ARCTOS

Acta Philologica Fennica

VOL. LII

ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

Arctos has been published since 1954, annually from vol. 8 (1974). *Arctos* welcomes submissions dealing with any aspect of classical antiquity, and the reception of ancient cultures in mediaeval times and beyond. *Arctos* presents research articles and short notes in the fields of Greek and Latin languages, literatures, ancient history, philosophy, religions, archaeology, art, and society. Each volume also contains reviews of recent books. The web site is at *www.journal.fi/arctos.*

INDEX

LEFT-DISLOCATION, SUBORDINATE CLAUSES AND THE STYLISTIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

Hilla Halla-aho*

1. Introduction

In this article I discuss stylistic differences between Plautus and Terence based on left-dislocation and subordinate clauses in Roman comedy.

The starting point for this study is recent research on left-dislocation in republican Latin (Halla-aho 2018). Left-dislocation is a construction where a nominal phrase occurs in a fronted position to the left of the clause to which it belongs, as *mulier* in (1), followed by a syntactically complete clause, whereby the initial element is usually taken up by a co-referent anaphoric expression, as in the dative *ei* in (1). Left-dislocation is a pragmatically conditioned construction that is most commonly used to introduce topics.[1] An example is (1) from Plautus:

(1) mulier quae se suamque aetatem spernit, speculo ei usus est
quid opust speculo tibi quae tute speculo speculum es maxumum?

---

[1] On left-dislocation generally, see Lambrecht (2001); on left-dislocation in Latin, see Halla-aho (2018). Left-dislocation has often been termed *nominatiuus pendens* in earlier research (e.g., Havers 1926).

> A woman who is dissatisfied with herself and her age needs a mir-
> ror. Why do you need a mirror? You yourself are the best possible
> mirror for the mirror.[2] (Plaut. *Most*. 250–251)

In Roman comedy, Plautus has a large number of left-dislocations and Terence
only a few (72 in Plautus, 5 in Terence). At first glance, this may not be sur-
prising, given that Plautus's style has traditionally been understood as more
colloquial and left-dislocation is a construction typically associated with spo-
ken or informal registers in different languages. However, the matter is not so
simple. Two further aspects, alongside colloquialism, must be considered. First
is the general difference between Plautus and Terence in their use of subordi-
nate clauses and the strategies they employ for constructing periodic sentences
(Eckstein 1921 and 1925; Blänsdorf 1967; see below). In particular, Plautus is
reported to employ subordinate clauses more often in front of their main clauses,
an arguably archaic tendency that could account for the construction in (1), in
which the head noun *mulier* together with the relative clause occurs before the
main clause.

Another, though closely related, aspect relevant to the interpretation of
(1) is Latin relative clause syntax. Cross-linguistically, left-dislocation has no
structural association with relative clauses, but most examples of left-dislocation
in republican Latin contain a relative clause defining the fronted element—for
example, in (1), where *quae se suamque aetatem spernit* defines *mulier*. Certain
factors affecting relative clause syntax in Latin suggest that the occurrence of
left-dislocation may be connected to, or even result from, the attached relative
clause. The problem results from left-dislocation in some cases being identical
to so-called correlative sentences, a construction that goes back to the Indo-
European stage of the language. Correlative sentences feature a sentence-initial
relative clause that is followed by a resumptive element picking up its referent.
To give an example of this ambiguity, when analysed as left-dislocation, (1)
features the fronted noun *mulier*, which is resumed by *ei* in the main clause; on
the other hand, (1) can alternatively be interpreted as a correlative construction,
where *mulier* belongs in the relative clause (as in *quae mulier*) and the whole
phrase *mulier quae* is resumed by *ei* in the main clause. In other words, the rela-

---

[2] Translations of Plautus are from de Melo (2011–2013), those of Terence from Sargeaunt (1964),
both with slight modifications.

tive clauses attested in left-dislocation may not be accidental. An overwhelming majority (62/72) of left-dislocation constructions in Plautus contain a relative clause, as do all 5 examples in Terence.

In sum, considering the high frequency of left-dislocation (with a relative clause) in Plautus and the tendency of Plautus to place subordinate clauses, including (cor)relative ones, in initial position, it is worth investigating whether the latter phenomenon might be the cause of the former. Should this be the case, the occurrence of left-dislocation in Plautus should not be taken as an independent phenomenon, but rather, as concomitant with other syntactic features and possibly as an extension of the correlative clause pattern. Thus, in this article, I use quantitative and qualitative evidence to investigate whether left-dislocation in Plautus is connected to, or even caused by, a general preference for sentence-initial relative clauses of the type seen in (1).

I start by recapitulating studies of Eckstein and Blänsdorf on periodic syntax in Roman comedy (section 2). I then present quantitative evidence for periodic syntax in Roman comedy (section 3) and look at qualitative data on subordinate clauses in initial position (section 4). Finally, I analyse left-dislocation and preposed relative clauses in section 5, followed by conclusions in section 6.

2. Eckstein (1921, 1925) and Blänsdorf (1967) on periodic syntax in Roman comedy

Both Eckstein (1921, 1925) and Blänsdorf (1967) focused on archaic modes of expression in Roman comedy, especially as evidenced in periodic structures, in the expression of complex sequences of events and in causal or temporal chains. While they agree that the periodic style in Terence's comedies is more developed and classical, Eckstein and Blänsdorf expressed differing views on the degree to which Plautus is directly dependent on earlier style in syntactic organization. Eckstein thought that Plautus developed the archaic technique for his own purposes, while Blänsdorf stressed the author's dependency on early style.

According to Eckstein (1921), adding subordinate clauses in a sequence before the main clause is a typically archaic technique for building periods.[3]

---

[3] On the influence of rhetorical style of the Greek originals in Plautus, see Eckstein (1921, 143).

Eckstein collected from Plautus constructions of archaic periodic structures, where combinations of subordinate clauses precede their main clauses, often arranged in 'chronological' order, as if mirroring the chain of events. This feature of early style, visible also in Cato's *De agricultura*, has its roots in the language of legal and official writing. Drawing extensive parallels from the language of early laws, Eckstein (1921, 157) listed 88 examples of such archaic periods in Plautus. Of these 88 constructions, 74 feature two subordinate clauses preceding their main clauses.[4] The rest have three or four such subordinate clauses. Importantly, Eckstein (1921, 168–173) argued that Plautus took over the old Roman technique of building periods but, instead of mechanically reproducing that technique, fashioned it into an effective and unique style of dramatic language (Eckstein 1921, 172 "[E]r hat mit grossem Geschick diese primitive Technik zu einem Mittel der Darstellungskunst umgestaltet"). In other words, Plautus took what at the time was the only available means building periods and modified it, creating a tool that suited his own purposes.

In Terence's comedies, Eckstein (1925, 411) identified 19 such archaic periods, of which the majority have two preceding subordinate clauses and only two contain three such clauses. If we tally the occurrences of these figures in the two corpora, we see that the frequency in Plautus is indeed higher (Plautus with 5.3 constructions per 10,000 and Terence with 3.8 constructions per 10,000 words).[5] This type of calculation can of course only give a very rough estimate of the differences in periodic syntax between the two authors. It must, however, be added that, upon closer investigation, not all of Eckstein's examples would probably stand up scrutiny, as regards either their archaic nature or the textual basis.[6] Nevertheless, given that these figures derive from the work of the same scholar, it is reasonable to assume that, even if not exact, the figures are in any case comparable.

While Eckstein (1925, 414) thought that Terence used the traditional Roman technique more consciously as a stylistic device than did Plautus ("mehr

---

[4] The subordinate clause must minimally precede the matrix clause predicate to be included in this group.

[5] Plautus has 88 examples in a corpus of 165,126 words; Terence has 19 examples in a corpus of 49,903 words. Word counts are taken from the Brepols *Library of Latin Texts*.

[6] It is worth remembering that syntactically complicated passages are often affected by textual corruption — a fact that Eckstein was well aware of.

bewusst und als Stilschattierung"), Blänsdorf (1967) saw things differently, emphasizing that Plautus's periodic style is the inevitable result of cognitive processes that forced the author to express one sequence of events in one long and complicated sentence—something which the author could not have avoided, had he wanted to do so. In other words, where Eckstein saw the deliberate development of a syntactic apparatus that Plautus had inherited from the Roman tradition, Blänsdorf identified a straightforward reflection of archaic thinking. According to Blänsdorf (1967, 25–26), what we see in Terence is a development, first and foremost, in thought, such that a complicated chain of events can be broken down into smaller units, and these in turn elegantly combined with conjunctions. Blänsdorf (1967, 25–26) accepted only two of the 19 archaic periods identified by Eckstein in Terence as genuinely archaic. Furthermore, Blänsdorf (1967, 23) argued that, because Eckstein made no comparison with Ciceronian periods, he overestimated the share of archaic periods in Plautus. Nevertheless, even Blänsdorf acknowledged the existence of such periods in Plautus. Blänsdorf (1967, 26) saw Plautus mainly as a translator who was unable to express the elegant style of his Greek source texts in the form of Latin that was available to him, in a way that, at the same time, would be understandable to his audience. This incapability of Plautus and the language he used can, according to Blänsdorf, be seen in the greater uniformity of and fewer variations in his construction of periods.

3. Sentence length, sentence complexity and preposed subordinate clauses: the quantitative data

Given that there are more examples of extreme constructions with three or four subordinate clauses in Plautus than in Terence, it is worth investigating whether this reflects a general difference in the way sentences are organized in the two writers. Are sentences in Plautus longer or more complex throughout his corpus than they are in Terence's? Do subordinate clauses in Plautus precede their main clauses more often than they do in Terence?

In this section, I assess the numerical data relevant to these questions. The results may, furthermore, shed light on the question of whether we are dealing with a conscious development by Plautus or an overall tendency towards

archaic syntax (see Blänsdorf 1967, 27 and Eckstein 1921, 169–173). If no no-
table difference can be observed between the two authors, I am inclined to con-
clude that the archaic periods observed by Eckstein are used in well-motivated
individual contexts, even if archaic methods are employed there.

        The first aspect to consider concerns the overall share of main clauses
and subordinate clauses. I follow the method of de Melo (2007), where sen-
tence length and complexity in three corpora of early Latin are analysed. These
are Terence's *Eunuchus*, the first book of Lucretius's *De rerum natura* and the
republican metrical inscriptions. De Melo (2007, 103) derives sentence length
("Satzumfang") by dividing the total number of words by the number of main
clauses in each subcorpus. This calculation gives the average number of words
that are governed by a single main clause. This is a not an ideal indicator, given
that the length of sentences especially in comedy typically ranges widely, from
one-word utterances to long sentences. Nevertheless, it is worth calculating this
figure to get a general sense of differences in average sentence length in Plautus
and Terence. In *Table* 1, I give the figure of average sentence length for two
texts, *Eunuchus* of Terence and *Bacchides* of Plautus. For Terence, the figures
are taken from de Melo (2007, 103). For *Bacchides*, I have used the word count
from the Brepols *Library of Latin texts* database.[7] The number of main clauses
derives from a search for all main clauses in the *LASLA Opera Latina* database.[8]

	Plautus, *Bacchides*	Terence, *Eunuchus*
Words	9317	9204
Main clauses	1469	1427
Sentence length	6.34	6.45

Table 1. Sentence length in Bacchides *and* Eunuchus.

Calculated this way, sentence length in the two authors seems to be practically
the same.[9] This means that on average, Plautus does not use longer sentences

---

[7] http://www.brepolis.net/

[8] http://cipl93.philo.ulg.ac.be/OperaLatina/

[9] The word count used by de Melo differs slightly from the figure given by the Brepols *Library of
Latin Texts* database. If we keep the number of main clauses reported for Eunuchus by de Melo and
use the Brepols word count (8960), the result is an average of 6.28 words per sentence. The *LASLA*

than Terence.

Next, I compare the share of subordinate clauses in the same two plays. Again, the figures for Terence are taken from de Melo (2007, 104; "Satzkomplexität"). For *Bacchides*, I have counted the total of subordinate clauses by summing up the figures for different subordinate clause types given in the LASLA *Opera Latina* database.[10] The figure illustrating average sentence complexity has been produced by dividing the number of subordinate clauses by the number of all clauses. In other words, the figure for sentence complexity gives the ratio of subordinate clause to all clauses in each play expressed as a percentage. Thus, the higher the figure, the more subordinate clauses there are per single main clause. [11]

	Plautus, *Bacchides*	Terence, *Eunuchus*
Main clauses	1469	1427
Subordinate clauses	713	668
Total	2182	2095
Sentence complexity	32.33%	31.89%

Table 2. Sentence complexity in Bacchides *and* Eunuchus.

Table 2 shows that, again, no differences can be observed between the two authors. However, if we consider this result together with the existence of several lengthy periods in Plautus and the relative lack of such periods in Terence, it is possible that the subordinate clauses are less evenly distributed within the main clauses in Plautus. In other words, there are likely to be more instances at both extremes in Plautus, main clauses with several subordinate clauses and main clauses without any subordinate clauses.[12]

Opera Latina database does not cover Terence.

[10] For de Melo's criteria on what counts as a main clause and what counts as a subordinate clause, see de Melo (2007, 103 fn. 13). Differences in the classification of individual constructions undoubtedly exist but I assume that, on the whole, the figures are comparable.

[11] All subordinate clauses are of course not governed by a main clause; the matrix clause of a subordinate clause may itself be a subordinate clause.

[12] It should be noted in this connection that, while the republican metrical inscriptions have figures comparable to Terence (and Plautus) in both indicators (de Melo 2007, 104), Lucretius (*De rerum natura I*) has a considerably higher figure for both sentence length (17.26 words) and sentence

As has been pointed out above, in an archaic period, subordinate clauses typically precede their main clauses. Given that Plautus is reported to have more periods built with preceding subordinate clauses, it is relevant to investigate whether subordinate clauses in Plautus precede their main clauses more often than they do in Terence. For this purpose, I report all examples of the three most frequent subordinate clause types in *Bacchides* and *Eunuchus* (*si* clauses, *ut* clauses with final meaning and relative clauses).[13]

	Plautus, *Bacchides*	Terence, *Eunuchus*
si	58.7% (37/63)	57.5% (35/61)
ut (final)	2.2% (2/92)	3.0% (4/132)
qui (relative clause)	19.5% (36/185)	16.9% (31/183)

Table 3. Proportion of preposed subordinate clauses
in Bacchides *and* Eunuchus.

It is notable that, in this respect as well, the picture given by the two authors is nearly identical. Given that, in Eckstein's data on archaic periods, *si* clauses and relative clauses are the most important types, there is no reason to believe that the situation would be decidedly different in the case of other types of subordinate clauses. On the other hand, *ut* clauses with a final meaning typically follow their main clauses, and they do so in both authors.[14] The only type where a difference can be seen is relative clauses, but even there the difference is small (19.5% vs. 16.9%).[15]

So far, then, it has not been possible to connect the difference in period construction with a general difference in sentence length, sentence complexity or proportion of preposed subordinate clauses. Thus, the reported archaic periods in Plautus and Terence do not reflect a measurable difference in syntax. Be-

---

complexity (58.60%).

[13] The data derive from searches in the Brepols *Library of Latin Texts*, wherefrom the counts have been done manually.

[14] Temporal *ut* clauses in Plautus (5 altogether) precede their main clauses, but they have not been included in these figures.

[15] This difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.603).

fore analysing relative clauses in closer detail, I shall next have a look at some of the more extreme combinations of preposed subordinate clauses to determine what causes the differences that arise between Plautus and Terence.

4. Preposed subordinate clauses: some qualitative data

First, we must take into account the greater variation in stylistic levels and sources of language in Plautus. An influence from legal style is often visible in Plautus (Eckstein 1921, 155). One such case can be seen in *Rud*. 810, an example quoted by Eckstein (1921). This passage has been plausibly identified as an imitation of legal style. Here, we see one reason for the preponderance of archaic periods in Plautus: they were not independently formed, but their style and syntax is used for the purposes of parody and to produce a comical effect in particular dramatic and linguistic contexts.

Other cases, not imitating legal style, can also be found. In *Persa* 361, we find a period with four preceding subordinate clauses (see Eckstein 1921, 168–169). The clauses are introduced by *si—etsi—ubi—dum*.

> (2) erus si minatus est malus seruo suo,
> tam etsi id futurum non est, ubi captumst flagrum,
> dum tunicas ponit, quanta afficitur miseria

> If a master has threatened his slave with a beating, how wreched
> is the slave when the whip has been taken, while he's taking off
> his tunics, even if it's not going to happen. (Plaut. *Persa* 361–364)

These lines are uttered by a girl, *uirgo*, to his father, a parasite. The father is about to perform a mock sale of his daughter, against which the daughter here protests. The construction seems to be used as a reflection of the confused state of mind of the girl and her attempt to change her father's mind. Constructions with four preceding subordinate clauses are not common but this is not the only example. If more than one subordinate clause precedes a main clause, one of them is usually a *si* clause, as in (2).

In the next example, from *Pseudolus*, the clauses are introduced by *ut—nisi—quod*:

> (3) ut litterarum ego harum sermonem audio,
> nisi tu illi lacrumis fleueris argenteis,
> quod tu istis lacrumis te probare postulas,
> non pluris refert, quam si imbrem in cribrum geras
>
> As I hear the speech of this letter, unless you cry silver tears for
> her, your wish to ingratiate yourself with her by those tears is of
> no more use than pouring water into a sieve. (Plaut. *Pseud*. 99)

In these lines, Pseudolus wishes to force Calidorus to stop crying and take action instead (see Eckstein 1921, 171). The elaborate period is undoubtedly used here to provoke Calidorus. It seems that Plautus characterized Pseudolus as having an inclination for complicated expressions. Another complicated expression uttered by Pseudolus is cited below in (13). It is likely that this is one of the features by which Plautus depicts his archetype of the clever slave.[16]

I move on now to relative clauses. In Eckstein's data, several of the more extreme combinations of subordinate clauses are constructions with relative clauses, of which an example from the prologue of *Rudens* may be cited (see the discussion in Eckstein 1921, 168 and Blänsdorf 1967, 98)[17]:

> (4) qui falsas litis falsis testimoniis
> petunt quique in iure abiurant pecuniam,
> eorum referimus nomina exscripta ad Iouem;
> cottidie ille scit quis hic quaerat malum
> qui hic litem apisci postulant peiurio
> mali, res falsas qui impetrant apud iudicem,
> iterum ille eam rem iudicatam iudicat

---

[16] For further discussion on Pseudolus, see Halla-aho (2018, 133 and 135).

[17] Blänsdorf (1967, 98) calls the construction in Rud. 17–19 (*qui ... eam rem*) "harte syntaktische Fügung".

> Of those who bring fraudulent cases to court, supported by fraudulent evidence, and of those who deny the receipt of money before a magistrate on oath, we write down the names and bring them back to Jupiter. Every day he learns who is looking for trouble here. If bad people here expect to win a lawsuit by perjury or succeed in pressing false claims before a judge, he judges the judged matter again. (Plaut. *Rud*. 13–19)

In this passage, spoken by Arcturus the star, there are two sentences that begin with relative clause constructions. On line 13, Arcturus talks about people whose evil deeds are reported to Iuppiter. These people are introduced by the autonomous relative clause *qui falsas litis ... petunt* ("people who bring fraudulent cases to court"), which is picked up in the genitive by *eorum referimus nomina exscripta ad Iouem* in the following main clause. The relative clauses that follow (*qui ... postulant* and *qui impetrant*) present a slightly different type of construction. In the main clause, reference is made to *eam rem* instead of the persons just defined (the referent of the relative clause): *iterum ille eam rem iudicatam iudicat*.

Preposed relative clauses where the referent of the relative clause is picked up by a resumptive pronoun in the following matrix clause (as in (4) above, where *qui* is picked up by *eorum*) occur throughout Latin, but they are often associated with archaic syntax.[18] In the language of law and legal writing, preposed relative clauses continue in use as a feature of the established technical style.[19] However, preposed relative clauses are not the main strategy of relative clauses, even in early Latin.

Another example is (5), where the construction is otherwise similar to (4), but instead of having an autonomous relative clause at the beginning, it has a postnominal relative clause with a nominal head. This passage was used as an example of the accumulation of relative clauses in archaic periods by Eckstein (1921).

---

[18] On this type, see Vonlaufen 1974, Clackson and Horrocks (2007, 105), Pompei (2011, 518–519), Probert and Dickey 2016.

[19] See Bertelsmann (1885, 45), Probert and Dickey (2016). Preposed relative clauses can be viewed as Latin continuators of Indo-European correlative sentences, presumably reflecting the original indefinite meaning of the relative pronoun (Hahn 1964, Lehmann 1979, Fruyt 2005, Pompei 2011, 430 and 494, Probert 2014, Probert and Dickey 2016).

(5) tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,
qui incedunt suffarcinati cum libris, cum sportulis,
constant, conferunt sermones inter se drapetae,
opstant, opsistunt, incedunt cum suis sententiis,
quos semper uideas bibentes esse in thermopolio,
ubi quid surrupuere: operto capitulo calidum bibunt,
tristes atque ebrioli incedunt: eos ego si offendero,
ex unoquoque eorum crepitum exciam polentarium
tum isti qui ludunt datatim serui scurrarum in via
et datores et factores omnis subdam sub solum

Then those Greeks in their cloaks, who wander around with their
heads covered, who prance about stuffed with books and food
baskets, who stop and palaver among each other, those runaway
slaves, who stand in your way and block your path, who prance
about with their clever sayings, whom you can always see drink-
ing in the tavern when they've stolen something; with their heads
covered they drink mulled wine and prance about with a grave
expression and drunk. If I meet them, I'll drive the barley-fed
farts out of every single one of them. Then those slaves of the city
bon vivants, who play ball in the street, I'll put all the throwers
and players under the ground. (Plaut. *Curc*. 288–297)

Here Curculio, a parasite, proceeds through the crowd in great haste, at the same
time making disparaging comments about Greek persons and slaves who are
blocking his way without any matter of real import to attend to. He introduces
both groups in nominative followed by relative clauses. The first group, *isti
Graeci palliati ... qui ambulant ... quod semper uideas*, can be construed as the
subject of the following regular main clause *operto capitulo calidum bibunt,
tristes atque ebrioli incedunt*. Formally, this means that the construction is a
standard sentence-initial relative clause. It must be noted, however, that the de-
scription of the Greeks is so long that the subject status of *isti Graeci* on l. 288
(going with *bibunt* and *incedunt* on ll. 293–294) is open to doubt, marked with
a colon in editions (i.e., left-dislocation). These Greeks continue as objects in
the following sentence (l. 293 *eos*). Eckstein's (1921, 169) observation on the

passage is to the point: 'Hier ist die Absicht des Dichters offenbar: Plautus will durch das Auftürmen der Relativ- und Konditionalsätze eine recht drastische Wirkung in der Schilderung der "Graeci palliati" erreichen.' I argue that the syntactic organization in this passage is meant to highlight Curculio's anxious state of mind. [20]

Based on the discussion in this section, I wish to highlight the active role of Plautus as a craftsman of drama. In my view, it is likely that archaic periods were not used mechanically and arbitrarily by Plautus to imitate the source text, resulting in a clumsy period due to an underdeveloped phase of thinking. Rather, Plautus consciously modified and refined the traditional style and, importantly, used it in suitable contexts to produce the desired dramatic and comical effect.

The evidence so far points to the conclusion that, when it comes to subordinate clauses generally preceding their main clauses, the difference between Plautus and Terence may be traced to Plautus's accumulating subordinate clauses in individual passages for dramatic purposes. Sometimes, these come close to being left-dislocations, as (5) above. What role relative clause syntax plays in this will be discussed in the next section.

5. Preposed relative clauses and left-dislocation

Above, it was pointed out that correlative sentences (i.e., preposed relative clauses with explicit resumption) may contribute to the apparent frequency of left-dislocation in Plautus. Such relative clauses are attested in a variety of syntactic patterns, a classification of which is given below (see further Halla-aho 2018, 38–51).

The first type has an autonomous relative clause without a nominal head preceding the main clause,[21] with a resumptive anaphoric in (6) and without a resumptive anaphoric in (7):

---

[20] Blänsdorf (1967, 98) notes on the archaic thought structure of (5) above that, in such contexts, the use of the resumptive demonstrative pronoun *is* is frequent ("recht häufig"), softening the block-like isolation of the subordinate clauses ("der Hang der alten Sprache zur pleonastischen Fülle entspringe also dem Wunsche, Klarheit und Verbindung zu schaffen").

[21] An autonomous relative clause functions at the level of the sentence and may or may not contain a nominal head; see further Pinkster (2012 and forthcoming). I am grateful to Harm Pinkster for allowing me to use a version of the second volume of his *Oxford Latin Syntax* prior to its publication.

Autonomous relative clause without a nominal head, with resumption

>   (6) nam quae indotata est, ea in potestate est uiri
>
>   A wife without dowry is in her husband's power. (Plaut. *Aul*. 534)

Autonomous relative clause without a nominal head, without resumption

>   (7) quae non deliquit, decet
>   audacem esse, confidenter pro se et proterue loqui
>
>   A woman who hasn't done anything wrong ought to be bold and
>   speak confidently and daringly in her own defense. (Plaut. *Amph*.
>   836–837)

The second type is otherwise similar but has a nominal head, with resumption in
(8) and without resumption in (9):
        Autonomous relative clause with an internal nominal head, with resump-
tion

>   (8) quod mihi praedicas uitium, id tibi est
>
>   You have the fault you say I have. (Plaut. *Amph*. 402)

Autonomous relative clause with a nominal (internal) head, without resumption

>   (9) qui homo timidus erit in rebus dubiis, nauci non erit
>
>   Someone who is timid in emergencies won't be a farthing. (Plaut.
>   *Most*. 1041)

When the head noun occurs before the relative pronoun, is external to the rela-
tive clause, and is taken up by a resumptive element, the result is left-disloca-
tion, as in (10):[22]

_____

22 In such constructions, the relative clause is not actually preposed but rather postnominal (Pompei

Adnominal relative clause, with an external nominal head, with resumption[23]

(10) sed gnatum unicum,
quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius, (…)
eum ego hinc eieci miserum iniustitia mea

But my only son, who should have shared the enjoyment equally, I have driven the poor boy out by my injustice? (Ter. *Heaut.* 130–132)

This head-external type also occurs without resumption, in a similar manner to (7) and (9) above; cf. (11):

Adnominal relative clause, with an external nominal head, without resumption

(11) Simul Alcumenae, quam uir insontem probri
Amphitruo accusat, ueni ut auxilium feram

At the same time I've come to bring help to Alcumena, whom her husband Amphitruo is accusing of adultery, even though she's innocent. (Plaut. *Amph.* 869)

The construction in (11) differs from left-dislocation only by the absence of resumption in the matrix clause.

In sum, the constructions with resumptive elements (exs. (6), (8) and (10) above) come in three types. In (6) and (8), the construction either does not have a head noun, as in (6), or the head noun is internal to the relative clause, as

---

2011, 493).

[23] Note that (1) above is ambiguous and can be understood as either a correlative sentence or left-dislocation, as *mulier* is potentially internal to the relative clause, an interpretation that is not viable in the case of (10). There, the head noun, *gnatum unicum*, is unambiguously in extra-clausal position because the relative clause is non-restrictive (i.e., it does not define *gnatum unicum*, whose identity is clear at this point of the play); by definition, such relative clauses cannot be head-internal. It should be emphasized that only a small portion of left-dislocation in comedy are of the type exemplified by (1), meaning that left-dislocation as a whole cannot be explained as simply one type of a correlative sentence.

in (8); these constructions are called correlative sentences. On the other hand, in (10), the head noun is external to the relative clause, and the construction is called left-dislocation. All three constructions have variants without the resumptive element (exs. (7), (9) and (11) above), in which case they are not correlative sentences or examples of left-dislocation.

To find out whether left-dislocation in Plautus is related to his use of correlative clauses, I look next at the frequencies of the different construction types in Plautus and Terence. While there is no difference to be seen when these constructions are tallied (*Table* 3), the situation changes somewhat when they are presented separately. In *Table* 4, I give the type of the construction in the left column and the example number of the relevant construction in the adjacent column. After these follow the number of examples in Plautus, the frequency per 10,000 words in Plautus, the number of examples in Terence, and the frequency per 10,000 words in Terence.[24]

Because the figures are only partially available for the entire corpus, I have calculated the frequency per 10,000 words for all constructions to facilitate comparison. The figures in square brackets are extracted from five plays of Plautus (*Amphitruo, Asinaria, Bacchides, Mostellaria, Pseudolus*) and two plays of Terence (*Heautontimorumenos* and *Eunuchus*).[25] The figures for constructions (8) and (9) are based on Bertelsmann (1885) and represent the whole corpus for both authors. The figure for left-dislocation likewise represents the whole corpus for both authors and has been collected by me.

---

[24] In the fifth row of *Table* 4 (*homo/ille qui … is*), I report only those instances of left-dislocation that are parallel to the other relative clause constructions. In other words, I leave aside left-dislocation without a relative clause and left-dislocation without resumption. On the status of the type *ille qui*, see Halla-aho (2018, 48–51).

[25] The figures for individual plays are as follows: (*qui … is*) *Amphitruo* 6, *Asinaria* 1, *Bacchides* 8, *Mostellaria* 7, *Pseudolus* 6, *Eunuchus* 3, *Heautintimorumenos* 5; (*qui … Ø*) *Amphitruo* 5, *Asinaria* 8, *Bacchides* 18, *Mostellaria* 3, *Pseudolus* 9, *Eunuchus* 12, *Heautontimorumenos* 6; (*homo qui … Ø / ille qui … Ø*) *Amphitruo* 13, *Asinaria* 10, *Bacchides* 5, *Mostellaria* 4, *Pseudolus* 9, *Eunuchus* 8, *Heautontimorumenos* 9.

Type of construction	Example no. above	Plautus examples*	Plautus frequency**	Terence examples*	Terence frequency**
qui … is	(6)	[28]	6.2	[8]	4.1
qui … Ø	(7)	[43]	9.5	[18]	10.1
qui homo … is	(8)	22	1.3	10	2.0
qui homo … Ø	(9)	21	1.3	15	3.0
homo qui … is / ille qui … is	(10)	54	3.3	5	1.0
homo qui … Ø / ille qui … Ø	(11)	[41]	9.0	[17]	9.6

*Table 4. Frequencies of preposed relative clause constructions in Plautus and Terence. * = number of examples, ** = frequency per 10,000 words.*

It can immediately be seen that there is no radical difference between Plautus and Terence in the frequencies of different types of preposed relative clauses. In nearly all categories of both authors, the type without resumption is more frequent than the corresponding one with resumption. Another tendency is that, in Terence, absence of resumption in all categories is more frequent than it is in Plautus. The final two rows in *Table 4*, left-dislocation in (10) and the corresponding construction without resumption in (11), also fit the picture of Terence using resumption less frequently after a preposed relative clause than does Plautus. This indicates that left-dislocation in Plautus may be, at least partly, increased by a general tendency to add a resumptive pronoun after a preposed relative clause.

However, it is in left-dislocation where the biggest difference in frequency between the authors can be observed, over three times as frequent in Plautus as it is in Terence.[26] It is worth considering here some qualitative data. The purpose in doing so is to show that, in Plautus, the preposed relative clause with an antecedent often has a form that is rather far removed from the simple pattern of antecedent—relative clause—resumption. I give two examples:

---

[26] The p value for this difference is the smallest of all the six categories (p=0.0074), with only one of the other categories having a statistically significant difference (p= 0.0087 in type (9)). For the remaining categories, p > 0.1. It is to be noted, however, that, with such a large corpus, even small differences easily turn out to be statistically significant.

> (12) hi qui illum dudum conciliauerunt mihi
> peregrinum Spartanum, id nunc his cerebrum uritur,
> me esse hos trecentos Philippos facturum lucri
>
> Those who a while ago procured that stranger from Sparta for me
> now have an itch in their brains about me making profit of these
> three hundred Philippics. (Plaut. *Poen*. 768–771)

Here, Lycus is talking about the advocates (*hi qui*) and his suspicion that the three hundred Philippics of the fake soldier (*peregrinum Spartanum*) have become an interest to the advocates as well (*his cerebrum uritur*). This complex idea results in a left-dislocation where the advocates are first introduced in the thematic nominative and referred to in the dative in the following main clause.

> (13) em ab hoc lenone uicino tuo
> per sycophantiam atque per doctos dolos
> tibicinam illam tuos quam gnatus deperit,
> ea circumducam lepide lenonem
>
> Here you go: this neighbour of yours, the pimp, I'll wittily swindle him out of that flute girl your son loves through trickery and clever guiles. (Plaut. *Pseud*. 526–529)

Example (13) has a complex syntactic construction that borders on being anacoluthon. The construction is *circumduco* with the person being deceived (*lenonem*, the pimp) in the accusative and the possession (*ea* the girl whom the pimp is going to lose as the result of the trick) in the ablative.

It is possible to adduce some further qualitative evidence to support the existence of left-dislocation as an independent construction. This evidence comes from examples of left-dislocation that do not have a relative clause. In these constructions, the question of interfering relative clause syntax does not arise. Plautus has several (at least ten) such constructions, whereas Terence has none that I know of. These examples can be observed in *hominem … eum* in (14) and *elephanto … ei* in (15).

(14) tamquam hominem, quando animam ecflauit, quid eum quaeras qui fuit?

Like a man who has breathed his last, why would you ask who he was? (Plaut. *Persa* 638)

(15) edepol uel elephanto in India quo pacto ei pugno praefregisti bracchium

Or take the elephant in India, how you broke its arm with your fist. (Plaut. *Mil*. 25–26)

Although left-dislocation without relative clause is rather limited even in Plautus, the existence of these constructions shows that left-dislocation in Latin is independent from relative clause syntax.

6. Concluding remarks

This study has shown that the differences in periodic technique between Plautus and Terence concern more individual passages than overall syntactic composition. Based on the evidence from one comedy from each author, I conclude that, on average, sentence length and complexity are similar in the two authors. Although Plautus shows more extreme forms of accumulating subordinate clauses before the main clause, this appears to be limited to those instances and does not reflect a general tendency to use either longer sentences or sentences with more subordinate clauses. Likewise, the passages of archaic periods that have two or more subordinate clauses are not linked to any overall preference for placing subordinate clauses before their main clauses. The figures used as indicators of these three features (sentence length, sentence complexity, and proportion of preposed subordinate clauses) do not differ meaningfully between the two authors.

A closer view was taken on preposed relative clauses. This clause type presents much internal variation concerning the presence and placement of the antecedent of the relative pronoun. One type of such relative clauses can be

defined as left-dislocation. This construction features an external antecedent of the relative pronoun and a following anaphoric resumption in the matrix clause. Plautus has a demonstrably higher frequency of such constructions. Given the association of preposed relative clauses and following anaphorics with archaic syntax and correlative clauses, I investigated whether the frequency of left-dislocation in Plautus might be due to an inclination to use resumptive anaphoric pronouns generally after preposed relative clauses.

The result is that Plautus does indeed use resumptive pronouns more often than Terence in these contexts. However, the difference is not radical. Moreover, it seems that, in Plautus, left-dislocation constructions often cannot be described in a simple framework of correlative clauses, containing, as they do, much variation in their syntax. Therefore, I conclude that left-dislocation in Plautus is a mixed category, reflecting both the use of resumptive anaphorics after preposed relative clauses, and a predilection for what might termed genuine left-dislocation. The difference in the number of left-dislocation constructions cannot be attributed only to the correlative clause type with resumptive anaphoric pronouns. Left-dislocation appears to belong to the idiosyncratic style of Plautus rather than to an archaic state of the language.

In my view, left-dislocation is not itself an archaic feature (unlike the correlative sentence), and should be identified in Latin as a construction with an independent existence, not merely an extension of the correlative sentence, though overlapping and interacting with it. While Plautus's style is conventionally thought to be more archaic and colloquial, it is also more exuberant and more complicated than the classical, elegant and natural Terence. My findings should be seen as supportive evidence for this tendency, an inclination towards a rather complicated expression for artistic and comical purposes, reserved, nonetheless, for individual passages. I thus do not consider the constructions discussed in this article to be typical constructions in actual conversations. Their sources may lie in spoken language, but the constructions we see in the comedies are artistic creations in their own right.

As for the differences in opinion between Eckstein and Blänsdorf, Plautus's use of correlative clauses and other preposed relative clause constructions, including left-dislocation as an important component, supports Eckstein's view that Plautus was an active developer of his linguistic style. It is true that Plautus

is often more archaic, but this should not be taken to mean that he simply reproduced the early periodic style.

University of Helsinki

References

K. Bertelsmann 1885. Über die verschiedenen Formen der *Correlation in der Structur der Relativsätze des* ältern *Latein*, Diss. Jena.

J. Blänsdorf 1967. *Archaische Gedankengänge in den Komödien des Plautus*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

J. Clackson - G. Horrocks 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*, Malden: Blackwell.

F. Eckstein 1921. "Syntaktische Beiträge zu Plautus", *Philologus* 31, 142–173.

F. Eckstein 1925. "Neue Untersuchungen zu Plautus und Terenz", *Philologus* 34, 410–436.

W. D. C. de Melo 2007. "Zur Sprache der republikanischen *carmina Latin epigraphica*", in P. Kruschwitz (ed.) *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 97–120.

W. D. C. de Melo 2011–2013. *Plautus. Vol. I–V. Edited and translated by Wolfgang de Melo*, Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

E. A. Hahn 1964. "Relative and antecedent", *TAPhA* 95, 111–141.

H. Halla-aho 2018. *Left-Dislocation in Latin. Topics and Syntax in Republican Texts*. Leiden: Brill.

W. Havers 1926. "Der sog. Nominativus pendens", *IF* 43, 207–257.

M. Fruyt 2005. "La corrélation en latin: définition et description", in P. de Carvalho - F. Lambert (eds.) *Structures parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin*, Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 17–44.

K. Lambrecht 2001. "Dislocation", in M. Haspelmath - E. Konig - W. Oesterreicher - W. Raible (eds.) *Language Typology and Language Universals, Volume 2*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1050–1078.

Ch. Lehmann 1979. "Der Relativsatz vom Indogermanischen bis zum Italienischen", *Die Sprache* 25, 1–23.

J. Penney 2011. "Archaic and old Latin", in J. Clackson (ed). *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 220–235.

H. Pinkster 2012. "Relative clauses in Latin: Some problems of description", in P. da
        Cunha Corrêa *et al*. (eds.) *Hyperboreans*: *Essays in Greek and Latin Poetry, Phi-
        losophy, Rhetoric and Linguistics*, São Paulo: Humanitas, Capes, 377–392.

H. Pinkster forthcoming. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume II.* Oxford: Oxford University
        Press.

A. Pompei 2011. "Relative clauses", in Ph. Baldi - P. Cuzzolin (eds.) *New perspectives
        on Latin Historical Syntax, Volume 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization,
        Typology*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 427–547.

Ph. Probert 2014. "Relative clauses, Indo-Hittite and Standard Average European", in S.
        W. Jamison - C. Melchert - B. Vine (eds.) *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA
        Indo-European Conference*, Bremen: Hempen, 137–64.

Ph. Probert and E. Dickey 2016. "Six notes on Latin correlatives", in J. N. Adams - N.
        Vincent (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?*, Cambridge: Cam-
        bridge University Press, 390–419.

J. Sargeaunt 1964. *Terence with an English translation by John Sargeaunt in two vol-
        umes: I The Lady of Andros, The Self-tormentor, The Eunuch. II Phormio, The
        Mother-in-law, The Brothers*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.

J. Vonlaufen 1974. *Studien über die Stellung und Gebrauch des lateinischen Relativsatz-
        es unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Lukrez*, Freiburg: Universitätsverlag
        Freiburg/Schweiz.