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I. Introduction.

[A. Reasons for Study.

With regard to construction, Latin, as compared with the modern languages, is extremely free. Due to its wealth of inflections ideas were expressed in it without the close regard for the order of words which is demanded by languages of a later date, or at least without so much need for expressing syntactical relations by order.

There is evidence that theories as to the order of words and the development of thought in a sentence were advanced by the ancients as well as the moderns. There is also evidence that none of these theories was strictly adhered to by those great ancient writers whose style we are still prone to speak of as unsurpassed. Especially is this true in the matter of sentence beginnings. We find Latin sentences beginning in a great variety of ways— with nouns, with verbs, with adjectives, with adverbs. In fact if we at random pick out a number of sentences from Latin literature we probably are amazed at the apparent utter lack of uniformity in the matter of introducing them. And yet we have been taught by our grammarians that in the main all sentences should
conform to stated rules.

I, like the majority of Latin students, have been taught that normally Latin sentences begin with the subject or with an emphatic word. I have discovered in reading Latin that such is not the case— and with these conflicting ideas in mind I began this study. To substantiate my early training I have consulted the Latin grammars to which I had access and have made note of what some of the recognized grammarians have to say regarding the order of words particularly in respect to beginnings of sentences. Their opinions are set forth on pages 6-19.

B. Extent of Material used.

In attempting a partial solution of the problem as to what constitutes the beginning of a Latin sentence, I have limited my study to selections from four of the recognized writers of Latin literature and I have confined my readings to selections which have a straight-forward unembellished style. I have not dealt with the orations of Cicero in which he gives vent to his feelings and has perhaps in his first utterances let emotion play a great part. I have attempted to use selections in which invective plays no part and in which there are no particularly florid passages. There has been in those chosen a continuous
logical setting forth of facts and ideas in an orderly, logical style.

I have read and considered:

Caesar's "Bellum Gallicum" Bk. 1, Chaps. 1-54.
Sallust's "Bellum Catilinae" - Chaps. 1-51.
Cicero's "De Senectute."
Nepos' "Miltiades", "Themistocles", "Aristides",
"Pausanias", "Cimon", and "Lysander."

In expressing my opinion I am quite aware of the fact that a subject of the type I am dealing with is, of necessity, treated subjectively. I have given to the sentences my own interpretation just as any other reader would have had to do. Some sentences I frankly did not know how to analyze with regard to beginnings, but in general I have satisfied myself as to results. I have used only clear cases to substantiate my conclusions. When I have not been able to decide why a particular word was put first in the sentence I have put that word into my list of questionable beginnings and have not used it in drawing my conclusions.

I have made note of each sentence in the above mentioned works and have attempted to analyze each one with respect to sentence beginnings.

I have considered as a sentence each completed thought although it may have been separated from another completed
thought by only a semi-colon. I have attempted to use, as nearly as possible, a system of American or English punctuation. I have supplemented Meusel's edition of Caesar with Walker's edition and have given to the latter preference in matters of punctuation.

I have not taken into account ut and quod clauses used as subjects.

It has been no part of my purpose to discuss in this paper the order of clauses.
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II. Statements of Grammars.

A. In his Complete Latin Grammar, Harkness makes these statements: "The Latin allows great variety in the arrangement of the different parts of the sentence, thus affording peculiar facilities both in securing proper emphasis and for imparting to its periods that harmonious flow which characterizes the Latin classics. But with all this freedom and variety there are certain general laws of arrangement which it will be useful to notice.

General Rules.

1. The subject followed by its modifiers occupies the first place in the sentence and the predicate preceded by its modifiers the last place.

2. Emphasis and the relative importance of different parts of the sentence often cause a departure from the grammatical arrangement just described. Thus, any word except the subject may be made emphatic by being placed at the beginning of the sentence.

3. Moreover, the context often has some share in determining the arrangement of words in the sentence. Thus, a word or phrase closely related to some part of the preceding sentence generally stands at or near the beginning of its own sentence.

B. Sloman says: "The arrangement of a Latin sentence is based
on the natural order of thought (1) Subject, (2) Predicate.
If the predicate contains an object the object stands normally,
before the verb. Words, phrases, or clauses which perform the
function of attributes or adjuncts usually stand next to the
word which they modify. So the regular order of a Latin sen-
tence is:

1st: Subject, with its attributes (if any)
2nd: Object (if any) with its attributes (if any)
3rd: Verb preceded by its adjuncts (if any)

Causal or temporal clauses and phrases which qualify a
sentence stand at or near the beginning.

The above statements give the normal order, but this order
is seldom strictly observed throughout a sentence of any length,
because emphasis is given to any word or phrase by putting it
out of its ordinary place. Emphasis may be given (1) by placing
a word first when its natural place is elsewhere (2) by inver-
sion, (3) by juxtaposition, (4) by separation, (5) by deferring."

C. Lane, in his grammar, makes no statements concerning
order of words in sentences.

D. Hale and Buck discuss emphasis first and then normal and
rhetorical order. They say "Emphasis may be obtained either by
putting an important thing before the hearer immediately, or by
holding it back for a time to stimulate his curiosity. Hence,
the most emphatic places in a sentence, clause or group are the
first and the last. The places next these are relatively next in emphasis and so on. If no special emphasis is to be given to any part the subject and the act are the most important things. Hence, they stand first and last respectively. Their modifiers naturally stand near them.

Normal Order.

Accordingly, the normal order of the sentence is: Subject, modifiers of the subject, modifiers of the verb, verb.

As a subhead under this general statement, among the statements regarding the position of adjectives, genitives, possessives, indefinites, numerals, appositives, vocatives, adverbs, etc., I find these two of interest:

1. Relative pronouns and conjunctions normally stand first in their clauses.

2. Determinative words referring to something in the preceding sentence, stand, like relatives at the beginning (first word, or in the first place.)

Rhetorical Order.

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 juxtaposition of like or contrasting words.
III. By the separation of connected words to produce suspense.

A. A double emphasis is of course possible.

B. On the other hand, the putting of a word into an emphatic position often throws another into an unusual place without special emphasis upon that other.

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."

E. Gildersleeve and Lodge, in their revised edition of Gildersleeve's grammar, express the following ideas with regard to the arrangement of words:

"The Latin language allows greater freedom in the arrangement of words than the English. This freedom is, of course, due to its greater wealth of inflections. Two elements enter into the composition of a Latin sentence, governing to some extent its arrangement: Grammar and Rhetoric.

1. Grammatical arrangement has for its object clearness. It shows the ideas in the order of development in the mind of the speaker. By grammatical arrangement the sentence grows under the view.

2. Rhetorical arrangement has for its objects emphasis and rhythm. It presents a sentence already developed in such a way that the attention is directed to certain parts of it especially.
A. Emphasis is produced:
   1. By reversing the ordinary position.
   2. By approximation of similars or opposites.
   3. By separation.

   In all sentences **Beginning** and **End** are emphatic points. In long sentences the means as well as the extremes are the points of emphasis.

   Two further principles seem to underlie the arrangement of Latin sentences: (2) that of the ascending construction; (b) that of the descending construction. In the ascending construction, which is more common, the principal word is placed last, and the subordinate ones, in the order of their importance, precede. In the descending construction the reverse is the process. The descending construction is regular in definitions:

   Rule I. The most simple arrangement of a sentence is as follows:
   
   1. The subject and its modifiers.
   2. The predicate and its modifiers.

   Rule II. Interrogative sentences begin with the interrogative, subordinate clauses with the leading particle or relative."

   F. Burton says: "The arrangement of words in a clause depends to a greater or less degree upon their relative importance. It is based upon the principle that the elements of the thought
are expressed in order of emphasis, the subject being normally the most emphatic. The position of the verb which normally stands at the end, is an apparent exception to this principle, but in most clauses the verb serves only to make definite an idea which has been already anticipated from the meaning or construction of the preceding words.

The normal order, so far as one may be formulated is as follows:

1. Subject.
2. Words qualifying the subject (not necessarily important, but closely connected in sense with the subject and finally forming a part of it)
3. Direct object (if there is one)
4. Adverbs qualifying the verb.
5. Verb.

Relative and interrogative words normally stand first in their clauses; also demonstrative words or phrases which serve to connect a clause with a preceding one.

The normal order is liable to unlimited variation by which all possible shades of emphasis may be expressed. Emphasis is secured in the following ways:

1. 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.

The following facts may be noted regarding subordinate clauses:
When the subject or object of the main and subordinate clauses is the same or when the subject of one is the object (either direct or indirect) of the other, it usually stands at the beginning of the sentence.

The arrangement of words was affected also by the desire to produce a rhythmical succession of sounds and by the individual habit of the writer. The position of the subject, at the beginning and that of the verb at the end were fixed by custom. The position of words in the middle of a clause was not so definitely established; ablatives, prepositional phrases; even forms of the verb sum (which do not stand habitually at the end) seem to be placed anywhere in the middle of the clause. These could be shifted without great change of emphasis and their arrangement is probably often to be explained as a matter of rhythm or habit rather than emphasis."

G. An early Latin grammar, published in 1832 by Benjamin A. Gould avoids any statement as to the beginning of a sentence. It does make the statement, however, that the finite verb is usually placed after its nominative case, sometimes at the distance of many words.

H. Andrews and Stoddard made the following assertions:

l. "In arranging the parts of a proposition in English, after connectives are placed, first the subject and the words which modify or limit it; next, the verb and its modifiers; then the
object of the verb; and finally, prepositions and the words depending upon them. This is called the logical or natural order.

2. In Latin, either of the four principal parts of a sentence may be placed first and there is great freedom in the arrangement of the rest but with this general restriction in prose that words which are necessary for the complete expression of a thought should not be separated by the intervention of other words. In ordinary discourse, especially in historical writing, the following general rule for the arrangement of the parts of a sentence is for the most part observed:

In a Latin sentence after connectives are placed first the subject and its modifiers, then the oblique cases and other words which depend upon or modify the verb; and last of all the verb. Hence, a Latin sentence regularly begins with the subject and ends with the principal verb of its predicate. But the verb is often not placed at the end of a sentence, especially if the sentence is long, or if too many verbs would be thus brought together at the end. In the familiar style, also, the verb is often placed earlier in the sentence and in explanatory clauses it is sometimes placed at the very beginning of the proposition, in which case a conjunction is generally added.

It is also to be remarked, as a further modification of the general rule of arrangement, that in sentences containing the expression of emotion, the word whose emphasis characterizes it as especially affecting the feelings or as forming a con-
Connectives generally stand at the beginning of the clause which they introduce.

I. In Allen and Greenough's grammar, we find the following statements:

"Latin differs from English in having more freedom in the arrangement of words for the purpose of showing the relative importance of the ideas in a sentence.

As in other languages, the subject tends to stand first, the predicate last.

Note. This happens because, from the speaker's ordinary point of view, the subject of his discourse is the most important thing in it as singled out from all other things to be spoken of.

In connected discourse the word most prominent in the speaker's mind comes first and so on in order of prominence. This relative prominence corresponds to that indicated in English by a graduated stress of voice (usually called emphasis)."

After quoting the first chapter in Caesar's Gallic War in which they attempt to bring out in translation as far as possible all the shades of emphasis they make some statements under the heading of Main Rules for the Order of Words which are worthy of notice here. For example:

1. When sum is used as the substantive verb it regularly stands first or at any rate before its subject.
2. The verb may come first or have a prominent position, either
(1) because the idea in it is emphatic; or (2) because the
predication of the whole statement is emphatic; or (3) the
tense only may be emphatic.

3. The negative precedes the word it especially affects; but if
it belongs to no one word in particular, it generally precedes the
verb; if it is decidedly emphatic, it begins the sentence.

4. Idemque regularly comes first in its sentence or clause.

J. Bennet is very brief. He says: "In the normal arrange-
ment of the Latin sentence, the subject stands at the beginning
of the sentence, the predicate at the end. But for the sake of
emphasis the normal arrangement is often abandoned and the em-
phatic word is put at the beginning, less frequently at the end
of the sentence,"

Under special principles he adds: "Words or phrases refer-
ing to the preceding sentence or to some part of it, regularly
stand first."

K. In Elmer's Latin Grammar, we find the following state-
ments with regard to word order: "The different parts of a Latin
sentence normally tend to arrange themselves as follows:

1. Subject.

2. Modifiers of the subject.

3. Modifiers of the predicate, in the following order:
   (a) cases indicating time, place, cause, means, etc. (b)
object, indirect and direct; (c) adverbs.

4. Verb.

This normal order is often interfered with by the desire for euphony or pleasing rhythm or for emphasis.

The specially emphatic positions in a Latin sentence are the beginning (except for the subject) and the end (except for the verb) also in poetry, the beginning of a verse.

In a short sentence, however, the verb may incidentally be placed first without intentional emphasis, or in order to give the subject the emphatic position at the end. On the other hand, the subject may be placed last in order to give the verb the emphatic position at the beginning. In such cases one can determine, only from the context, which of the two is intended to be especially emphasized.

L. Sonnenschein in his grammar, gives five rules for normal order dealing with (1) adjectives; (2) objects; (3) relative pronouns, adjectives and adverbs; (4) Co-ordinating conjunctions, and (5) adverbs, respectively. Then he says:

"In no language is the order of words rigidly fixed; and in Latin the order is more elastic than in English, owing to its wealth of inflected forms. Thus we find the normal order is frequently changed for various reasons."
And among the departures from normal order he gives the following:

(1) To put a word in an unexpected position often makes it prominent and emphatic.

(2) The verb *est* in the sense "there is" often stands at the beginning of a sentence.

(3) Imperatives are often put at the beginning of a sentence or clause, as in French and English with adverbs and objects after them.

(4) The order of words in a sentence or clause is to a considerable extent influenced by the sentence or clause which precedes and by that which follows.

(a) The speaker or writer often begins with a word or phrase which is closely connected in meaning with something which has been said in the preceding sentence or clause.

(b) The speaker or writer often ends with a word which prepares the way for something that is to be said in the following sentence or clause.

M. In Madvig's Latin Grammar, we find the following statements:

"Since in Latin the connection and construction of the words may easily 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 the individual
words according to the sense of the passage, and sometimes also by a regard to euphony.

The most simple arrangement of the words is this: that the subject with what belongs to it stands first and the predicate follows afterwards in such a way, that the verb usually stands last in order to combine the whole proposition while the object and the object of relation or the predicative noun, with the other definitions of the verb (ablative, prepositions with cases, adverbs) are placed in the middle.

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

If for the sake of antithesis or for some other reason a word is to be put prominently forward as the most important with reference to the contents of the whole proposition (e.g. when the predicate is asserted as something remarkable or surprising of a subject that is well known and readily anticipated) this word is put at the beginning without reference to its grammatical class or construction.

Sometimes the verb is put first only to avoid separating the other connected words, or to give prominence to one of them, and at the same time to form the transition.

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 conjunctional 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.

N. Summary of Statements of Grammars.

1. A sentence normally begins with the subject. Ten of the thirteen grammars consulted agree on this point.

2. Emphasis plays an important part in determining the beginning of a sentence.

Eleven of the thirteen grammars consulted agree that an emphatic word may stand first.

3. Most of the grammars recognize as a minor influence on word-order the principles which I have found to be the dominant influence—namely, the connection between the new sentence and the preceding thought. Sonnenschein in his grammar gives clear expression to this theory—See pages 17-4

My only criticism of his statement is that he mentions it as a deviation from normal order whereas I have found it to be the prevailing and fundamental principle of order. Harkness admits that context shares in determining the arrangement of words in a sentence and Bennett states under special rules that words or phrases referring to the preceding sentence or to some part of it regularly stand first. Other grammars mention specific
instances of this sentence-connection order without recognizing the general principle. For example— the statement that relative pronouns normally stand first in their clauses is made by Hale and Buck, Burton, and Sonnenschein. Burton says that demonstrative words or phrases which serve to connect a clause with a preceding one stand first. That a word which refers to something in the preceding sentence stands, like relatives, at the beginning is stated by Hale and Buck, Bennett and Madvig.

A few minor points also are made by the grammars. Of these the most important for my discussion are:

4. The verb sum when used substantively regularly comes first in the sentence or clause.

5. The interrogative pronoun or adverb regularly stands first.
III. Test of the Validity of the Statements of the Grammars.

A. Does the subject stand first?

The test of the statement that normally the subject stands first can best be shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of sentences examined</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sentences with subject expressed</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sentences in which subject is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first word</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not first word</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Does an Emphatic word stand first?

There are two theories of emphasis. According to one the first place in any sentence is by nature emphatic and all emphatic words stand at the beginning.

According to the other a word may be made emphatic by being placed in any unusual position. If any word which would naturally stand at the beginning of a sentence is dislodged by another word, attention is attracted to that word and it therefore becomes emphatic.

It is my opinion that the first place in a sentence is not naturally filled by an emphatic word. On the other hand, the first place is usually occupied by a word which has to do with the connection of thought between the new sentence and a previous one. Words which serve as a link between sentences may
be emphatic. A word which introduces a new topic could be considered an emphatic word and a word used for the sake of contrast is undoubtedly emphatic. Thus a majority of beginning words might possibly be classed as emphatic, but they are not emphatic simply because all sentences begin with emphatic words. The first word in a sentence can be classed as a truly emphatic word only when it has been given that position for the express purpose of calling attention to it and when naturally some other word would have stood first. The theory that an emphatic word normally stands at the beginning of a sentence can be disproved by the observation that (1) decidedly unemphatic words sometimes stand first in a sentence; (2) a large number of words which undoubtedly express emphasis stand elsewhere; and (3) the position of the vast majority of emphatic words is better explained on the sentence-connection theory.

C. The remainder of my work is devoted to a test of the sentence connection theory of word-order to which I have previously alluded. At this point it is necessary only to say that I consider that the statements made in the grammars in connection with this theory are true and need only to be amplified and given first rather than second place.
D. Does the verb *sum* used substantively stand first?

The test of this statement can be best shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of sentences in which <em>sum</em> is used substantively</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of sentences in which <em>sum</em> stands first</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sentences in which <em>sum</em> does not stand first</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Does the interrogative word stand first?

The statement that interrogative pronouns and adverbs stand at the beginnings of sentences I have found to be true without exception in the Latin I have studied for this thesis.
IV. The Sentence Connection Theory of Word Order.

A. Statement of Theory.

In attacking the problem of what constitutes the beginning of a Latin sentence I have found a small book entitled "The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages" by Henry Weil, Translated by Charles W. Super, 1887 - Ginn & Co., and one on "Latin Sentence Connection" by Clarence W. Mendell, 1917 - Yale University Press., of valuable assistance. Both men have expressed quite clearly views in regard to sentence construction which are at best only vaguely suggested by a few of the grammarians. They recognize the fact that there is a logical thread running through and binding together the separate parts of any connected discourse. There is no such thing as a disconnected sentence. Mendell says that "A sentence cannot be an isolated unit. All thought is associative. While one concept is immediately before the mind for analysis not only are the previous ideas present in less distinct form but in the same way it (the mind) is vaguely, at least, conscious of the further idea or ideas which the one immediately before it suggests."

Certainly the continuity of thought has a direct bearing on the order of words. In a discourse each sentence must of necessity relate to the previous one. In keeping with the laws of understanding we should proceed from the known to the unknown. There should be a continuous movement of thought or
of speech and the order of the words is of necessity of the
utmost importance. Surely the order of words should correspond
to the order of ideas, regardless of the language employed.
To quote further from Mendell: "Just as words spoken in
succession are instinctively assumed to have relation and in
fact must always bear some relation to each other if the
utterance be that of a rational being, so when expression of
thought in sentences had become an established fact, some rela-
tion between sentences spoken in succession was beyond question."
And he tells us that the most unstudied discourse, if investi-
gated, will prove to be not merely a succession of concepts
put into words without relation. The ideas behind the spoken
or written language were of necessity related in the mind of
the speaker or writer and without being conscious that he is
doing so he gives expression to the relations as well as to the
ideas themselves. His mind carries forward the idea already
expressed and also foresees the ideas that are to follow and
without any deliberate effort on his part, the sentence being
spoken expresses its own relation to one or both of these.

Charles W. Super, who has translated Weil's work on
"The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages" is of the
opinion that the question of the order of words has been
rarely approached in a philosophical spirit and that it has
been generally decided on purely subjective grounds. I agree
with him and I believe that Weil has come nearer to making a
philosophical approach to the question than have the grammarians. According to him when the grammarians speak of the order of ideas they have in mind the order of the constituent parts of the proposition as exhibited by syntactic analysis. He says: "Syntax relates to the exterior, to things; the succession of the words relates to the speaking subject, to the mind of man. In a proposition there are two different movements: an objective movement, which is expressed by syntactic relations; and a subjective movement, which is expressed by the order of the words."

The ancients were not concerned in making the movement of ideas and the syntactical movement correspond with each other. The numerous terminations of the languages took care of the latter and they showed by the order of the words the movement of the ideas. Evidently the order of the words agreed always with the thought itself. If in translating the works of the old Latin writers today we find it impossible to conform to both the syntax and the order of the words, it is best to retain the order of the words and disregard the grammatical relations.

The Romans no doubt were influenced in their writing and speaking by a regard for euphony as well as by a conforming to syntax. It is quite likely too that the voice played an important part in emphasizing certain points in their discourse. If we agree with Weil in his statement that "There is a point of departure, an initial notion which is equally present to him
who speaks and to him who hears which forms, as it were, the ground upon which the two intelligences meet; and another part of discourse which forms the statement, properly so called. This division is found in almost all we say "then we must believe that the point of departure, especially, and the goal of what they were to say must have influenced them as they do us in our modern discourses. It seems logical that over and above everything else they must have followed the order of their ideas and must have attempted to so place those ideas in their sentences that they would produce the most effective and most animated result. In modern languages we are prone to say that in nearly every instance the subject is the point of departure for the thought. Perhaps we do not realize that in order to conform to this theory we are continually busy with manipulations of the language in order to have the subject agree with the rules of syntax and yet carry forward the march of ideas. The Romans were spared that trouble, and in spite of what the grammars say to the effect that sentences should begin with the subject, we find objects, prepositional phrases and adverbs doing service at the beginning of sentences quite as well as subjects. And we are forced to conclude that the word which carries forward the march of ideas in the most harmonious manner should logically stand first. Previously in my paper I have pointed to the fact that several of the grammarians make a minor point of this sentence-
connection theory.

In my reading I have been convinced that the great majority of sentences fall into one of two main groups to which I have given the names of linking and new topic type.

The minority of sentences I have classed as belonging to types called contrast, parallel and emphatic.

In addition I find myself left with a remnant of sentences which I have been unable to classify satisfactorily.

B. Types of Sentences.

1. Linking.

A sentence in which the first word carries forward the march of ideas and relates to, repeats, summarizes, "picks up" so to speak, something previously mentioned.


A sentence in which the first word denotes the beginning of a new topic, which usually means a break in the train of thought—a crossing over from one place, actor or thing to another.

3. Contrast.

A sentence in which the first word contrasts one idea with another which has already been expressed or is about to be expressed. The first member of the contrast group may be a linking word or a new topic, and will stand first for that reason. The second member will be a new topic word but the idea of contrast is more prominent than the idea
of a change of topic and I believe justifies the contrast classification.

4. Parallel.

A sentence in a series of sentences which amplify or describe several features of something just mentioned without advancing the story. The sentences in such a series regularly begin with words strikingly similar or related. These words are in reality of the linking type as regards the sentence to which they refer and of the new topic type as regards the other sentences in the series.

5. Emphatic.

A sentence in which the first word is not by nature emphatic (in accordance with the theory advanced by some grammarians which would lead us to believe that all Latin sentences ran down hill, so to speak) but has been made emphatic by being placed where it does not naturally belong with reference to the order of ideas. Words are especially emphatic if they have dislodged from the first place in the sentence some linking, new topic or other word which would naturally stand first.

6. Unclassified.

Some sentences I was not able to classify satisfactorily with regard to beginnings. The reason for a certain word's being placed first was not apparent. Possibly further study would show that some of them are in reality linking type or that they belong to other types. It does not seem unnatural to suppose
however, that languages do not always follow the same principle. Weil says, "There is nothing in nature which may not be drawn in different directions by different influences in turn. The mind of man is subject to the same law. Why then should not languages which are the image of the human mind be subject to it? It is evident on the contrary, that a language will be perfect in proportion as it is a faithful reflector of these varying states, a plastic wax capable of receiving the impression of every inequality, every undulation of the human mind." He is of the opinion that the perfection of a language consists not in following invariably an exclusive system of construction or in adhering with immutable logic to the ultimate consequence of an adopted principle. With regard to substantive sum he makes the point that sometimes we can find nothing which will prepare the hearer for that which we wish to communicate to him and not wishing to enter into the matter without preparation, we begin with that which is most general, most indispensable, but also most insignificant; namely, with the idea of existence, pure and simple. We lay hold on something that is already known by the hearer in order to make a beginning, be it only for form's sake.

According to Weil too, the most general initial notions and therefore also the most frequently employed are the relations of time and place. These are comprehended by every one and are a sort of mental compartments in which the intellect easily places all that it can apprehend. One easily gains a starting point
by means of these general notions.

Admitting the truth of Weil's statements with regard to substantive sum and to expressions of time and place, the number of otherwise unclassified sentences in my computation is slightly reduced. See tables following.
V. Test of the Sentence Connection Theory.

A. Table based on Caesar's "Bellum Gallicum", Book I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of sentences</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking type</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic type</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast type</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel type</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic type</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Sum First</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Time or Place first</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of sentences explained</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of sentences not explained</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type Examples:

1. Linking;

   Book I, Chapter 10, Sentence 2. The word id at the beginning of the sentence refers to and picks up the whole idea of the preceding sentence.


   Book I, Chapter 7, Sentence 1. Caesar is an excellent example of a new topic word. Caesar has not been mentioned before this time. The scene shifts from the Helvetians to him and there is a break in the train of thought.

3. Contrast.

   Book I, Chapter 13, Sentence 3. In this sentence we find the word bello contrasted with the word paeam above.

4. Parallel.

   Book I, Chapter 2, Sentence 3. The expressions una ex parte, altera ex parte and tertia belong to a series of sentences which do not in any way advance the story.

5. Emphatic.

   Book I, Chapter 20, Sentence 4. The word tanti is emphatic, clearly so because it has dislodged the linking word eius.

6. Unclassified.

   Book I, Chapter 10, Sentence 5. In compluribus his proelis pulsis I am unable to decide why the first word is first. His is clearly a linking word. Compluribus, by dis-
lodging it, seems made emphatic. Perhaps Caesar wished to emphasize the fact that he had to force his way through by a series of battles, not by a single fight. But I have preferred to err on the safe side by calling it unclassified.
EXAMPLES

CAESAR

Explanatory Note: 1 - Sentence; 1 - linking; n - new topic; c - contrast; p - parallel; e - emphatic; u - unclassified.

BOOK I - CHAPTERS 1-54.


CHAPTER V. 1. Post eius mortem, l; 2. ubi iam, u; 3. frumentum, n; 4. trium mensium, u; 5. Persuadent, u; 6. Beiosque, n.


CHAPTER VIII. 1. Interea, l; 2. Eo opere, l; 3. Ubi ea dies, l; 4. et si vim, u; 5. Helvetii, n.


CHAPTER XII. 1. Flumen, n; 2. Id, l; 3. ubi per exploratores, u; 4. Hos, l; 5. reliqui, l; 6. Is pagus, l; 7. His pagus, l; 8. Ita, l; 9. Qua in re, l.


CHAPTER XVI. 1. Interim, l; 2. nam propter frigora, u; 3. eo autem frumento, n; 4. Diem, u; 5. conferri, u; 6. ubi se, n; 7. praeassertim, e.

CHAPTER XVII. 1. Tum demum, l; 2. Esse, u; 3. Hos, l; 4. Praestare, u; 5. neque dubitare, u; 6. ubi se, n; 7. praeassertim, e.


CHAPTER XIX. 1. Quibus rebus, l; 2. His omnibus rebus, l; 3. nam ne eius, l; 4. Itaque, l; 5. simul, l; 6. Petit, u.

CHAPTER XXI. 1. Eodem die, 1; 2. Renuntiatum est, 1; 3. De tertia vigilia, u; 4. Ipse, n; 5. Considius, n.

CHAPTER XXII. 1. Prima luce, u; 2. id, 1; 3. Caesar, l; 4. Labienus, n; 5. multo denique die, u; 6. Eo die, l.

CHAPTER XXIII. 1. Postridie, 1; 2. itaque, 1; 3. Ea res, 1; 4. Helvetii, n.

CHAPTER XXIV. 1. Postquam id, 1; 2. Ipse, e; 3. in summo iugo, 1; 4. Helvetii, n; 5. ipsi, 1.


CHAPTER XXVI. 1. Ita, 1; 2. Diutius, 1; 3. nam hoc toto proelio, 1; 4. Ad multam noctem, 1; 5. Diu cum esset pugnatum, u; 6. Ibi, 1; 7. Ex eo proelio, 1; 8. nullam partem, 1; 9. Caesar, n; 10. qui, 1; 11. Ipse, 1.

CHAPTER XXVII. 1. Helvetii, n; 2. Qui, 1; 3. Ea, 1; 4. Dum ea, 1.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 1. Quod, 1; 2. reductos, 1; 3. reliquos, n; 4. Helvetios, n; 5. ipsos, 1; 6. Id, 1; 7. Boios, n.


CHAPTER XXXV.  1. His responsis, l; 2. Quoniam tanto, u; 3. primum, p; 4. deinde, p; 5. neve, p; 6. Si ita, l; 7. si non, c.


CHAPTER XLVI. 1. Dum haec, l; 2. Caesar, n; 3. Nam etsi sine ullo periculo, u; 4. Posteaquam, l.


CHAPTER L. 1. Proximo die, l; 2. ubi ne tum quidem, e; 3. Tum demum, l; 4. Acrifer, u; 5. Solis occasu, l; 6. cum ex captivis, n; 7. eas, l; 8. non esse fas, u.

CHAPTER LI. 1. Postridie, 1; 2. alarios, n; 3. ipse, n; 4. Tum demum, 1; 5. Ec, 1.

CHAPTER LII. 1. Caesar, n; 2. ipse, n; 3. ita, l; 4. Reietis pilis, l; 5. At Germani, n; 6. Reperti sunt, u; 7. cum hostium, n; 8. Id, l.
CHAPTER LIII.

1. Ita, 1; 2. Ibi, 1; 3. In his, 1; 4. reliquos, 1; 5. Duæ, u; 6. utraque, 1;
7. Fuerunt, u; 8. harum, 1; 9. C. Valerius Procillus, n; 10. Quæ quidem res, 1;
11. Is, 1; 12. sortium, 1; 13. Item, 1.

CHAPTER LIV.

1. Hoc proelio, 1; 2. quos, 1; 3. Caesar, n; 4. hibernis, 1; 5. ipse, n.
B. Table based on Sallust's "Bellum Catilinae".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Type</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic Type</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Type</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.02-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Type</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Sum first</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Time or Place first</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences explained</td>
<td>451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences not explained</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.10-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I.


CHAPTER II.


CHAPTER III.


CHAPTER IV.

1. Igitur, l; 2. sed a quo incepto, l; 3. eo magis, n; 4. Igitur, l; 5. nam id facinus, l; 6. De cuius hominis moribus.

CHAPTER V.


CHAPTER VI.


CHAPTER VII.


CHAPTER VIII.


CHAPTER IX.

1. Igitur, l; 2. concordia, n; 3. ius, n; 4. Iurgia, c; 5. in suppliciiis, n; 6. Duabus his artibus, u; 7. Quarum rerum, l; 8. in pace, n.


CHAPTER XII.  1. Postquam divitiae, n; 2. Igitur, l; 3. rapere, u; 4. pudorem, n; 5. Operae pretium est, u; 6. Verum illi, l; 7. At hi, c; 8. proinde, l.


CHAPTER XVI.  1. Sed inventutam, n; 2. Ex illis, l; 3. fidem, n; 4. si causa peccandi, n; 5. scilicet ne per otium, u; 5. Esi amiois, l; 6. In Italia, n; 7. ipsi, n; 8. tutae, u.


CHAPTER XXI. 1. Postquam acceperse, u; 2. Tum Catilina, l; 3. praeterea, l; 4. petere, u; 5. cum eo, l; 6 Ad hoc, l; 7. Admonebat, u; 8. Postquam omnium animos, l.


CHAPTER XXIV. 1. Igitur, l; 2. Quod factum, l; 3. neque tamen Catilinae furor, n; 4. Ea tempestate, l; 5. Per eas, l.


CHAPTER XXVII. 1. Igitur, l; 2. praeterea, l; 3. Interea, l; 4. Postremo, l; 5. eum, l.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 1. Igitur, l; 2. Curius, n; 3. Ita, l; 4. Interea, l; 5. praeterea, l; 6. nonnullus, n.

CHAPTER XXIX. 1. Ea, l; 2. Itaque, l; 3. Ea potestas, l; 4. aliter, o.

CHAPTER XXXI.  1. Quibus rebus, 1; 2. festinare, u; 3. Ad hoc, 1; 4. At Catilinae, n; 5. Postremo, 1; 6. Tum, 1; 7. Sed ubi ille, 1; 8. ea familia, n; 9. ne existimarent, u; 10. Ad hoc, 1; 11. Tum ille, 1.


CHAPTER XXXIII.  1. Deos hominesque, n; 2. neque cuiquam, 1; 3. tanta saevitia, e; 4. Saepe, u; 5. Saepe, u; 6. At nos, n; 7. Te atque senatum, n.

CHAPTER XXXIV.  1. Ad haec, 1; 2. Si quid, n; 3. ea mansuetudine, e; 4. At Catilina, n; 5. Ab his, 1.


CHAPTER XXXVI.  1. Ad ipse, 1; 2. Haeo, 1; 3. Praeterea, 1; 4. Ea tempestate, 1; 5. Cui, 1; 6. Namque duobus senati decretis, u.


CHAPTER XXXVIII.  1. Nam postquam potestas, n; 2. ita, 1; 3. Contra eos, 1; 4. Namque uti paucis, u; 5. neque illis, 1; 6. utrique, l.


CHAPTER XLII. 1. Isdem fere temporibus, l; 2. Namque illi, n; 3. nocturnis consiliis, l; 4. Ex eo numero, l; 5. item, l.


CHAPTER XLV. 1. His rebus, l; 2. rem onnum, n; 3. cetera, l; 4. Illi, l; 5. Postquam ad id, l; 6. Voluturio, n;


C. Table based on Cicero's "De Senectute".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Type</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic Type</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Type</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.016%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Type</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Sum first</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Time or Place first</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences explained</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences not explained</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLES

CICERO


CHAPTER VI. 1. A rebus gerendis, n; 2. Quibus, n; 3. Nihil ergo, 1; 4. Ad Appi Claudi senectutem, n; 5. Tamen is, 1; 6. ceteraque, n; 7. notum, 1; 8. Et tamen ipsius, 1; 9. Atque haec, 1; 10. ex quo, 1; 11. et tamen sic, 1; 12. nihil, n; 13. non facit ea; 14. non viribus, 1;
15. Nisi forte, u; 16. at senatu, n;
17. de qua, l; 18. Quam palam, l;
igitur, l; 22. nec enim excursione, n;
23. Quae, l; 24. Apud Lacedaemonios, n;
25. Quo dis legere, u; 26. Sic, l; 27.
respondentur, u; 28. Temeritas, n.

CHAPTER VII.

1. At memoria, n; 2. Credo, l; 3. Themistocles, n;
4. num igitur, l; 5. Equidem, e; 6. his, l;
7. nec vero, e; 8. omnis, n; 9. Quid, u;
10. manent, u; 11. Sophocles, n; 12. quod
propter studium, l; 13. Tum senex, l;
14. Quo recitato, l; 15. num igitur, l;
16. Age, u; 17. Quamquam in aliis, n;
21. Dis immortalibus, l.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. Et melius, u; 2. Et multa, c; 3. Illud, n;
4. Ut enim adulescentibus, n; 5. nec minus, l;
Solonem, l; 9. quas, l; 10. Quod, n.

CHAPTER IX.

1. Nec nunc, e; 2. Quod, n; 3. Quae enim vox, n;
4. qui, l; 5. at hi, l; 6. Non vero, e; 7.
nihil, e; 8. quorum, l; 9. Orator, n; 10. est, u;
14. An ne illas quidem vires, e; 15. quo quidem
opere, l; 16. Nisi vero, e; 17. Etsi etsi, l;
18. libidinosa, l; 19. Cyrus, n; 20. Ego, u;
21. nihil, u.

CHAPTER X.

1. Videtisne, u; 2. Iam, e; 3. Etenim ut ait, l;
4. Et tamen dux, n; 5. quod, l; 6. sed redeo, u;
7. Quatum ago annum, u; 8. Nec enim umquam, u;
9. Ego, e; 10. Itaque, l; 11. At minus, n;
12. Ne vos quidem, e; 13. Moderatio, n;
igitur, l; 17. Denique, l; 18. Cursus, n;
19. Audire, u; 20. cum ingressus, u; 21. potest, u.

CHAPTER XI.

1. Ne sint, n; 2. Ne postulantur, u; 3. Ergo, l;
4. Itaque, l; 5. At multi, n; 6. At id, l;
7. Quam tuit imbecillus, u; 8. Quod, l;
9. Ad paternam, l; 10. Quid mirum, n;
vero, e; 14. nam haec, l; 15. et corpora, l;
16. Nam quos, n; 17. Ut petulantia, n;
18. Quattuor, u; 19. intentum, l; 20. tenebat, l;
21. vigebat, u; 22. Ita, l; 23. ut enim adules-
centem, n; 24. quod, l; 25. Septimus, u;
29. Semper, u; 30. Ita, l.
CHAPTER XII.
1. Sequitur, 1; 2. Praeclarum, u;
3. Acipite, u; 4. Nullam, n; 5. Hinc, l;
6. cunque homini, n; 7. nec enim libidine, 1;
8. Quod, 1; 9. nemini, e; 10. Quocirca, 1;

CHAPTER XIII.
1. Saepe, u; 2. Quod, 1; 3. Vixerat, u;
10. C. Duellium, n; 11. defectatur, u;
15. Sodalitates, 1; 16. Spalabar, u; 17. qua, 1;

CHAPTER XIV.
1. Ego, n; 2. Quodsi quem, e; 3. Me vero, n;
4. quae, 1; 5. At non est, u; 6. Crede, l; 7. nihil, 1; 8. Bene, u; 9. Cupidis, n;
Quamquam non caret, u; 11. ergo, 1;
12. Quodsi istis, l; 13. Ut Turpione Ambivio, n;
17. quotiens, e; 18. Quid, n; 19. Vidi, u;
20. qui, 1; 21. Quid, n; 22. Atque eos, 1;
23. M. vero Oethogum, n; 24. Quae, e;
25 Atque haec, n; 26. quae, 1.

CHAPTER XV.
1. Venio, 1; 2. quae, 1; 3. Habent, u; 4. quam-
quam me quidem, e; 5. Quae, 1; 6. ex quibus, 1;
serpentem, 1; 14. Itaque, 1; 15. Qua, 1;
16. Cuius, 1; 17. Quid ego, u; 18. Quid de
utilitate, n; 19. dixi, 1; 20. de qua, 1;
21. At Homerus, n; 22. Nec vero, 1; 23. nec
conditiones, 1.

CHAPTER XVI.
1. Possum, u; 2. Ignoscoetis, 1; 3. nam et
studio, 1; 4. Ergo, 1; 5. Cuius, 1; 6. Curio, l;
7. Poteratne, u; 8. Sed venio, u; 9. In agris, 1;
10. cuinis, 1; 11. A villa, 1; 12. num igitur, 1;
15. Tam hortum, u; 16. Quid de pratorum, n;
17. brevi, e; 18. Agro, n; 19. ad quem, 1;
20 Ubi enim potest, u; 21. Sibi,n.

CHAPTER XVII.
1. Multas ad res, e; 2. quos, 1; 3. Quam, e;
4. Atque ut intellegatis, 1; 5. cum autem admir-
aretur, u; 6. et Cyrum, n; 7. mel, e; 8. Tum, l;
Valerium Corvinum, n; 12. cuuis, 1; 13. Ita, l;
14. Atque huius, 1; 15. apex, n; 16. Quanta, e;
CHAPTER XVIII.


CHAPTER XIX.


CHAPTER XX.


CHAPTER XXI.


CHAPTER XXII.

9. abeunt, l; 10. Iam vero videtis, l; 11. Atqui
dormientium, l; 12. Multa, n; 13. Ex quo, l;
17. nos, c.

CHAPTER XXIII.

4. Sed nescio, u; 5. Quod quidem, l; 6. Quid
quod, n; 7. Equidem efferor, e; 8. Quo, l;
9. Et si quis deus, n; 10. Quid habet, n;
Commorandi, n; 14. O. Praeclarum, n; 15.
Proficiscer, l; 16. cuius, l; 17. Quem ego, l;
18. His, l; 19. Quod si in hoc, l; 20. sin
mortuus, c; 21. Quodsi non sumus, n; 22. Nam
habet natura, n; 23. Senectus, n; 24. Haec, l;
25. ad quam, l.
D. Table based on Nepos' "Lives of "Miltiades"

"Themistocles", "Aristides", "Pausanias", "Cimon"

and "Lysander".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total No. of Sentences</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of sentences</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Type</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic Type</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Type</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.04-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Sum first</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Time or Place first</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences explained</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences not explained</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.09-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLES

NEPOS


MILTIADES I. 1. Miltiades, n; 2. cuius generis, 1; 3. namque tum, 1; 4. His consulentibus, 1; 5. id, 1; 6. Hoc oraculi responso, 1; 7. Hic, 1; 8. Miltiades, n.


MILTIADES III. 1. Eisdem temporibus, 1; 2. pontem, n; 3. eius, 1; 4. Sic, 1; 5. In hoc, 1; 6. Hic, 1; 7. nam si cum his copiis, n; 8. id, 1; 9. Ad hoc consilium, 1; 10. quo extinoto, 1; 11. Itaque, 1; 12. Huius, 1; 13. Cuius ratio, 1.

MILTIADES IV. 1. Darius, n; 2. Illi, 1; 3. Inde, 1; 4. Is, 1; 5. Hoc tumultu, 1; 6. Domi, n; 7. Inter quos, 1; 8. unus Miltiades, e; 9. id, 1.

MILTIADES V. 1. Hoc in tempore, 1; 2. Ea, 1; 3. Itaque, 1; 4. quo, 1; 5. Elus ergo auctoritate, 1; 6. Dein, 1; 7. Datis, n; 8. Itaque, 1; 9. In quo, 1; 10. Qua pugna, 1; 11. nulla enim manua, e.


MILTIADES VII. 1. Post hoc proelium, 1; 2. Quo in imperio, 1; 3. Ex his, 1; 4. cum iam in eo esset, u; 5. Cuius, 1; 6. Quo factum est, 1; 7. Accusatus ergo est, u; 8. Ex tempore, 1; 9. Itaque, 1; 10. causa cognita, 1; 11. Hanc pecuniam, 1.


ARISTIDES II. 1. Interfuit, u; 2. Idem praetor, l; 3. Neque alius, n; 4. namque ante id tempus, l; 5. Tum, l.


E. Table based on combined works of the four authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Type</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic Type</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Type</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Type</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Type</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Sum first</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Time or Place first</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences explained</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. sentences not explained</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Conclusion.

A. Conclusions Drawn.

1. The subject of the sentence does not normally stand first.

2. The first word in a sentence is not generally an emphatic word.

3. The verb sum when used substantively does not generally stand first.

4. The first place in a sentence is determined by the connection of thought. A word which relates to something said in a previous sentence is the commonest type of beginning word.