

Word Order in Subordinate  
Clauses in Livy

By  
Hazel Murray

Submitted to the Department of Anc. Languages  
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 A. P. Walker  
Department of Anc. Langs.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### I. Introduction:

- A. Purpose of the investigation: to continue a study made by Miss Florence Hale to determine the normal order of words in subordinate clauses.
- B. Miss Hale's statement as to the importance of a rule for normal order in subordinate clauses
  - 1. Latin had no punctuation.
  - 2. Inflections confuse and do not clarify a complex sentence.
- C. Investigation of material available on the subject.
  - 1. List of grammars examined, and statements found therein about the beginning and end of subordinate clauses.
  - 2. Summary of grammar statements.
    - a. They are incomplete.
  - 3. Findings of Miss Hale.
    - a. A subordinate clause normally begins with the connective and ends with the verb.

### II. Investigation of a Latin author to establish a rule for word order in subordinate clauses, testing Miss Hale's

rule.

- A. Scope and method of the investigation.
- B. Table I, giving percentage of subordinate clauses that begin with the connective and end with the verb.
- C. Table II, showing that the introductory word does normally stand first.
- D. Table III, giving data for main verbs as well as subordinate verbs, showing that the verb stands last more normally in subordinate clauses than in main clauses.
- E. Conclusion: a subordinate clause normally begins with the connective and ends with the verb.

III. A study of departures from the order established as normal, with an attempt to classify and explain them.

A. Investigation of material available on the subject.

1. Statements of the grammars.

2. Summary of these statements.

a. No statement referring specifically to the end of the subordinate clause.

b. Principles used to account for irregularities.

(1) Emphasis.

- (2) The common factor (for the beginning of the clause).
- (3) Linking.
- (4) Rhythm (particularly for the end of the clause).

### 3. Findings of Miss Hale.

- a. Initial clauses have a tendency to be irregular at the beginning.
  - b. The importance given by the grammars to the common factor and emphasis in accounting for irregularities in the beginning of the clause is not warranted.
  - c. Clauses which stand at the end have a tendency to be irregular at the end only to a limited extent.
  - d. The verb sum has a tendency to be irregular.
- B. Investigation of a Latin author to discover and explain his usage, testing results with those of Miss Hale.
1. Irregularities at the beginning of the

clause.

a. Table IV: subordinate clauses irregular at the beginning, showing the behavior of initial clauses. Conclusion.

b. Testing grammar statements.

(1) The common factor.

(a) Common factor expressed in both clauses. Investigation and conclusion.

(b) Common factor expressed in one clause. Table V, showing its behavior. Conclusion.

(2) Explanation of all clauses irregular at the beginning.

c. General conclusion as to validity of grammar statements and of Miss Hale's.

2. Irregularities at the end of the clause.

a. Table VI, showing behavior of clauses at the end of the sentence. Conclusion, with evidence for "linking".

- b. Tables VII and VIII, showing behavior of sum and verbs compounded with sum. Conclusion.
- c. Possible effect of rhythm and euphony. Table IX, showing stylistic peculiarity of Livy.
- d. Emphasis and other considerations.

#### IV. General conclusion.

## Word Order in Subordinate Clauses in Livy

### Introduction

In a thesis by Miss Florence Hale with the caption, "Is there a Normal Order in Subordinate Clauses?", the "inclosing order", (clause beginning with the connective and ending with the verb) has been successfully established as the normal order for portions of Caesar and Cicero. My purpose is to continue her investigation in another part of Latin, comparing my results with hers, and thus making it possible to base conclusions on a larger body of facts.

The necessity for a normal order in subordinate clauses is obvious for the following reasons, stated by Miss Hale. As Latin had no punctuation, clearness had to be secured from two possible standpoints: first, form of the individual word (inflection), and second, arrangement of words in the sentence (word-order). The fact that the Latin language is highly inflected of course permits greater freedom in the arrangement of words; and in fact, the existence of inflection is quite generally assumed to account sufficiently for clearness in the sentence. It will be seen, however, that in a complex sentence, with two or more subjects and

verbs, and numerous modifiers, the situation becomes complicated, and that, to quote Miss Hale, "inflections confuse and do not clarify a complex sentence". If inflection does not serve the purposes of clearness in the complex sentence, then the other agent, word-order, comes into play.

#### Investigation of Grammars

At this point it is necessary to state what matter pertinent to the problem has been found in the grammars. The following grammars have been examined:

Allen and Greenough, New Latin Grammar

Bennett, A Latin Grammar

Burton, Latin Grammar

Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar

(Revised and enlarged by Gildersleeve and  
Lodge)

Hale and Buck, A Latin Grammar

Harkness, Complete Latin Grammar

Madvig, A Latin Grammar (Wood's Translation)

A statement is also included from Nutting,

Advanced Composition.

Failing to find any rule for normal order, in the

subordinate clause, particularly Miss Hale's rule, I have looked for statements about the beginning and end of the subordinate clause, feeling that the treatment of these points might establish a rule for normal order. I have found the following statements which are pertinent:

Burton: Relative and interrogative words normally stand first in their clauses. Par. 1058 (2)

Gildersleeve: Interrogative sentences begin with the interrogative, subordinate clauses with the leading particle or relative. Par. 675

Hale: Relative pronouns and conjunctions normally stand first in their clauses. Par. 624, 8

Harkness: Conjunctions and relatives, when they introduce clauses, generally stand at the beginning of such clauses. Par. 677

Madvig: Interrogative propositions begin with the interrogative word and what belongs to it, subordinate propositions with the conjunction or the relative pronoun. Par. 464

Relative words, which refer back to what precedes, can never (in prose) be dislodged from the first place. Par. 465, b

The following statements may be made as a result

of the investigation of the grammars:

1. Two grammars, Allen and Greenough, and Bennett, do not treat the beginning of the subordinate clause.

2. None of the grammars mention the end of the subordinate clause.

3. While each grammar does not deal with every type of introductory word, we may summarize their statements by saying that the subordinate clause normally begins with the introductory word.

4. If the omission of any treatment of the end of the clause assumes that the statements made for main clauses apply to subordinate clauses as well, we must infer then that the verb "normally" or "commonly" stands last. Such an assumption is broad, however, and needs to be verified.

I shall state here again Miss Hale's findings, in the form of a rule, and proceed from this point to an investigation. The rule she established is: A subordinate clause normally begins with the connective and ends with the verb.

Investigation of a Latin author

I have chosen for the material of my investigation the First Book of Livy's History of Rome, and will state my

principal results in nine tables. Clauses which conform to the rule stated above are termed "regular", those which depart from it "irregular". Clauses preceded by a term or terms syntactically common to the subordinate and to the main clause, I have termed irregular, though in numerous cases it obviously belongs to the main clause (see Example 1), or at least to one as much as the other (see Example 2).

1. Livy I, 26, 5: Rex, ne ipse tam tristis ingratusque ad vulgus iudicii ac secundum iudicium supplicii auctor esset, --- inquit ----.

2. Livy I, 58, 10: Ego me etsi peccato absolvo, supplicio non libero.

This practice, which I have adopted for fairness, of making the common syntactical factor a part of the subordinate clause, makes irregularities more numerous than they would otherwise be.

There are three cases, where the irregularity of a clause hinges on a matter of punctuation, in which I have adopted the punctuation of the editor. I quote them here, because there is probably cause for difference of opinion as to the punctuation involved.

Livy I, 9, 6: Cui tempus locumque aptum ut daret Romulus, aegritudinem animi dissimulans ludos---parat--.

Livy I, 17, 8: Cum sensissent ea moveri patres, offerendum ultro rati quod amissuri erant, ita gratiam ineunt --- ut ---.

Livy I, 55, 3: Nam cum omnium sacellorum ex augurati- ones admitterent aves, in Termini fano non addixere.

In the tables which follow <sup>1</sup> I have counted verbs and introductory words, rather than clauses as a whole.

Table I gives data for all subordinate clauses in the passage read.

Table I.: Subordinate Clauses.<sup>1</sup>

Clauses in which the verb does not stand at the end.	Clauses in which the introductory word does not come first.	Clauses irregular at both the beginning and the end.	Total number of irregular clauses.	Total number of subordinate clauses.	Percentage of subordinate clauses that are irregular.
132	67	10	209	884	.236

As a result of this calculation we may state that the normal order in a subordinate clause is the introductory word first and the verb last, since only .239 vary from this order. These results coincide approximately with Miss Hale's, whose percentage of irregularities is .220. To establish

<sup>1</sup>. Omitting indirect discourse.

this point further, I shall take up the beginning and the end of the clause separately in Tables II and III, in the latter giving data in main clauses for comparison.

Table II

---

Part I: Introductory word at the  
beginning of the clause

---

Introductory words	Livy Book I
antequam	1
cum	69
cum primum	1
donec	7
dum	3
dummodo	1
etsi	2
ne	31
ne (question)	1
nisi (ni)	6
postquam	4
praeterquam quod	1
priusquam	14
pronouns	289
quam (after comparatives)	11
quam (with possum)	2
quamquam	5
qualis	3
quando	3
quantus	7
quia	24
quin	2
quippe qui	3
quoad	1
quod (causal)	21

quod (substantive)	5
quod si	1
quoniam	5
seu	1
si	39
sicut	2
sin	1
tamquam	1
ubi	30
unde	12
ut (uti)	136
utrum - an (or one member)	2
introductory word omitted	3

Table II

---

Part II: Introductory word not at the  
beginning of the clause

---

Introductory words

Livy Book I

---

cum	34
dum	1
etsi	2
ne	2
postquam	6
pronouns	3
quamquam	2
quantus	1
quia	2
si	2
simul	1
ubi	7
unde	1
ut	11
velut si	2

---

It is interesting to note the following list of the common <sup>or</sup> connectives which are never displaced from the beginning of the clause in both Miss Hale's range of investigation and mine:

donec  
 priusquam  
 quam (with possum)  
 qualis  
 quando  
 quin  
 quoad  
 quod (substantive)  
 quoniam

Table III

Main clauses			Subordinate clauses		
Total number of clauses.	Clauses in which the verb does not stand at the end.	Percentage of clauses that are irregular at the end.	Total number of clauses.	Clauses in which the verb does not stand at the end.	Percentage of clauses irregular at end.
1217	387	.317	884	140	.158

These results confirm the findings of Miss Hale, (Her percentages are .324 for main clauses and .129 for subordinate clauses.) that the verb is more likely to

stand last in the subordinate clause than in the main clause.

As a conclusion from Tables I, II, and III, we may safely state the following rule: A subordinate clause normally begins with the connective and ends with the verb.

#### Exceptions to the Normal Order

With the establishment of this rule it will be profitable further to discuss departures from it, and, if possible, to classify and explain them. The grammars shed some light on the problem, and I include here their statements, giving first those which apply specifically to subordinate clauses, and second, those which, in the absence of any distinction, might be taken to apply to either the main or the subordinate clause.

#### Investigations of Grammars

Allen and Greenough, 601: In the structure of the period, the following rules are to be observed:

- a. In general the main subject or object is put in the main clause, not in a subordinate one:-

Hannibal cum recensisset auxilia Gades profectus est. (Liv. XXI, 21) -----

- d. A change of subject, when required, is marked by the introduction of a pronoun, if the new subject has already been mentioned. But such change is often purposely avoided by a change in structure, - the less important being merged in the more important by the aid of participles or of subordinate phrases:-

quem ut barbari incendium effugisse viderunt, telis eminus missis interfecerunt (Nep. Alc. 10).

- e. So the repetition of a noun, or the substitution of a pronoun for it, is avoided unless a different case is required:-

dolorem si non potuerō frangere occultabo (Phil. XII, 21).

Bennett, 351, 2: A word serving as the common subject or object of the main clause and a subordinate one, stands before both.

- a. The same is true also

(1) When the subject of the main clause is object (direct or indirect) of a subordinate clause.

- (2) When the subject of a subordinate clause is at the same time the object (direct or indirect) of the main clause.

Burton, 1068: When the subject or object of the main and subordinate clauses is the same, or when the subject of the one is the object (either direct or indirect) of the other, it usually stands at the beginning of the sentence.

Hale, 626: An emphatic word is often taken out of a dependent clause and put before the connective, especially if it belongs in thought to both the dependent and the main clause.

- a. Sometimes many words of the dependent clause precede the connective.

Harkness, 677, 1: Conjunctions and relatives may follow emphatic words. 684: When either the subject or the object is the same both in the principal and in the subordinate clause, it usually stands at or near the beginning of the sentence and is followed by the subordinate clause.

1. When the object of the principal clause is the same as the subject of the subordinate clause, it usually stands at the beginning of the sentence.

Madvig, 465, b: Relative words, which refer back to what precedes, can never (in prose) be dislodged from the first place. Relatives, on the contrary, which refer to a demonstrative proposition following, as well as interrogative pronouns, may stand after a very emphatic word. So, likewise, when a conjunctive subordinate proposition precedes the leading proposition, the conjunction may stand after one or several words which have a particular emphasis, frequently after pronouns which refer to something preceding. In prose the verb is never put before the relative or the conjunction.

Obs. Ut and ne, even where the leading proposition comes first, have sometimes one or several words before them: in particular a negative word often stands before ut, signifying so that (*vix ut, nemo ut, nihil ut, nullus ut, also prope ut, paene ut*).

476, a, Obs. 1: A period is often formed in Latin, when the leading proposition is broken off, by placing first a word of the leading proposition which belongs at the same time to the subordinate (e. g. as a common subject or object) and which points with emphasis to the person or thing to be mentioned, and the subordinate proposition immediately after it.

Nutting, *Advanced Latin Composition*, p. 7, Ex. 4, footnote 4: When the same person or thing is referred to in both the main and the subordinate clause, this subject of discourse should be placed first, with the subordinate clause immediately following. This arrangement makes the subject of discourse a part of the main clause; e. g. *Romani, cum venissent, castra posuerunt*. The English usage is different, "When the Romans came, they pitched camp".

The following grammar statements make no special reference either to main or subordinate clauses, but in some cases, by giving examples from subordinate clauses, indicate that, to that extent at least, they consider them applicable to subordinate clauses.

Allen and Greenough, 596: As in other languages, the subject tends to stand first, the predicate last.

a. There is in Latin, However, a special tendency to place the verb itself last of all, after all its modifiers. But many writers purposely avoid the monotony of this arrangement by putting the verb last but one, followed by some single word of the predicate. (This statement is particularly applicable to Livy, as I shall

show later.)

597: In connected discourse the word most prominent in the speaker's mind comes first, and so on in order of prominence.

b. The more important word is never placed past for emphasis. The apparent cases of this usage (when the emphasis is not misconceived) are cases where a word is added as an afterthought, either real or affected, and so has its position not in the sentence to which it is appended, but, as it were, in a new one.

601, f: The Romans were careful to close a period with an agreeable succession of long and short syllables.

(Note.- In rhetorical writing, particularly in oratory, the Romans, influenced by their study of the Greek orators, gave more attention to this matter than in other forms of composition. Quintilian (IX, 4, 72) lays down the general rule that a clause should not open with the beginning of a verse, or close with the end of one.)

Bennett, 349: But for the sake of emphasis

the normal arrangement (subject first, predicate last) is often abandoned, and the emphatic word is put at the beginning, less frequently at the end of the sentence.

350, 9: Words or phrases referring to the preceding sentence or to some part of it, regularly stand first. 12: At the end of a sentence certain cadences were avoided; others were much employed.

Burton, 1064 (1): Emphasis is secured by putting a word in a position in the clause earlier than that in which it would normally stand, especially by giving it the first place.

Gildersleeve, 672, 2, (a):----- In all sentences beginning and end are emphatic points. In long sentences the means as well as the extremes are the points of emphasis. (b) Rhythm - Much depends on the rhythmical order of words, for which the treatises of the ancients are to be consulted. Especially avoided are poetic rhythms. So, for example, the dactyl and spondee, or close of an hexameter at the end of a period.

680: A word that belongs to more than one word regularly stands before them all, or after them

all, sometimes after the first.

Hale, 624, 9: Determinative words referring to something in the preceding sentence stand, like relatives, at the beginning (first word, or in the first phrase).

625: But the so-called normal arrangement is really rare, since the speaker or writer generally has some special emphasis to put upon some part of the sentence (rhetorical order).

This may be effected:

- I. By reversing the normal order.
- II. By the juxtaposition of like or contrasting words.
- III. By postponement to produce suspense.

Harkness, 665: Emphasis and the relative importance of different parts of the sentence often cause a departure from the grammatical arrangement just described (subject first, predicate last).

Thus,

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

may be made emphatic by being placed at the end of the sentence.

669: The context often has some share in determining the arrangement of words in the sentence.

Thus,

1. A word or phrase closely related to some part of the preceding sentence generally stands at or near the beginning of its own sentence.
2. A word or phrase closely related to some part of the following sentence stands at or near the end of its own sentence.

678, 1: In general, in negative clauses the negative word, whether particle, verb, or noun, is made prominent.

Madvig, 463: Since in Latin the connection and construction of the words may early be known from their inflection, their position is not determined by such strict and definite rules as is usually the case in English and other modern languages, but is regulated in a great measure by

the emphasis which is laid on individual words according to the sense of the passage, and sometimes also by a regard to euphony.

The following conclusions may now be stated by way of summary to the grammar references:

1. There is no statement referring to irregularities at the end of the subordinate clause as distinct from the main clause.
2. The principal agent in irregularities at both the beginning and end of the sentence is apparently held to be emphasis.
3. The common factor, or element which "belongs in thought to both the subordinate clause and the main clause" (Hale) is held quite largely accountable for irregularities at the beginning of the subordinate clause. There are apparently three types of this "common

element", though not so distinguished: first, a common syntactical factor, which is limited by the grammars to common subject and common object; second, a term standing in one of the clauses (either main or subordinate) which is common to the subject unexpressed in the other clause. This term is limited by the grammars to the object (direct or indirect), except the grammar of Hale, whose statement referred to above, must be taken to include other syntactical relations. The third type implies a common factor expressed in both clauses, and is deduced from the following examples:

Bennett, 351, 2, a, 1), Ex.:  
 Caesar, cum hoc ei nuntiatum esset,  
 maturat ab urbe proficisci.

Hale, 626, Ex.: servi mehercule  
mei si me isto pacto metuerent,  
 domum meam relinquendam putarem.

All grammars agree in stating that the common factor comes first, and those which mention the position of the subordinate clause concerned, state that it comes immediately after the common factor.

4. The attraction toward the beginning of the sentence of a term, particularly a pronoun, which refers to something that has gone before (to which the name "linking" has been applied, - a term I shall use), is mentioned specifically for the subordinate clause by Madvig, and for clauses in general by Bennett, Hale, and Harkness. The possibility of a

rearrangement at the end of the sentence so that words which refer to what follows may link up with the next sentence is mentioned only by Harkness.

#### Conclusions of Miss Hale

It will be instructive at this point to state Miss Hale's conclusions with reference to the grammar statements, and the special deductions she has made from her study of the Latin authors. They are as follows:

1. Initial clauses have a tendency to be irregular at the beginning.
2. The importance given by the grammars to the common factor and emphasis in accounting for irregularities in the beginning of a clause is not warranted.
3. Clauses which stand at the end have a tendency to be irregular at the end only to a limited extent.

4. The verb sum has a tendency to be irregular.

#### Investigations of Livy's Usage

I am now ready to set forth the evidence gained from my study of Livy, and to evaluate the above statements in the light of this evidence. I shall first take up irregularities at the beginning of the sentences, and now submit Table IV, showing the behavior of initial clauses.

Table IV

---

Subordinate clauses that stand  
at the first of the sentence

---

Total number subordinate clauses.	Number irreg- ular at the begin- ning.	Percent- age irregular at the begin- ning.	Total number initial clauses.	Number irregular at begin- ning.	Percent- age irreg- ular.
884	77	.086	152	49	.322

---

These results agree substantially with those of Miss Hale, whose percentage for all clauses is .093 and for initial clauses .463. I shall refer to this tendency of initial clauses again, and attempt to explain it.

Proceeding now to test the grammar statements that the common factor stands first, followed immediately by the subordinate clause and then the main clause, I submit Table V, in which is collected all instances of the common factor which I have described as types one and two; namely, the common syntactical factor, and the factor standing in any syntactical relation in one clause, common to the subject unexpressed in the other. The third type, common element expressed in both clauses, I may dismiss here briefly by saying that out of thirteen instances collected from Livy I, 1-20, I found but one which might be said to conform to the order prescribed by the grammar, namely:

Livy I, 3, 11: stirpem fratris virilem  
interimit, fratris filiae Reae Silviae  
per speciem honoris cum Vestalem eam

legisset, perpetua virginitate spem  
partus adimit.

It will be seen here that the genitive filiae Reae Silviae, standing first, is common to eam in the subordinate clause which stands between the genitive and the main clause. This arrangement can be satisfactorily explained on the principle of "linking" (which I shall discuss more fully later), namely: "brother's sons" is followed immediately by "brother's daughter", the term to which it is most closely related. It seems fair to state then, that this rule is not operative, - a conclusion which agrees with that of Miss Hale.

Table V

Function of the common factor (C. F.) in the main (M) and in the subordinate clause (S).	Position of the common factor						Total of 2,3,4,5,6.
	1 C. F. first followed by S. clause M. last	2 S. clause containing C. F. first M. clause last.	3 S. clause followed by M. clause containing C.F.	4 M. clause containing C.F. first S. clause last.	5 M. clause first followed by S. clause containing C.F.	6 S. clause within M. clause containing C. F.	
Subject of both	24	10	3	10		4	27
Modifier of subject of both	2						
Direct object of both	1						
Subject of both (O.O.)	1	1	1	10	1	1	14
Direct object M. Subject S.	4		3	11		2	16
Genitive M. Subject S.				7		1	8

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Indirect object M. subject S.	5		3	12		1	16
Accusa- tive with pre- position M. Subject S.		1	1	1		1	4
Ablative M. Subject S.	1			4			4
Indirect object S. Subject M.	1						1
Direct object S. Subject M.		4			2		6
Accusative with pre- position S. Subject M.		2					2
Total	39	18	11	54	3	10	97

It will be seen at once from the preceding table that order 1, prescribed by the grammars, is not only unusual (being found in less than one-third of the examples) but is outnumbered by another single arrangement, order 4. The combination mentioned specifically by several of the grammars, consisting of object (direct or indirect) in one clause and subject in the other, appears ten times in order 1, as contrasted with 38 times in other arrangements. The ratio is a little higher for the common syntactical factor, as it appears about half of the time in order 1, thus being used more frequently in that order than in any other one arrangement. A rule which works only half the time (Miss Hale's figures show less than half) does not seem satisfactory, and it therefore is desirable that another explanation be sought for the irregularities being discussed. I propose attempting such explanation on other grounds. For my material I shall use the 39 examples appearing in Column I of Table V, (eleven of which I have not classed as irregular, since the common factor shows by its form that it belongs to the main clause) and the remaining 49 examples of clauses irregular at the

beginning, - taking these last types first. If I can account satisfactorily for a majority of these clauses, - those which follow Order 1, and those which do not, those which have common factors and those which do not, - on other grounds than the agency of the common factor, it will be seen that the common factor is not operative in the arrangement of words in sentences.

A number of the grammars take account of the fact that a relative referring to something preceding is placed first. Of the 49 examples referred to, 22 are of this type of "linking". I quote them here:

I, 7, 6: pergit ad proximam speluncam, si forte eo  
vestigia ferrent. quae ubi ---- vidit----

I, 7, 7: horum vox Herculem convertit. quem cum  
 vadentem ad speluncam Cacus vi prohibere  
 conatus esset, ictus --- morte occubuit.

(It will be seen here that the linking  
 relative takes precedence over the common  
 subject Cacus.)

I, 15, 2: Romanus (exercitus) --- Tiberim transit.  
quem postquam castra ponere --- Veientes

audivere, obviam egressi (sunt) --- (Here also the linking relative takes precedence over the common subject Veientes.)

- I, 9, 8: ---- ad vin spectare res coepit cui tempus  
locumque aptum ut daret Romulus -----
- I, 19, 1: eam(urbem) legibusque ac moribus --- condere  
parat. quibus cum inter bella adsuescere  
videret non posse ---- .
- I, 19, 4: deorum metum iniciendum ratus est. qui cum  
descendere ad animos --- non posset-----.
- I, 21, 3: lucus erat --- quo quia se persaepe Numa ---  
inferebat ----.
- I, 25, 5: duo Romani --- exspirantes corruerunt. ad  
quorum casum cum conclamasset --- Albanus  
exercitus ---.
- I, 27, 10: ab --- fuga flumen --- arcebat. quo  
postquam fuga inclinavit ---- .
- I, 29, 1: legiones deinde ductae ad diruendam urbem.  
quae ubi intravere portas----.
- I, 31, 1: -- in monte Albano lapidibus pluisse. quod  
cum credi vix posset ---. (The relative  
refers to the entire preceding statement.)

- I, 32, 1: --- regis nepos --- Ancus Martius erat.  
qui ut regnare coepit ---.
- I, 34, 3: nec diu manet superstes filio pater:  
qui cum decessisset ---.
- I, 48, 5: regem prima appellavit. a quo-- iussa --  
cum se domum reciperet---.
- I, 49, 4: accedebat ut --- metu regnum tutandum  
esset. quem ut pluribus incuterat ---.
- I, 50, 5: cui enim non apparere, adfectare eum  
imperium in Latines? quod si sui bene  
crediderint cives ----.
- I, 52, 5: indictumque (est) iunioribus Latinorum  
ut--- frequentes adessent. qui ubi --  
convenere ---.
- I, 56, 1: non pecunia solum -- publica est usus, sed  
operis etiam ex plebe. qui cum --- adderet  
labor ---.
- I, 56, 9: is--- ductus Delphos --- dicitur ---.  
quo postquam ventum est---.
- I, 57, 8: avolant Romam. quo cum--- pervenisset.
- I, 58, 4: ut in sordido adulterio necata dicatur.

quo terrore cum vicisset---. (The relative refers to the entire preceding statement.)

I, 59, 7: --- in forum curritur.quo simul ventum est ---.

The following seven cases of linking are performed by relative adverbs:

I, 1, 5: Troia et huic loco nomen est. ibi egressi Troiani --- cum --- agerent ---&

I, 7, 4: ipsum fessum via procubuisse. ibi cum eum --- sopor oppressisset---.

I, 7, 6: ex loco infesto agere--- armentum occipit. inde cum --- boves --- mugissent---.

(inde relates to the whole preceding statement.)

I, 10, 5: in Capitolium escendit, ibique ea cum --- depossuisset.

I, 31, 5: pestilentia laboratum est. unde cum pigritia militandi overetur ----.

I, 43, 11: unde primae classis centuriae ---- vocabantur; ibi si variaret ---.

I, 54, 2: dux ad ultimum belli legitur. ibi cum --- proelia --- fierent----.

Demonstrative pronouns are also recognized by the grammars as being placed first for linking purposes.

The following eight examples are of this type:

I, 24, 1: plures tamen invenio--- hos ut sequar ---.

I, 24, 9: a direct quotation followed by "id ubi dixit".

I, 26, 6: lex erat: --- hac lege duoviri creati --- cum condemnasset.

I, 32, 13: A direct quotation followed by "id ubi dixisset".

I, 36, 2: Tarquinius --- addere alias constituit -- id quia inaugurato Romulus fecerat ----.  
(id refers to the whole statement preceding.)

I, 45, 3: ea erat confessio ---- id quamquam omissum ---- videbatur----.

I, 50, 6: A quotation followed by "haec --- homo -- cum --- dissereret---".

I, 51, 2: servum --- corrumpit in deversorum eius vim magnam gladiatorum inferri clam sineret. ea cum --- perfecta essent ---. (ea refers to the whole statement.)

I add here the last example of linking.

Livy is describing the religious reforms of Numa.

Instructions are given that the pontiff have charge of all religious ceremonies, and

I, 20, 6: nec caelestes modo caeremonias sed iusta quoque funebria --- ut idem pontifex edoceret--.

In connected narrative there are usually two or more participants in the action, and interest shifts from one to the other. When one of these factors resumes action, or when a new factor is introduced, such factor is made prominent by being placed first. I quote here five examples of irregularity caused by this practice:

I, 6, 1: The characters involved are Numitor and his two grandsons; Numitor makes a speech. Then we have: iuvenes-- cum avum regem salutassent --.

I, 34, 4: Two characters are represented here, Lucumo, who is rich, and Egerius, who is poor. The explanation of Egerius' poverty is followed by: Lucumoni contra omnium heredi bonorum cum divitiae iam animos facerent ---.

I, 40, 1: Servius Tullus is king, and the two sons of Ancus pretend to the throne. The

reign of Servius is described. Then:

Anci filii duo etsi --- pro indignissimo  
habuerant se --- pulsos---

I, 41, 1: Tarquin is attacked by two ruffians, who  
escape. The account of their action is  
followed by: Tarquinum moribundum cum  
---- excepissent---

I, 56, 11: All the sons of Tarquin except Tarquinus  
Sextus have gone to Greece to consult the  
oracle. After describing their experiences  
Livy turns back to him as follows:  
Tarquinus Sextus, -- ut ignarus --- esset,  
rem --- taceri iubent.

We frequently find that members of a series are  
made prominent, as in the following examples:

I, 43, 2: prima classis omnes appellati; seniores ad  
urbis custodiam ut praesto essent, iuvenes  
ut foris bella gererent.

I, 19, 2: Ianum --- indicem pacis bellique fecit,  
apertus ut in armis esse civitatem,  
clausus pacatos circa omnes populos  
significaret.

The following two examples may be considered irregular by emphasis:

I, 23, 8: illud te, Tulle, monitum velim: Etrusca  
res quanta circa nos teque maxime sit, quo propior  
 es Tuscis, hoc magis scis.

I, 52, 3: censere ut renovetur id foedus, secundaque  
 potius fortuna populi Romani ut participes  
 Latini fruantur quam urbium excidia ----  
 patientur.

I simply quote the single example remaining:

I, 14, 4: ---- vastatur agri quod inter urbem ac  
 Fidenas est.

I now wish to consider the 39 instances listed in Table V, Column I. I shall first explain the eleven previously referred to, which are properly not irregular, since the common factor, placed first, shows by its form that it belongs to the main clause. I shall account for the position of the common factor, however, as I have in the irregular clauses.

The following I take to be examples of

linking:

- I, 20, 3: virginesque Vestae legit. --- iis, ut  
 adsiduae templi antistites essent,  
 stipendium --- statuit.
- I, 43, 8: --- duodecim scripsit centurias. sex  
 item alias centurias ---- sub isdem,  
 quibus inauguratae erant, nominibus fecit.
- I, 44, 4: ut --- puri aliquid at humano cultu  
 pateret soli. hoc spatium, quod neque  
 habitari neque arari fas erat --- pomerum  
 Romani appellarunt---.
- I, 54, 5: ex suis unum --- ad patrem mittit---.  
hunc nuntio, quia -- dubiae fidei  
 videbatur, nihil voce responsum est.

In the following examples, a new topic  
 is made prominent, as the action shifts from one  
 character to another:

- I, 7, 2: Remum novos transiluisse muros; inde  
 ab irato Romulo, cum --- adiecisset ---  
 interfectum.
- I, 39, 5: eorum magis sententiae sum qui ----  
uxorem, cum inter reliquas captivas  
 cognita esset. --- ab regina Romana

prohibitam ferunt servitio---.

I, 55, 8: eo magis Fabio, praeterquam quod antiquior est, crediderim ---.

The following is a case of emphasis by contrast:

I, 1, 1: --- in ceteros saevitum esse troianos:  
duobus, Aeneae Antenorique, ---- quia  
 pacis --- auctores fuerunt, omne ius belli  
 Achivos abstinuisse.

The last I take to be an example of parallel structure, used in describing, one by one, the exploits of Romulus.

I, 7, 3: Palatinum primum --- munit.  
sacra--- ut --- instituta erant, facit.

I am now ready to take up the remaining clauses in order 1, which may be termed irregular by considering the common factor which comes first, a part of the subordinate clause immediately following it. Of these instances, 28 in number,

I shall take up first 24 cases of the common subject, and one case of the common object, found in connection with a common subject.

In the following six cases an actor who has previously taken part in the story is reintroduced:

I, 2, 4: Aeneas -- ut animos --- conciliaret ---  
Latinos utramque gentem appellavit.

I, 61 : Numitor --- cum pubem --- avocasset ---  
scelera -- ostendit.

I, 7, 6: Hercules --- cum gregem perlustrasset --- pergite--.

I, 15, 2: Romanus contra, postquam hostem --- non invenit--  
-- Tiberim transit.

I, 46, 1: Servius quamquam --- regnum possederat --  
ausus est --.

I, 56, 12: Brutus --- velut si --- cecidisset,  
terram --- contigit ---.

Here follow four examples of the introduction of an entirely new topic:

I, 16, 2: Romana pubes --- ubi vacuum sedem regiam  
vidit --- silentium obtinuit.

I, 32, 6: Legatus ubi --- venit --- inquit --.

- I, 40, 5: ex pastoribus duo --- quibus consueti  
erant --- ferramentis --- in se omnes  
--- convertunt.
- I, 56, 4: anguis --- cum terrorem --- fecisset --  
perculit pectus --.

The following five examples are clearly  
cases of linking:

- I, 7, 8: Euander --- regebat loca--- Is tum Euander--  
postquam --- audivit --- rogitat---
- I, 26, 5: tamen raptus --- ad regem. Rex, ne --  
auctor esset, --- inquit ---.
- I, 28, 2: praecones --- excivere Albanos. ii --  
ut --- audirent, proximi constitere.
- I, 48, 1: huic orationi Servius cum intervenisset --  
inquit ---. (This is preceded by a  
speech. Servius is also a new topic.)
- I, 56, 7: comes iis additus L. Junius Brutus ---  
is cum --- audisset --- statuit ---.

I take the three examples following to  
be cases of emphasis:

- I, 4, 2: vi compressa Vestalis cum geminum

partem edidisset, --- Martem -- patrem  
nuncupat. (Vestalis is also a case of a  
new topic.)

I, 46, 9: Arruns Tarquinius et Tullia minor -- cum  
domos vacuas -- fecissent, iunguntur  
nuptiis ---. (The crimes of these individuals  
have just been described, and their names,  
though not needed here for clearness, are made  
prominent thus in conjunction, to emphasize  
the enormity of their crimes.)

I, 58, 10: ego me etsi peccato absolvo, supplicio  
non libero. (This includes also the case of  
common object, to which I have previously  
referred.)

The two cases following illustrate  
parallelism, where members of a series are prominent:

I, 17, 1: --inter ordines certabatur. oriundi  
ab Sabinis, ne --- possessionem imperii  
amitterent, -- volebant; Romani veteres--.

I, 27, 11: alii --- in aquam --- ruebant, alii, dum  
cunctantur in ripis, -- oppressi.

The four cases of common subject following occur in the middle of the sentence, and their position is to be explained, I am inclined to think, through the sequence required by the structure of the period:

I, 2, 5: fretusque his animis --- Aeneas, quamquam tantis opibus Etruriam erat, ut eam non terras solum sed mare etiam --- fama --- implesset, tamen, cum moenibus bellum propulsare posset, - copias eduxit.

I, 7, 5: ibi cum eum --- sopor oppressisset, pastor--- cum avertere eam praedam vellet --- aversos boves -- traxit. (The fact that pastor is a new subject may constitute a reason for its introduction so early in the sentence.)

I, 37, 1: ventoque iuvante accensa ligna et pleraque in ratibus impacta sublicis cum haerent pontem incendrunt. (There is a possibility that ligna is put forward to link with lignorum, which occurs in the previous sentence.)

I, 37, 2: --- res --- terrorem attulit Sabinis, effusis eadem fugam impedit, multique mortales, cum hostes effugissent, --- periere---

In conclusion, I submit three examples of common factors not to be included in the above list:

I, 9, 9: invitati --- cum --- urbem vidissent,  
mirantur ---. (This participle may belong syntactically to either subject. I take it that it stands first here, however, because it is equivalent to a clause, and as such, belongs first chronologically.)

I, 12, 7: haec precatus, velut si sensisset auditas preces, - inquit ---. (Precatus is also a common participial modifier, and might be explained on the grounds stated in the previous example, but is here probably brought forward in conjunction with haec, a linking word.)

I, 54, 8: Sexto urbi -- patuit, priores civitatis --- interemit. (This is a case of "new topic", a return to Sextus, after discussing the behavior of his father.)

Having completed the study of all clauses irregular at the beginning, I am ready to state

conclusions therefrom and to evaluate statements made by the grammars and Miss Hale. In the first place, it will be seen that the principle of linking is responsible for a majority of these cases, for it is operative 48 out of 88 times. The breaking, or "new topic" arrangement is next in prominence. With these principles, and others of less frequent occurrence, I have explained practically all of my examples without taking into account the common factor. I must therefore concur in Miss Hale's conclusion that the importance given to emphasis and to the common factor in the grammars as agencies in irregularities at the beginning of subordinate clauses is not warranted.

I am now ready to take up the discussion of irregularities at the end of the clause. Grammar statements would lead one to attribute these irregularities principally to emphasis, and, to a lesser extent, to the requirements of rhythm and euphony and to the principle of linking with what follows.

Miss Hale investigated clauses at the end of the sentence, feeling that the principle of linking might cause a larger percent of irregularities in clauses that stood at the end, on the analogy of the behavior of initial clauses. The evidence she obtained was not sufficient to be conclusive. Miss Hale also established the fact that sum tends to be irregular in Caesar and Cicero. My findings on these points I shall present in a series of tables, from which I may draw conclusions. Table VI follows, showing behavior of all clauses at the end of the sentence:

--

Table VI

---

All clauses that stand at the  
end of the sentence

---

Part I : Main clauses

---

Total number of main clauses that stand at the end.	Total number of simple sent- ences.	Sum of simple sent- ences and main clauses at end.	Main clauses at end with verb irreg- ular.	Simple sent- ences with verb irreg- ular.	Total of main clauses and simple sent- ences irreg- ular.	Percent- age irreg- ular at end.	Percent- age of all main verbs.
466	171	637	93	70	163	.255	.317

---

Part II : Subordinate clauses

---

Total number subordinate clauses at end of sentence.	Number irregular at end of sentence.	Percentage irregular at end of sentence.	Percentage of all subordinate clauses.
234	27	.115	.158

---

This evidence is even less conclusive than Miss Hale's, for it shows that clauses standing at the end are less irregular than other clauses, and this fails to establish that clauses tend to be irregular at the end of the sentence. There is, however, some evidence for irregularities caused by putting a word at the end to link with what follows. I have found 61 examples of such linking in main clauses, and seventeen in subordinate clauses. I quote one example of the latter:

I, 56, 1: minus tamen plebs gravabatur --- quam  
 postquam ad alia --- traducebantur  
opera, foras --- cloacamque ---  
receptaculum.

To show the behavior of sum I present  
 Tables VII and VIII:

Table VII

---

 The position of sum


---

Number of clauses exclusive of <u>sum</u> .	Number irregular exclusive of <u>sum</u> .	Percentage irregular exclusive of <u>sum</u> .	Total number of times <u>sum</u> is used.	Number of times <u>sum</u> is irregular.	Percentage of times <u>sum</u> is irregular.
---	--	--	---	--	--

---

 Part I : Main clauses
 

---

1100	353	.348	117	34	.29
------	-----	------	-----	----	-----

---



---

 Part II : Subordinate clauses
 

---

722	124	.171	162	16	.098
-----	-----	------	-----	----	------

---

It is here shown that sum is less irregular than all other verbs, and that it therefore cannot be used to account for irregularities at the end of clauses in Livy, as it can be in the portions of Latin examined by Miss Hale. The ratio established between main and subordinate

clauses is still maintained here, in that sum is regular more often constantly in subordinate clauses than in main clauses.

In Table VIII, which follows, I have considered compounded verbs regular in which one member occurs at the end of the clause.

Table VIII

---



---

 Position of verbs compounded with sum


---



---

Number verbs in normal arran- gement.	Number irreg- ular. with sum omitt- ed.	Number verbs irreg- ular. with sum omitt- ed.	Number irreg- ular. with members separat- ed.	Number verbs irreg- ular. with members separat- ed.	Number irreg- ular. with sum.	Total verbs com- pounded with sum.	Number irreg- ular.	Percent- age irreg- ular.
--	---	--	---	--	---	---	---------------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Part I: Main clauses

52	12	111	44	22	5	185	61	.324
----	----	-----	----	----	---	-----	----	------

---

## Part II: Subordinate clauses

74	3	4	2	12	0	90	5	.055
----	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	------

---

By comparing with these figures the percentage for all clauses, given in Table III, (.317 for main clauses, and .158 for subordinate clauses) it will be seen that verbs compounded with sum behave practically as all other verbs in main clauses, and are less irregular in subordinate clauses. Miss Hale's percentages show that verbs compounded with sum are somewhat less irregular than other verbs. Conclusions at this point are again consistent with one of my main points, that verbs in subordinate clauses are more regular than those in main clauses. I may state here that Livy's fondness for omitting sum from the compound seems to be confined largely to main clauses, possibly because such an arrangement would destroy clearness more easily in the subordinate clause than in the main clause.

The factor of rhythm as it affects the end of the clause, I am not prepared to discuss. Doubtless when Livy's clausulae have been studied as have Cicero's, much light will be shed on the problem. In studying Livy's sentences, I became convinced that it was a feature of his style to put a single

word after the verb. I have also quoted a grammar statement which says such a practice was common to some authors to "avoid monotony". The term euphony rather than rhythm should be used perhaps, in accounting for this practice. That it was a feature of Livy's style will be shown in the next table. I must first, however, explain another matter taken up in this table, and in so doing will refer to considerations mentioned at the outset of this thesis. We have maintained that the "inclosing order" is normal for subordinate clauses in order to serve the purposes of punctuation as an aid to clearness. If this be true, then, any variation from this order might be taken as defeating the purposes of clearness, to the extent of its variation. That this is not true in every case is shown by instances I have collected in which the word or words placed after the verb, are anticipated syntactically, usually by an attributive modifier (see Example 1) though not necessarily (see Example 2).

I, 3, 9: qui nunc pars Romanae est urbis---

II, 17, 8: ut non plus darent iuris---

It is obvious that clearness is not obviated when such anticipation is present. These points are included in the following table:

Table IX

Type of irregularities at end of clauses				
Total number clauses irregular at end.	Number irregular by <u>one</u> word.	Percent- age irregular by <u>one</u> word.	Number antici- pated.	Percentage anticipated.
Part I : Main clauses				
387	135	.348	47	.121
Part II : Subordinate clauses				
140	82	.585	19	.135

Other considerations no doubt affect the end of the sentence. I have found seven cases in which it seems emphasis is operative. I quote on of them which secures emphasis by juxtaposition:

I, 25, 6: --- cum conclamasset gaudio Albanus  
exercitus, Romanos legiones iam spes  
 tota --- deseruerat.

Words of phrases are often added as an afterthought, by way of parenthesis, apparently. Occasionally emphasis or linking puts the verb forward, and this makes the end of the clause irregular.

In conclusion I may state that I have corroborated the findings of Miss Hale, in practically every point, the only notable exception being the behavior of sum.