--how different his actions are from what they ought to be!"

1.44 "Genus erat pugnae militum illorum ut magno impetu primo procurrerent, audacter locum caperent, ordines suos non magnopere servarent, rari dispersique pugnarent." Anaphora and contrast.

1.64 "centuriones tribunosque militum adire atque obsecrare ut per eos Caesar certior fieret ne labori suo neu periculo parceret." Contrast.

1.74 "Afranii etiam filius adulescens de sua ac parentis sui salute. . . agebat." Contrast between sua and parentis.

1.76 "neu se neu Pompeium imperatorem suum. . . tradant, obsecrat." Contrast between se and Pompeium imperatorem.

1.79 "Nam tantum ab equitum suorum auxiliis aberant quorum numerum habebant magnum ut eos superioribus perterritos proeliis in medium reciperent agmen utroque eos tuerentur;" This follows a description of the method the Afranians used to fight off Caesar's horsemen. The emphasis of the first clause can be interpreted in more than one way when read aloud. I have interpreted the equitum as being contrasted with the idea of the bravery of the foot soldiers in spite of their own "numerum

magnum."

1.85 "Reliquos enim omnes officium suum praestitisse: se, . . .; exercitum suum, . . .; illius denique exercitus milites qui per se de concilianda pace egerint;" The word order of the first three clauses of this sentence is obvious. The action of Afranius is contrasted with that of everyone else concerned.

2.41 "aut suam mortem miserabantur aut parentes suos commendabant." Probably contrast of suam and parentes. Chiasmus is used.

2.42 "Curio ubi perterritis neque cohortationes suas neque preces audiri intellegit. . ." Contrast of cohortationes and preces.

1.64 ". . .cernebatur equitatus nostri proelio novissimos illorum premi vehementer. . ." Anaphora and slight contrast which stresses the nouns somewhat more than the possessives.

About a third, as may be seen from the above quotations, of the unemphatic following possessives are with nouns that tend to be contrasting. The use of anaphora when there is contrast is interesting. In fact it is hard to separate in one's mind the inner force of contrast and the balanced appearance of anaphora. In reading balanced phrases one feels there must be a sort of contrast, often, in the words. One might argue that, if a . . .b is contrasted with c . . .d, b is contrasted with d as much as a

with b. However, in l.64 (second example above) the nouns are probably more important than nostri and illorum. This is the only example of exactly the "a. . .b, c. . .d" type which I have to quote in this group of adjectives.

The examples here quoted, which show how nouns frequently are placed when they are in contrast with other words, strengthens the figures already given, which indicate that contrasting adjectives are placed first.

Proper Adjectives

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Contr	Unemph
Immed	7		9	1			19
Separ	2			2			
	9		9	3			19

Total 40

Total preceding, 18 = 45%

Total following, 22 = 55%

Total emphatic, 12

Preceding emphatic, 9 = 75% (all contrasting.)

Following emphatic, 3 = 25%

Proper adjectives are similar, often, to possessives, especially when referring to persons. The preceding proper adjectives which were considered contrasting are quoted.

1.9 "Tota Italia delectus haberi, retineri legiones II, quae ab se simulatione Parthici belli sint abductae, civitatem esse in armis." Contrast implying the legions were taken not for a Parthian war but for a civil war.

2.17 "M. Varro. . . diffidens Pompeianis rebus antioissime de Caesare loquebatur.

2.32 "Hae vox fortuna atque his ducibus repudiatis Corfiniensem ignominiam, Italiae fugam Hispaniarum diditionem, Africi belli praeiudicia, sequimini"! The anaphora is interesting.

2.34 "Sed praeoccupatus animus Attianorum militum timore et fuga et caede suorum nihil de resistendo cogitabat. . . ." This follows a description of what Curio's soldiers were doing.

2.7 "Sed Nasidianae naves nullo usui fuerunt celeriterque pugna excesserunt. . . ." Contrasted with "Bruti classe" in preceding sentence.

1.40 "Hoc idem fere atque eadem de causa Pompeiani exercitus duces faciebant." The first part of the paragraph describes measures taken by the Fabian army.

1.40 "Quo cognito a Petreio et Afranio ex aggere atque oratibus, quae flumine ferebantur, celeriter suo ponte Afranius quem oppido castrisque coniunctum habebat legiones IIII equitatumque omnem traiecit, duabusque Fabianis occurrit legionibus." This is not, of course, a very sharp contrast, but some contrast is present, nevertheless.

1.25 "His datis mandatis Brundisium cum legionibus VI ((Caesar)) pervenit, veteranis III et reliquis, quas ex novo delectu confecerat atque in itinere compleverat; Domitianas enim cohortes protinus a Corfinio in Siciliam miserat."

In this group it is fairly clear again that contrasting adjectives tend to be placed first.

Pronominal Adjectives

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Unemph
Immed.	3	3	32		1	1
Separ.	2	5	12	1		
	5	8	44	1	1	1

Total number, 60

Preceding, 57 = 95%

Following, 3 = 5%

Emphatic preceding = 13 = 86.67%

Emphatic following = 2 = 13.33%

Alter and alius were not included in this group, though they are pronominal, but were placed purposely in the "contrasting" group, along with uterque, also.

A much greater percentage than usual of the pronominals precedes the noun modified. The percentage of emphasis in the preceding position is smaller even than it would be if position had no effect on emphasis. And, while the number of cases is small for reliability, the immediately preceding position does not seem to be a favorite one for "sonorous" emphasis. Only three pronominals were found to follow their nouns. Care must be taken not to draw conclusions quickly from a very small number of cases, in which the probably error would be correspondingly large. However, the fact that two out of these three seem to be undoubtedly emphatic is suggestive. It is not claimed that this ratio would

invariably hold with a large number of cases, of course.

1.78 "Premebantur Afraniani pabulatione, aquabantur aegre. Frumenti copiam legionarii nonnullam habebant. . ." Nonnullam was considered contrasting. This was the only pronominal both separated and following--and it is emphatic.

2.6 "Commisso proelio, Massiliensibus res nulla ad virtutem deficit. . . ." This was listed as emphatic but not contrasting.

The unemphatic example follows:

1.33 "Cuius cognito consilio Caesar frustra diebus aliquot consumptis. . . ab urbe proficiscitur."

Demonstrative Adjectives

	Preceding		Following	
	Contr	Not Contr	Contr	Unemph
Immed	11		158	4
Separ	14		33	
	25		191	4

Total number 220

Number preceding, 216 = 98.18%

Number following, 4 = 1.82%

Number emphatic, 25 (all contrasting).

Number preceding emphatic = 100%

Number immediately preceding = 169 = 78.24%

Number separated preceding = 47 = 21.76%

Immediately preceding contrasting = 11 = 44%

Separated preceding contrasting = 14 = 56%

It is significant how the proportions in the last two calculations made above reverse themselves. One may reason that the contrasting significance of the immediately preceding position probably was dulled by frequent use in the case of the demonstrative, so that the attention-calling device of separating the adjective was resorted to.

These are the four demonstratives found which followed. Their very small number is noteworthy.

2.28 "Erat in exercitu Vari Sextus Quintilius Varus, quem fuisse Corfinii supra demonstratum est. Hic dimissus a Caesare in Africam venerat, legionesque eas traduxerat Curio, quas superioribus temporibus Corfinio receperat

Caesar. . . ." Legiones was perhaps put first to show change of subject.

2.1 "Massilia enim fere tribus ex oppidi partibus mari alluitur; reliqua quarta est, quae aditum habeat ab terra. Huius quoque spatii pars ea, quae ad arcem pertinet loci natura et valle altissima munita longam et difficilem habet oppugnationem." I cannot feel that there is any reason pertaining to emphasis for the word order here. The order is chiasmic, of course.

1.44 "Genus erat pugnae militum illorum ut magno impetu primo procurrent. . . ." There may be a rhythmic reason for this order.

2.36 "Erat in oppido multitudo insolens belli diurnitate otii, Uticenses pro quibusdam Caesaris in se beneficiis illi amicissimi, conventus is qui ex variis generibus constaret, terror ex superioribus proeliis magnus." ((Illi amicissimi--"who were most friendly to him"--was considered to be in apposition rather than attributive.)) I believe the anaphora of the nouns in this sentence explains the position of is.

In two cases out of four, then, the position of the adjectives is explained by the contrast of their nouns.

Individual Demonstratives

	Preceding		<u>is</u>	Following	
	Contr	Unemph		Contr	Unemph
Immed.		95			3
Separ.		5			
<u>hic</u>					
Immed.	3	41			
Separ.	8	21			
<u>ille</u>					
Immed.	1	4			1
Separ.		2			
<u>idem</u>					
Immed.	7	18			
Separ.	6	5			

Idem is the most emphatic demonstrative, then hic. It is probable that hic never follows its noun because it is so frequently used like the relative--to refer back to something that has gone before. It has, of course, a more distinct and emphatic character than the relative adjective. It can bridge a wider gap than can qui. The following is an example of this:

1.50 "Hae permanserunt aquae dies complures." Hae goes back to the beginning of chapter 48.

It is true with both of these adjectives as with the whole, that the preceding separated position is more emphatic than the immediately preceding.

Indefinite Adjectives

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Contr	Unemph
Immed			8				5
Separ	1		11				
	1		19				5

Total number = 25

Number preceding = 20 = 80%

Number following = 5 = 20%

The proportion preceding is about average. It is interesting that 48% of the total are separated from the noun. Only one indefinite was considered emphatic (also contrasting).

1.67 ". . .etsi aliquo accepto detrimento tamen summa exercitus salva locum quem petant capi posse." Aliquo is, in my opinion, contrasted with summa.

Relative Adjectives

	Preceding		Following			
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph
Immed.			68			
Separ.			21			
			<hr/>			
			89			

Total, 89 = all preceding

Immediate = 76.41%

Separated = 23.59%

Ten of the 21 separated adjectives are separated only by prepositions. Two are separated by participles in the ablative absolute. The relative must precede, naturally, because it has the function of any other connective.

Intensive Adjectives

	Preceding		Following	
	Contr	Not	Contr	Unemph
Immed.			15	1
Separ.			5	

Preceding = 95.24%

Following = 4.76%

The fact that ipse is translated "himself" in English makes one think at first that it should usually be emphatic. Considering it more carefully, one finds that it really intensifies its noun. For instance, in reading the following sentence aloud one's voice almost involuntarily emphasizes the noun Pompeius.

1.4 "Ipse Pompeius totum se ab eius amicitia averterat." This fact is interesting because the intensive precedes in all cases but one. In this instance, at least, the preceding position is not therefore, the emphatic one.

The only following intensive I have counted as emphatic and contrasting.

2.9 ". . . turrem tutum per se ipsum pressionebus ex contignatione prima suspendere ac tollere coeperunt." Se is more colorless than a common, or especially a proper, noun. would be.

Interrogative Adjectives

Five were found, two immediately preceding and three separated and preceding. They were considered unemphatic.

Adjectives of Quantity

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Unemph
Immed.	13	9	169	5	5	14
Separ.	6	13	46	1	5	5
	19	22	215	6	10	19

Total, 291

Preceding, 256 = 87.97%

Following, 35 = 12.03%

Total Emphatic, 57

Preceding emphatic, 41 = 71.93%

Following emphatic, 16 = 28.07%

Total Contrasting, 25

Preceding, 19 = 75 %

Following, 6 = 24%

Total Sonorous, 32

Preceding, 22 = 68.75%

Following, 10 = 31.25%

The percentages for this specific type of adjective agree with the general statements which have been made. Emphasis of any kind, the figures, show, tends to fall on the following modifier. A contrasted adjective is,

however, a little more likely to precede than an adjective which is sonorous. Here again, perhaps, we see the dulling effect of frequent use of one device. It may be that the original tendency was always to balance contrasted adjectives by placing them before their nouns--perhaps even to make all emphatic adjectives precede. But as time went on this tendency--if there was such--evidently weakened, though less so for contrast. However, if it were possible to judge degrees of contrast with any hope of objective accuracy it seems reasonable that the strongest contrast would be found in adjectives which follow their nouns.

The following figures are for the single adjective omnis.

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Contr	Unemph
Immed.	6	0	74	3	4		9
Separ.	2	6	9	0	2		3
	8	6	83	3	6		12

Total = 118

Preceding, 97 = 82.2%

Following 21 = 17.8%

Emphatic = 23

Preceding, 14 = 60.87%

Following, 9 = 39.13%

It can be seen that omnis is less likely, even, than the other adjectives of quantity to precede when emphatic.

The percentage of preceding contrasted adjectives, also, is smaller than would be expected if position made no difference in emphasis, being about 72%, whereas more than 82% of all the adjectives precede.

Comparative Adjectives

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Contr	Unemph
Immed.	42		21	3			7
Separ.	8	2	2	3	1		1
	50	2	23	6	1		8

Total, 90

Preceding 75 = 83.37%

Following 15 = 16.67%

Emphatic 59

Preceding 52 = 88.14

Following 7 = 11.86

These figures are similar to those for possessive adjectives except that there is a smaller discrepancy between total percentages and emphasis percentages.

The following were considered sonorous rather than contrasting. They are all separated from their nouns.

1.46 ". . .atque inter duas acies perequitans commodiorem ac tutiorem nostris receptum dat."

2.19 ". . .non civis Romanus paulo notior quin ad diem conveniret."

Comparatives are, of course, of course, ordinarily contrasting. Again we find as was true with possessives, that contrast, coming first to the mind, consequently has first place. We found that the immediately preceding position was somewhat "worn out" in the case of the demonstrative and the separated preceding place was more

often used for contrast.

Comparing similar figures, we do not find so great a discrepancy, though there is a small one.

Total immediately preceding, 63 = 84%

Total separated preceding, 12 = 16%

Immediately preceding emphatic = 80.77%

Separated preceding emphatic = 19.23%

This difference may be reasonably supposed to be due to the fact that the demonstrative is much more frequently used.

Contrasting Adjectives

	Preceding		Unemph	Following		Unemph
	Contr	Not Contr		Contr	Not Contr	
Immed.	33		22	1		
Separ.	6		4			
	39		26	1		

Total 66

Preceding 65 = 98.48%

Following 1 = 1.52%

Emphatic = 40

Preceding emphatic, 39 = 97.5%

Following emphatic, 1 = 2.5%

Separated preceding, 10; 60% are emphatic.

Immediately preceding, 55; 60% are emphatic.

This division is not a grammatical one. It relates only to the meaning of these adjectives and was made on this basis because of the individual character of this study. It includes the following adjectives: reliquus, alius, uterque, contrarius, alter.

The vast majority of preceding adjectives in this group is interesting and significant, when their nature is considered. It is another bit of evidence that it is, in general, contrast which gives a stressed adjective first place.

The very unusual position in the following example was, however, considered emphatic. Here again the difficult question of the degree of contrast enters in. It is to be noticed that when the sentence under consideration is read

aloud one's voice naturally stresses the "reliqua" quite strongly:

2.11 "Compluribus eam lapidibus ex ea quae suberat turri subductis, repentina ruina pars eius turris concidit, pars reliqua consequens procumbebat. . . ."

Superlative Adjectives

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph
Immed.	2	10	52	2	3	3
Separ.	1	2	10	1	1	1
	3	12	62	2	4	4

Total 87

Preceding 77 = 88.51%

Following 10 = 11.49%

Number emphatic 21; 71.43% preceding; 28.57% following.

Number contrasting, 5; 60% preceding; 40% following.

Number sonorous 16; 75% preceding; 25% following.

The number of emphatic superlatives is rather small for statistical reliability, especially in the case of the contrasting superlative. The number of sonorous superlatives is somewhat larger, however, and show the tendency of sonorous adjectives to follow their nouns.

Absolute Superlatives

	Preceding			Following		
	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph	Contr	Not Contr	Unemph
Immed.		6	16	3		2
Separ.	1		3	1		
	1	6	19	4		2

Total 32

Preceding, 26 = 81.25%

Following, 6 = 18.75%

Abolsute superlatives are obviously not usually contrasting--they are equivalent to our absolute superlatives in English or to an italicized word. A larger percentage of these adjectives follows than is true of the pure superlatives.

Pure Superlatives (including superlatives denoting place and time.)

	Preceding			Following			
	Contr	Not	Unemph	Contr	Not	Contr	Unemph
Immed.	2	4	36	2	0	1	
Separ.	0	2	7	0	0	1	
	2	6	43	2	0	2	

Total 55

Preceding 51 = 92.75%

Following 4 = 7.27%

These figures, when compared with the preceding table are particularly significant because practically no subjectivity enters into them. It is obvious that absolute superlatives would not in general contrast with any other words, and this type of superlative is easy to distinguish. It is rather frequently emphatic, moreover. Therefore, if a larger percentage of this type follows than of the remaining superlatives it would seem to be evident that a word which is emphatic but not contrasting has a tendency to follow its noun.

Adjective Pairs

Often two adjectives are used together in expressions such as "hi omnes" or "hoc idem". These have been considered separately. Twenty-four were found, of which nine seemed to have some degree of emphasis. Eight were combinations with an emphatic omnis, and in all but two omnis followed. It should be noted that in combination with hic the omnis seemed normally to follow, so that the two exceptions are examples of abnormal order. They do not prove, however, that the first place is emphatic, but that the unusual place is emphatic, because, if the former were true, one would find that hic in the many uses of hi omnes, etc. would be often emphatic.

Following are the two cases in which omnis preceded:

1.4 "Omnibus his resistitur omnibusque oratio consulis, Scipionis, Catonis opponitur." Anaphor is used effectively here.

1.85 "Neque enim sex legiones alia de causa missas in Hispaniam, septimamque ibi conscriptam neque tot tantasque classes paratas neque submissos duces rei militaris peritos. Nihil horum ad parandas Hispanias, nihil ad usum provinciae provisum, quae propter diurnitatem pacis nullum auxilium desiderarit." Omnia haec iam pridem contra se parai; . . ." I have quoted a good deal of the preceding passage to show the strong feeling in this speech.

Another interesting example is a combination of idem and hoc. In all but this one example idem follows hoc. The idem I considered emphatic.

1.74 ". . . compluresque tribuni militum et centuriones ad Caesarem veniunt seque ei commendant. Idem hoc fit a principibus Hispaniae quos evocaverunt et secum in castris habebant obsidum loco." The same speech quoted above in 1.85 also gives this example which has been used in connection with the possessives.

"Reliquos enim omnes officium suum praestitisse: se, . . .; exercitum suum. . .; illius denique exercitus milites. . ."

The reliquos is obviously contrasting and stands in first place in an anaphorical arrangement. Omnes, however, is also emphatic, in my opinion, but not contrasting--and it stands in a following, separated position.

From this peculiar type of adjectival combination one may gather that the first place may be considered emphatic if it is unusual, an added strength being given when a mechanical arrangement of clauses, such as anaphora, is used.

Part III. Conclusion

I. Position without regard to emphasis.

In every case except that of the proper adjectives, of which a separate category was made because of their contrasting nature, more than half of the adjectives precede. (The proportions in this case are 45% preceding to 55% following.) The fact that adjectives so often precede is at variance with the statements of the Hale-Buck, Gildersleeve, Allan and Greenough, Roby, Harkness, Sloman, and Madvig grammars. Bennett's and Kühner's statements agree better with the findings of this study.

(1)

II. Emphasis.

Diagram of Emphasis in Preceding Position (1)

Type	Freq. in Preced. Position	Emphasis	
Unclassified	+	+-	
Numeral	+	++	
Possessive	+	++	
Proper	-	++	
Pronominal	+	+-	
Demonstrative	+	++	
Indefinite	+	++	(2)
Relative	+	0	
Intensive	+	+-	(3)
Interrog	+	0	
Quantity	+	+-	
Comparative	+	++	
Contrasting	+	+-	(4)
Superlative	+	+-	

1. Plus in second column indicates respective types of adjective precede more than 50% of the time. First plus in third column indicates the preceding place has over 50% of the emphatic cases. Second plus or minus means the percentage is respectively greater or less than the percentage in the second column.

2. Only one emphatic.

3. Follows only once.

4. " " "

This diagram does not take into account the difference between contrasting and non-contrasting emphasis, and it does not show varying degrees of emphasis. Nevertheless, it is useful as a rough picture of the influence of emphasis on adjective placing. We find that in half of the cases (marked ++) a greater percentage of preceding adjectives is emphatic than would be true if emphasis were of no importance in word order. But note the types of adjective of which this is true: numeral, possessive, proper, demonstrative, indefinite, comparative. In the case of the numerals it is contrast which brings up the emphasis percentage for those numerals which precede. The possessives and proper adjectives, and the demonstratives are contrasting. Only one indefinite was considered emphatic; so this type should hardly be considered in this kind of diagram. The comparatives are contrasting.

On the other side, it is true that the intensive and contrasting types have only one example in the following position, but these two types are more colorful than the indefinites, and the single examples found are themselves emphatic. However, supposing that they are omitted, and that the influence of contrast is ignored, we have five types tending to be emphatic in first place and four in last place. This is quite a different picture from that given by some of the grammars, which state flatly that the first place is the emphatic position. Considering the type of adjective tending to be emphatic in first

one would conclude that emphasis when it is not contrasting emphasis, is likely to throw the adjective into the following, more unusual position.

Moreover, in the general conclusions made at the beginning of this study, in which all the adjectives are treated together, the percentages point to last place as more emphatic than first.

A brief outline will show how the grammars agree or disagree with the above conclusions.

Professor Ullman is correct in finding that the possessive is emphatic in first place. It is natural that this should be true, because it is the contrast of "mine" and "thine" which accounts for emphasis in the case of the possessive, but his studies cannot be considered authoritative for emphasis with respect to other adjectives.

Hale and Buck have good general rules for making a word emphatic, but, if their rule of "reversing normal order" to gain emphasis is followed, a wrong impression is received, because they make another statement that adjectives normally follow their nouns.

Gildersleeve says the emphatic attribute is commonly put before the substantive. His general rules, as in the case of the Hale-Buck grammar, are more in accordance with the conclusions here reached: "Reversing normal position"; "Approximation of similars or opposites"; "Separation."

Bennett recognizes that possessives emphatic in first place are in contrast. He says that for the sake of

emphasis normal order is often abandoned and the emphatic word is put at the beginning, less often at the end. This is correct in that it partially recognizes that it is the unusual position, and not one particular place or another, that makes for emphasis; yet it seems too much influenced by the usual mechanical rules.

Allan and Greenough. Nothing could be more arbitrary and more colorless than their rule. It could not apply to anything so variegated and flexible as a language.

Roby's statement that any word which is to be made emphatic is placed at or near the beginning of the sentence, or sometimes, if not the primary predicate, at the end, may be interpreted to mean that the unusual place is emphatic. He says also that an unemphatic word between a pair of connected words gives emphasis to the first, and this is often true.

Harkness says that adjectives when emphatic generally stand before the noun. But he also states that two words are sometimes made emphatic by separation. Why both should be made emphatic, except on occasion, is a question.

Sloman has general rules similar to those of Hale-Buck and Gildersleeve. However, he is infected with the enthusiasm for first place as the emphatic position, for he makes a special rule of "placing a word first when natural position is elsewhere," whereas, "Inversion of normal order" would have been sufficient.

Madvig is wrong in saying that the adjective usually follows, but he does state correctly that the adjective may be separated from the substantive and made emphatic.

Kühner makes the clearest statement of all the grammars, although he does not differentiate between kinds of emphasis. He subscribes, however, to no mechanical idea that this or that location in the sentence is per se emphatic, but stresses the fact that the out-of-the-ordinary position, which he recognizes in the case of the attributive to be the following place, is emphatic. Kühner, therefore, is superior to the grammars in two respects: his statistical knowledge of the usual order of the adjective is correct; and his philosophical interpretation of the facts is logical.

Bibliography

- Allan and Greenough, New Latin Grammar, Boston, 1888.
- Bennett, Charles, New Latin Grammar, Boston, 1908.
- Gildersleeve, B. L.-Lodge, G., Latin Grammar, N. Y., 1906.
- Hale, W. F.-Buck, C. D., Latin Grammar, New York, 1903.
- Harkness, Albert, A Complete Latin Grammar, N. Y., 1898.
- Kühner, Raphael, Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache, Hanover, 1914.
- Madvig, I. N., A Latin Grammar, London, 1882
- Merryman, Mabel, Position of Attributive, Univ. of Kans., 1916.
- Roby, H. J., A Grammar of the Latin Language, London, 1887.
- Sloman, Arthur, A Grammar of Classical Latin, Cambridge, 1906.
- Ullman, B. L., Latin Word-Order, Classical Journal, V. LXIV, 7.