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Preface

The origins of this book lie in my doctoral thesis on non-literary Latin letters. In that study, I encountered syntactic and pragmatic phenomena that seemed to lack a proper description in Latin. A wish to provide such a description prompted the idea for this project. I began and completed the main part of the research during a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Helsinki.

The result is an old-fashioned book on a modern topic. By ‘old-fashioned’, I mean that the philological approach that lies at the heart of the study involves collecting a comprehensive collection of examples and studying each example in its context. By ‘modern’, I am referring to recent interest in information structure and its influence on linguistic expression. This is not to say that earlier generations were not interested in such things—quite the contrary. Much of the critical research on this topic was written in the late 19th and early 20th century, though studies from this time naturally used different terminology.

I wish to thank the following people for help of various kinds over the years: Josine Schrickx for helping to acquire old literature, Harm Pinkster, Wolfgang de Melo, Philomen Probert and Jim Adams for granting access to (at the time) unpublished work, Jaakko Leino for offering useful discussions and references and Heikki Solin for help with the curse tablets. I owe a special thanks to Timo Korkiakangas for reading through earlier versions of all chapters and offering critical remarks that greatly helped me improve the overall readability and argumentation of the work.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In this introductory chapter, I outline what I mean by left-dislocation (1.1) and present its distribution in Latin texts (1.2). In section 1.3, I address a specific syntactic aspect of left-dislocation in Latin. This is followed by a presentation of the corpus of republican Latin used in this study (1.4) and, finally, a short description of other similar constructions in early Latin (1.5).

1.1 What Is Left-Dislocation? The Aims and Coverage of This Study

The term left-dislocation refers to the construction seen in (1):

(1) plerique homines, quos cum nil refert pudet, ubi pudendum est, ibi eos deserit pudor.

Plaut. Epid. 166–167

‘Most people who are ashamed when there’s nothing for them to be shamed about, their sense of shame escapes them, when there is something about which they ought to be ashamed.’

The expression in (1) begins with the noun phrase plerique homines, ‘most people'. After the intervening relative clause quos cum nil refert pudet, the initial noun phrase is taken up by the anaphoric pronoun eos in the main clause. In other words, the same referent is expressed twice in this utterance: first, in a detached position at the start of the sentence and, again, as a pronominal phrase within the main clause. The construction seems immediately familiar at least in English, as seen in the easiness of the word-for-word translation (‘most people—them’). A comparison with the English translation suggests that the use of the anaphoric pronoun eos in the main clause is present to highlight the role of plerique homines in the sentence. The construction brings plerique homines to the fore, introducing it as the entity about which the following predication tells us something. The main clause, on the other hand, ubi pudendum est, ibi eos deserit pudor (‘their sense of shame escapes them, when there

---

1 Translation adapted from de Melo (2011).
is something about which they ought to be ashamed’) describes what is said about ‘most people’ (plerique homines).

Left-dislocation is thus a syntactic construction that typically comprises two parts:
1) The first part is a nominal or pronominal phrase that occurs in an extra-clausal position to the left of the clause to which it belongs.
2) The second part is a syntactically complete clause, whereby the initial phrase is usually (but not necessarily) taken up by a co-referent anaphoric expression.

The initial nominal phrase plerique homines is extra-clausal, since it is not part of the following sentence—in this case, the main clause ubi pudendum est, ibi eos deserit pudor. That it is not a member of the main clause can be seen from the fact that the main clause contains an element (eos) that is co-referent with plerique homines and that performs the same syntactic function as plerique homines does, being the object of the main clause predicate deserit. The term ‘dislocated constituent’ is used to describe the initial extra-clausal constituent—plerique homines, in the above passage. The co-referent element in the main clause is called a resumptive element, and it is typically an anaphoric pronoun.

Left-dislocation is a phenomenon that is often mentioned (in one form or another) in commentaries and studies on early Latin. However, a detailed description and analysis of the phenomenon in Latin is still lacking. This is a gap that this book aims to fulfil. The following questions will be addressed:
1) Which syntactic forms of left-dislocation are attested in the republican (pre-classical) Latin corpus?
2) How is the occurrence of left-dislocation determined? Is left-dislocation in Latin, as it is usually claimed, pragmatically conditioned and, if so, which discourse functions does it perform?

The present research is based on a comprehensive corpus of examples from republican Latin. The corpus of texts that has been used in the analysis covers all republican Latin until the classical period meaning all texts until Cicero and Caesar. In addition, Sallust and Varro are included outside of this temporal frame due to their archaizing tendencies.

The decision to discuss in this study only republican Latin is supported by two considerations. First of all, in the later period Latin was affected by a number of changes in its case system and syntactic organization, and the extent to

---

2 Despite its name, deriving originally from the generative tradition, the term is used in recent non-generative literature and does not imply any movement or displacement in the generative sense (Lambrecht 2001: 1051).
which the written evidence reflects the spoken reality becomes more complicated. In late Latin evidence, questions of competence in standard Latin and the ever-growing variety of non-standard constructions hinder the definition and analysis of left-dislocation. By concentrating on republican Latin I hope to be able to show that this construction existed in Latin from an early period onward and was not simply a curiosity that emerged in a period of increasing syntactic irregularity. The second reason is of a more practical nature. In late Latin, the mass and variety of textual evidence becomes too vast to be handled in a single study.

The corpus of pre-classical Latin is very heterogeneous in its genre and text type. This fact will largely determine the shape this discussion will take. Comedy, which practically means Plautus, is, by far, the wealthiest witness for left-dislocation in Latin. The range of constructions in Plautus both quantitatively and qualitatively surpasses all other texts as a source of dislocation constructions. Other major parts of the corpus are inscriptions and prose texts. These latter two groups of texts will supplement the picture of left-dislocation that can be formed on the basis of Plautine comedy. The material is heterogeneous in terms of the syntactic forms that left-dislocation takes. Therefore, certain aspects of definition as well as description will need to be sensitive to context and genre.

The term left-dislocation is not usually found in studies that analyse the material discussed in this book. The standard grammars have nothing on a phenomenon called left-dislocation. This does not mean, however, that the phenomenon does not exist in Latin or that no studies have been written on it. For example, in the standard reference grammars Hofmann and Szantyr (1965) and Kühner and Stegmann (1971), the phenomenon here called left-dislocation can be found in two sections, those on nominatiuus pendens and attractio inuersa. The same applies to specialized studies written on the subject, in which usually one of these two constructions (nominatiuus pendens or attractio inuersa) is discussed.

In addition to nominatiuus pendens and attractio inuersa, constructions that can be analysed as left-dislocation have been called anacoluthon, prolepsis, nominatiuus absolutus, hanging case, fronting and an abundant use of pronouns. It is true that certain examples of left-dislocation lend themselves to more than one interpretation. These alternative analyses will be discussed at appropriate places. There is an overlap especially in the category of anacoluthon, resulting largely from the broad definition (or lack of definition) of this

---

3 See section 2.3 for previous studies on the topic.
concept. In the Functional Grammar framework, the constructions here called left-dislocation have been called ‘Theme constituents’. Theme constituents are described in Functional Grammar in practically the same way as I do left-dislocation.

Left-dislocation is defined syntactically, albeit assumed to be largely motivated pragmatically, so we will need to define the syntactic forms we are looking for in our republican Latin corpus. The traditional term *nominatiuus pendens* (the ‘hanging nominative’) refers to an independent constituent in the nominative preceding the main clause, where a co-referent resumptive element occurs in the grammatical case required by the main clause predicate.

Example (2) presents such a construction: the initial element *mulier* is in the nominative case, and the anaphoric pronoun follows in the dative.

(2)  
*mulier quae se suamque aetatem spernit*, speculo *ei* usus est  
quid opust speculo tibi quae tute speculo speculum es maxumum?  

*Plaut. Most. 250–251*

‘A woman who is dissatisfied with herself and her age needs a mirror. Why do you need a mirror? You yourself are the best possible mirror for the mirror.’

This construction, similar to (1) above, contains a relative clause (*quae se suamque aetatem spernit*). Left-dislocation without an accompanying relative clause, as in (3), is also attested in Latin:

(3)  
*pater tuos, is erat frater patruelis meus,*  
et *is me heredem fecit quom suom obiit diem,*  
quo *me priuatum aegre patior mortuo.*  

*Plaut. Poen. 1069–1071*

‘Your father, he was my first cousin, and he made me his heir when he passed away: it’s hard for me to be deprived of him through his death.’

In (2) and (3), the initial elements *mulier* and *pater* are in the nominative and are thus classifiable as *nominatiuus pendens* in the traditional terminology. Left-dislocation, however, also includes constructions where the initial element is in some other case form. This is most often the accusative, as in (4):

---

4 Translations of Plautus are from de Melo (2011–2013).
In (4), the initial element *istos captiuos* agrees in case with the co-referent element in the main clause (the anaphoric pronoun in the accusative, *is*) as well as with the relative pronoun in the accusative (*quos*). It is easy to understand what caused even *istos captiuos* to appear in the accusative: it anticipates its syntactic role in the following clauses.

On the other hand, there are constructions where the initial element is not taken up by a resumptive element in the main clause. In these instances, the fact that the initial element is not a member of the following clause can be seen only from the case disagreement between the initial element and its role in the following clause. An example is (5):

(5) *eunuchum quem* dedisti nobis quas turbas *dedit*

*Ter.* *Eun.* 653

‘That eunuch you gave us, pretty trouble he’s caused us!’

In this construction, *eunuchum* is the subject of *dedit* but appears in the accusative. The motivation for this is usually assumed to lie in the accusative case of the following relative pronoun *quem*, and the construction is called an attraction (*attractio inversa*). Constructions that have no anaphoric element in the following clause are defined as left-dislocation because of the break in the syntactic structure caused by case disagreement.

---

5 Translations of Terence are from Sargeaunt (1964).
6 This attraction is called ‘inverse’, because, in ‘normal’ attraction, the opposite takes place, with the relative pronoun attracted to the case of its head (*attractio relatiui*). *Attractio relatiui* is a well-known construction in Greek, but in Latin the phenomenon is highly restricted and seems not to have been a native construction. Instead, *attractio inversa* is usually mentioned as a typical Latin construction. The construction in (5) is open to several interpretations, for which see 2.2.4 and 3.2.1.3.
1.2 Genre, Text Type and Register

Left-dislocation (abbreviated LD) is attested in a wide selection of languages, and it has been the object of a number of studies in recent years. Cross-linguistically, left-dislocation is a construction that typically occurs in informal spoken conversation (Lambrecht 1994: 182; Geluykens 1992; Gregory and Michaelis 2001: 1679). This means that its occurrence in a corpus language is subject to many restrictions. We do not have any spoken data and even the written corpus consists mainly of genres and text types that do not represent spoken conversation. Against this background, it is hardly surprising that the construction is found in considerable numbers in Roman comedy (Plautus). An explanation that draws on the cross-linguistic tendency of left-dislocation to appear in spoken and informal varieties seems, at least at first glance, to be compatible with the large number of attestations of left-dislocation in comedy.

On the other hand, the point has been raised that we should be wary of hastily associating left-dislocation with a colloquial style or imperfect performance of the language user (Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt 2005: 17–21; partly as a reaction to Mayer 2005 in the same volume). Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt stress that syntactic irregularities may be the result of several factors, not all which have anything to do with colloquialism. An apparent irregularity may well have been motivated by its context or be indicative of a transitional stage of the language. Therefore, a category like ‘colloquial’ is not an adequate description. Indeed, it will be argued in this study that even in comedy the matter of syntactic irregularity—and left-dislocation as part of that—is more complex than a simple reflection of spoken syntax.

Left-dislocation in early Latin appears in genres and text types that are rather far from each other by all indicators. Alongside comedy, we have examples of left-dislocation from prose texts and inscriptions, all of which have provided examples cited in previous studies on nominatiuus pendens and attractio inuersa. This distribution would seem to suggest that left-dislocation is indeed a phenomenon common to all early Latin notwithstanding the genre. However, at the same time, this raises a question concerning the origin and motivation of such constructions. It is, at least in principle, possible to extend the ‘spoken language explanation’ to include the prose writers Cato and Varro if we suppose

---

7 Geluykens (1992: 33–34) shows that, in his English data comprising four different categories (spoken conversational, spoken non-conversational, written printed, written unprinted), the frequency of left-dislocation is highest in spoken conversation (note, however, the absolute numbers are low, N = 29, of which 25 are in spoken conversation).
that, in the early phase of the written tradition and before the emergence of a more refined stylistic equipment, Latin (not unlike languages generally) was what might be termed a vernacular variety and closer to a spoken language than it became later in its linguistic history.

Nevertheless, this explanation runs into difficulties when epigraphic texts are taken into consideration. They consist mainly of legal texts, which by their very nature are written in the opposite of spoken and informal or vernacular language. Even more importantly, they are undoubtedly products of a long and specialized tradition of legal writing, where postulating any sort of straightforward influence of spoken practices or vernacular syntax is completely unjustified. The detailed syntactic analysis carried out in this book is needed to explain this distribution. It will be shown that different types of relative clauses across the corpus constitute one essential factor.

Given the strong association between left-dislocation and informal spoken conversation, it may be surprising that studies on left-dislocation in other corpus languages and in written evidence are not lacking. For instance, Tizón-Couto (2012) has studied on left-dislocation in Late Modern English (18th and 19th centuries), and Westbury (2014) has studied left-dislocation in Biblical Hebrew. The reasons why the construction is found in historical evidence despite its informal status may differ from one language to another. In Biblical Hebrew, the construction is grammaticalized to a higher degree than in many other languages (including Latin, but note that Westbury works with a highly inclusive definition of LD). Tizón-Couto’s (2012) sources vary in their genre and text type but include dramatic dialogue, which has the highest frequency of left-dislocation. In Latin, too, the dramatic language of Plautus is the main witness for this construction.

Left-dislocation is a globally attested phenomenon (for one list of studies on individual languages, see Tizón-Couto 2012: 19 fn. 2—to this should be added Westbury’s [2014] study of Biblical Hebrew). The form, role and frequency of left-dislocation vary across languages (cf. Gundel and Fretheim 2009: 155). In most European languages, LD is considered non-standard and is therefore used mainly in spoken and informal varieties. Among Indo-European languages, French stands out with its relatively unconstrained use of the construction, especially in spoken and non-standard varieties (Lambrecht 1981; Barnes 1985). As for its function, left-dislocation is cross-linguistically associated with topics. In certain languages (often called topic-prominent, like Japanese), the expression of topics with left-dislocation is, to some degree, grammaticalized. Recently, however, it has been claimed that LD does not only serve to activate topics but that it may even be used to express the focus function as well (Yamaizumi 2011; Westbury 2014).
My approach in this study is a combination of philological and linguistic perspectives. The purpose is to identify patterns (both syntactic and pragmatic) and to find out where, how and why they were used. This approach is based on the idea that, across different time periods and in different contexts of writing, the acceptability of left-dislocation varied.\textsuperscript{8} Left-dislocation is a simple and practical device to (re)introduce a referent and to make a predication about it in the same sentence. However, as syntactic means and stylistic ideals evolved toward an overall government and balanced dependencies between the different parts of the sentence, left-dislocation, with its ‘hanging’ element, was felt probably to be too loose in its syntactic arrangement. As such, it may have been associated with an archaic style.

Left-dislocation was never very frequent in Latin, and it was used only in certain restricted contexts in pre-classical Latin. In classical Latin, left-dislocation was largely avoided. It does, however, make a sporadic appearance even in Cicero and elsewhere in classical and later literary Latin, and there are clear indications of continuation especially in certain genres (Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 105) and even more generally in late Latin (Halla-aho 2016).\textsuperscript{9} The extant examples in the classical period seem to fit the general pattern (Halla-aho 2016).

1.3 Left-Dislocation and Relative Clauses

It will be argued that the different types of constructions illustrated above can meaningfully be described together and that left-dislocation offers a useful framework for such a description. However, because a considerable part of the corpus contains a relative clause, the study of Latin left-dislocation cannot be accomplished without taking into account Latin relative clause syntax. Indeed, because of the frequency of relative clauses in these constructions and the history of the Latin relative clause, the whole phenomenon has often been discussed as caused by relative clause syntax.\textsuperscript{10} The perspective of left-dislocation has been secondary in most of the research so far. In the present study, the aim

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Cf. Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 18): ‘The detached nominative remained available for those who wanted to exploit it, but not all writers chose to do so.’
\item \textsuperscript{9} For evidence of the decline of left-dislocation, together with correlative sentences in late Latin and the agricultural genre, see Probert and Dickey (2016).
\item \textsuperscript{10} This is largely because \textit{attractio inversa} has been defined to include the nominative; see 2.2.4.
\end{itemize}
is to integrate these two perspectives to produce a balanced analysis where neither of the two approaches is neglected.

The definitional problems related to relative clauses in connection with LD have to do with the following two issues: the placement of the head noun and the role of the anaphoric element in the main clause. The first of these can be illustrated by looking back at example (2). That passage, if interpreted as left-dislocation, contains, first, an independent nominative, then a relative clause, and, finally, the main clause: *mulier, quae se suamque aetatem spernit, speculo ei usus est*. Commas here mark the clause boundaries. On the other hand, due to the history of the Latin relative clause, another interpretation is possible: the head noun *mulier* could be seen as belonging to the relative clause, not the main clause. The construction in this case is *mulier quae se suamque aetatem spernit, speculo ei usus est*. Relative clauses where the head noun follows the relative pronoun (*quae mulier*) are generally attested in Latin. Example (2) is formally ambiguous between these two interpretations. However, in example (4), a demonstrative pronoun (*istos*) modifies the head noun of the relative pronoun (*captiuos*), making it incompatible with the alternative interpretation (viz., head noun *mulier* belongs in the relative clause) that was possible in the case of (2).

Another issue is with the role of the anaphoric element in the main clause. Due to the history of relative clauses, it is possible to take the anaphoric expression in the main clause as part of relative clause syntax (i.e., the correlative clause). This approach assumes that the construction consists of two parts, the ‘relative part’ (*mulier quae*) and the ‘correlative part’ (*ei usus est*). In this interpretation, the anaphoric pronoun does not indicate a break in the syntactic structure (see section 2.2) that would justify an analysis as left-dislocation.

There are three potential approaches to these problems. The first is that all constructions with relative clauses should be explained as relative clause phenomena. This perspective stresses the historical development, linking Latin constructions primarily with Indo-European correlative sentences, either as their direct descendants or as influenced by them in an analogical process, whereby the preposed relative clause pattern included an anaphoric element in the governing clause, regardless of the exact status of the head noun. Adopting this perspective has the consequence that, in fact, left-dislocation in Latin (according to this interpretation, a construction necessarily without a relative clause) is a highly restricted phenomenon.

The second possibility is to subsume all examples under the phenomenon known as left-dislocation and maintain that the occurrence of relative clauses is strictly coincidental. On a theoretical level, it is possible that there are factors in the context of the Latin constructions that favour the appearance of
relative clauses. For example, one might claim that, because we are dealing with written texts, the dislocated constituent typically needs to be securely identified in context and that relative clauses are employed as such anchoring devices.

The third possibility is to accept that this phenomenon in Latin results from a combination of both factors, relative clause syntax and left-dislocation. By doing so, one can appreciate both the historical perspective of the correlative clauses and the synchronic perspective of left-dislocation. It is this third approach that will be adopted in this study. I hope to show that both perspectives are needed to gain a better understanding of this phenomenon in Latin. Analysing the constructions in the framework of left-dislocation will enable the study of their discourse functions. By incorporating the relative clause perspective, it will be possible to offer a description that is also historically sound. The frequency and importance of relative clauses vary across the corpus. This means that the focus of the discussion will shift according to the demands of each part of the corpus. For the sake of convenience, I shall use the umbrella term 'left-dislocation' in this study to refer to constructions seen in (1)–(5). This is done with the above considerations in mind and respecting the fact that the phenomenon owes much to relative clause syntax.

1.4 The Republican Latin Corpus

In this book, I discuss a comprehensive corpus of left-dislocation in republican Latin, covering all extant texts in republican Latin up to Cicero and Caesar but including Varro and Sallust. This temporal frame is motivated by the following considerations.

First, with the development of the classical prose style, Latin syntax was advancing to a state in which syntactic ‘irregularities’ motivated by spoken practices were disfavoured. Furthermore, relative clause syntax, an integral part of early Latin left-dislocation, was in a state of change toward the classical period, whether it was due a general drift towards right-branching structures or as a part of general stylistic development. The consequence of these changes is that, in classical prose (literary or documentary), left-dislocation appears infrequently. This is not entirely unexpected, as left-dislocation is infrequent in the stylized written or literary register of any language (unless it is grammaticalized). Instead of dislocation, later prose style favours, for example, prepositional phrases with *de* and clausal topical expressions introduced by *quod*. This combined with the fact that left-dislocation was never (not even in early Latin) a regular expression for topic promotion results in a situation...
TABLE 1 Left-dislocation in republican Latin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Occurrences of LD</th>
<th>Chapter, discussed in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican inscriptions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato (De agricultura)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other early prose</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where left-dislocation becomes nearly non-existent for some authors by the time of classical Latin.

Second, left-dislocation is typically an early Latin phenomenon. One reason for this is the exceptional nature of Plautine dramatic dialogue. Without Plautus, we would not know much about Latin left-dislocation. LD continues to appear infrequently through the postclassical period.

It is an oft-made claim that, in late Latin, the LD construction resurfaces in greater quantities. This has been attributed to a submerged continuity between early and late Latin. However, I have argued elsewhere that it is not possible to talk about genuine continuity. Rather, LD in Latin is a phenomenon that belongs more to discourse than to syntax. As such, it is not inherited from one state of the language to another (Halla-aho 2016). Bortolussi and Sznajder (2014) point out that there is no direct continuity from Latin to old French, either.

As for the classical period, it must be mentioned that the classical prose authors Cicero and Caesar are in clearly different categories when it comes to their use of left-dislocation. Caesar’s style does not allow much freedom in this respect. There are practically no examples of LD. Cicero, on the other hand, has occasional examples where they suit his style and purpose (especially in his letters).

In table 1, I summarize the sources of republican Latin covered in this study and the number of left-dislocations each source provides.

I have divided the corpus into three groups, each of which is discussed in a separate chapter.

The first and most important group is comedy (Chapter 3). Nearly all material in comedy comes from Plautus. This is not a surprise, given the associa-
tion between LD and spoken or informal registers and that Plautus is usually thought to be the closest witness to spoken conversation in republican Latin. This does not mean, however, that we could treat Plautine dialogue as a faithful representation of spoken Latin. Generally speaking, dramatic dialogue has a special place as the source of syntactic phenomena in historical data. Görllach (2001: 210, cited in Tizón-Couto 2012: 28), writing on fictional dialogue in plays, notes that such interactions are carefully constructed and, therefore, much more coherent and linguistically denser than ordinary unmonitored conversations tend to be. The author employs fictional interactions to characterize speakers, ‘which can result in higher degrees of stereotyping and memorable idiosyncrasies produced for certain effects than in normal life’, that ‘they are also determined by rules of rhetoric and literary traditions’; however, ‘authors must apparently retain a modicum of real-life plausibility to make their texts—whether performed or read—acceptable.’ Geluykens (1992: 34–35) notes that, in English printed written discourse, left-dislocation is most frequently seen in pseudo-conversational parts—i.e., fictional quotes.

It is of some interest to compare the frequency of left-dislocation in different data sets. Geluykens (1992: 34) reports a frequency of 2.0 instances of LD per 5,000 words in spoken conversation (data taken from the Survey of English Usage). This would give an average of 4.0 instances per 10,000 words. Gregory and Michaelis (2001: 1678–1679) extracted 187 instances of LD from a corpus of 250,000 words, yielding a frequency of 7.48 LD per 10,000 words. Tizón-Couto (2012: 26 and 143) reports an overall frequency of 2.97 LD per 10,000 words in his corpus of 2,004,990 words of Late Modern English. This figure is based on an inclusive definition—e.g., including if clauses and -ing absolutes. The categories LD proper and listing LD (Tizón-Couto 2012: 142–147), which correspond more or less to my definition of LD in republican Latin, give the frequencies 1.01 for LD proper and 0.12 for listing LD.

The number of words in Plautus amounts to 165,607 (numbers extracted from Brepols Library of Latin Texts). My corpus has 72 instances of left-dislocation from Plautus. This gives a frequency of 4.3 LD per 10,000 words. The figure for Plautus is roughly the same as Geluykens’s figure for spoken con-

---

11 Gregory and Michaelis (2001: 1678) used the syntactically parsed portion of the Switchboard Telephone Speech Corpus, which consists of telephone conversations between unacquainted adults.

12 In Tizón-Couto’s study, $N = 597$ for the whole corpus, $N = 204$ for LD proper and $N = 24$ for listing LD. Westbury (2014) reports 93 prototypical examples in Biblical Hebrew, which corresponds more or less to the definition of LD adopted in this study.

versation in English. In Cato’s *De agricultura*, on the other hand, there are 21 examples in merely 16,026 words, which gives a frequency of 13.1 LD per 10,000 words. Considering that the texts of Plautus and Cato are 2,200-year-old written data, the frequency seems surprisingly high.\(^\text{14}\)

In addition to Plautus and Terence, I discuss examples from Lucretius in section 3.7.

The second part of the material consists of epigraphic texts. The largest part of these comes from laws and other texts of legal nature (the Roman statutes, *Lex Puteolana*, *Sententia Minuciorum*, *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*), but, in this context, I will also discuss other epigraphic evidence. These texts are investigated in Chapter 4.

Finally, the third part of the corpus is republican prose (chapter 5). The two most important authors here are Cato and Varro. In addition, occasional examples are found in Sallust, *Bellum Africum* and the fragments of the republican historians and orators.

The corpus of LD that this study is based on has been assembled manually using different methods depending on the nature of each part of the corpus and previous research available in each case. For Plautus and Terence, the corpus has been assembled mainly by retrieving examples from earlier studies (Bertelsmann 1885; Bach 1888; Havers 1926). Of these, Bach (1888) and Bertelsmann (1885) together provide a nearly complete coverage of examples with relative clauses for comedy. Bach studied only *attractio inuersa*, but, due to his definition of the construction, the study yields examples also to the corpus of *nominatiuus pendens*.\(^\text{15}\) The main problem with Bach and Bertelsmann is that both are old and, because of that, were dependent on now-outdated editions. Thus, while both studies contain examples that have to be discarded, the actual problem is that we do not know how many examples they have missed, because the texts they used did not have them.

Havers (1926) collected a small corpus of *nominatiuus pendens*, but he does not claim to have a full coverage of the material. He included examples both with and without a relative clause, but he did not include combinations of nominative (dislocation) + nominative (main clause) because of his view that these are not isolated (extra-clusual).

\(^{14}\) In Varro, the frequency is 2.0 and in Lucretius 1.0 per 10,000 words. For the inscriptions, counting would be unreasonable because of the difficulty of determining the corpus as well as the impossibility in practice, because there is no information on the total number of words of all Latin inscriptions.

\(^{15}\) Bach (1888) includes the nominative attraction; see 2.2.4 and 3.2.1.3.
Because of this, it is possible that there are examples without a relative clause (either in the nominative or in other cases) that I have missed, because nobody has claimed to have collected them. To make up for this apparent lack of data, I have performed checks for both Plautus and Terence to ensure the best possible coverage. For Plautus, I have done this by checking all occurrences of the pronoun *is* in his works. This is the most frequently used pronoun in the main clause resumption. These checks provided a couple of new examples. Terence only has a handful of examples of left-dislocation reported in previous research. Therefore, the probability of finding many more examples in his comedies was restricted to begin with. For this purpose, I have checked all instances of the most common resumptive pronominal forms *is, ei* and *eum*. This check did not provide any new examples. Nevertheless, we must remember that forms of *is* are likely to have been subject to corruption and variation in the manuscripts and, therefore, absolute certainly about these is impossible to gain. For example, I have included in my corpus of LD in Plautus a construction where the dislocation is the result of editorial correction (Plaut. *Poen.* 64–67 *sed illi seni qui mortuost, ⟨ei⟩ filius unicus qui fuerat*).

It is still possible that there are examples that I have missed, especially in Plautus. These would be instances that either have some pronoun other than *is* in the resumption (*hic, ille, iste*) or that have a nominal resumption. The same is true if there is no resumption and no relative clause (since, if they have a relative clause, they were probably collected by Bach or Bertelsmann). However, in both types, the construction is extraordinary and likely to have caught the attention of a previous commentator. I believe to have ascertained that there is no substantial group of examples missing. The corpus for comedy can be held to be representative, if not exhaustive, with the above limitations in mind.

For Lucretius, I have collected examples from studies on his language and from commentaries. This collection has no claims for complete coverage but, given the existence of Bailey’s (1947) commentary, which gives ample attention to linguistic detail, there are not likely to be many missing.

As for the statutes and inscriptions, several examples have been collected by Bach (1888) and Havers (1926), as well as by Altenburg (1898). However, I have also extracted examples manually from these texts to make the collection comprehensive. The editions I used are Crawford (ed.), *Roman Statutes* (1996) for the statutes and Degrassi (ed.), *Inscriptiores latinae liberae res publicae (ILLRP)*

---

16 The search was done in the Brepols *Library of Latin Texts* database (http://www.brepolis.net/) for all forms of the pronoun *is.*
(1957–1963), together with *CIL* I², for the other inscriptions. For curse tablets, I have used Audollent 1904 and Kropp 2008.

For the prose corpus, especially Cato has been well documented in previous studies, but I have also checked the text myself. I have done this also for Varro.

### 1.5 Left-Dislocation and Early Latin Syntax

In early Latin the building of sentences was, in several respects, different from the strategies that were to be developed in the later republican period. Some of these syntactic patterns are very close in structure and meaning to constructions defined as left-dislocation (see below). These can all be called Topic-Comment structures (cf. Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 105). The first part of the sentence expresses the topic about which something is said in the second part.

Another important feature of early Latin syntax is that subordinate clauses precede the main clauses more often than they do in classical Latin. Characteristically, subordinate clauses are more independent in relation to their main clauses. Periods are formed of loosely combined ‘blocks’ that follow one another. In the main clause, the various threads are then pulled together (see Blänsdorf 1967: 7–8). The parts of the sentence do not form such a balanced system as they do in more developed prose style later on. These are hallmarks of a young writing tradition, where pragmatic means are preferred over syntactic ones, thus leaving much of the interpretative work to the reader or hearer. This early style is still visible in the texts that provide most of the material covered in this study. The frequency of early features depends on genre, with Cato showing the highest occurrence rate of such features. On the other hand, the language of early prose was also influenced by the official legal style of Roman bureaucratic writing (Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 105).

The two types of preposed subordinate clauses that have the closest affinities to left-dislocation are conditional clauses and autonomous relative clauses. Conditional clauses introduced by *si* constitute the most frequent kind of subordinate clause in early Latin. Much of early Latin evidence outside com-

---

17 See Eckstein 1921; Blänsdorf 1967.
18 This traditional view is tentatively challenged in Probert and Dickey (2016: 414–415) in so far as the decline of correlative sentences is concerned.
19 One indication of this is the practice of changing the subject between different subordinate clauses or a subordinate clause and a main clause without any explicit marking as happens in the *leges xii tabularum.*
edy consists of instructions and laws, in which it is characteristic to have the ‘restrictor’ (definition of the situation where the instruction applies) before the instruction itself (see Probert and Dickey 2016: 415–417), as in the following example from the Twelve Tables:

(6) si intestato moritur, cui suus heres non escit, adgnatus proximus familiam habeto

‘If person dies intestate, and has no self-successor, nearest agnate male kinsman shall have possession of deceased’s household.’

Translation WARMINGTON

Very typical are *si quis* clauses followed by a prescription in the apodosis (see Eckstein 1921: 147; Rosén 1992: 252–253):

(7) *si quis in eo uim faciet, ast eius uincitur, dupli damnas esto coloni(isq(ue)) eius colon(iae) (sestertium) (uiginti milia) d(are) d(amnas) esto

‘If anyone shall use force in that case, and if he is convicted of it, he is to be condemned for double the amount and he is to be condemned to pay to the colonists of that colony 20,000 sesterces.’

Translation CRAWFORD

The *si* clause in such contexts can be interpreted as identifying the relevant setting for the main clause, and, because of this, *si* clauses often contain topical information even outside prescriptions (Bach 1888: 10–11):20

(8) *si bona fortuna ueniat, ne intromiseris

‘If Good Fortune herself comes, don’t let her in.’

In such preposed conditional clauses there is no extra-clausal (nominal or pronominal) element and, because of that, they do not qualify as left-dislocation in this study. The same applies to other types of sentence-initial sub-

---

20 Westbury (2014) includes conditional clauses—even temporal ones—in his corpus of LD.
ordinate clauses that introduce topics, like *ubi*: Cato *Agr.* 6.1 *ubi ager crassus et laetus est sine arboribus, eum agrum frumentarium esse oportet*.

However, it often happens in preposed subordinate clauses that a constituent of the subordinate clause is placed before the subordinating conjunction. This is often the subject, but it may be some other constituent as well. The result is a construction that is close to left-dislocation in both form and function:21

(9) *uir tuos si ueniet, iube domi opperirier*
    *ne (in) quaestione mihi sit, si quid eum uelim*

    Plaut. *Cist.* 592–593

    ‘If your husband comes, tell him to wait at home, so that I don’t have to look for him if I want him for anything.’

(10) *fici aridae si uoles uti integrae sint, in uas fictile condito*

    Catu *Agr.* 99

    ‘If you wish to keep dried figs from spoiling, place them in an earthenware vessel.’22

(11) *item pueros pusillos si laues eo lotio, numquam debiles fient*

    Catu *Agr.* 157.10

    ‘Also, if babies are bathed in this urine, they will never be feeble.’

(12) *Bacchae bacchanti si uis aduorsarier,*
    *ex insane insaniorem facies, feriet saepius*

    Plaut. *Amph.* 702–703

    ‘If you want to oppose a Bacchant in her frenzy, you’ll turn her from mad into madder and she’ll hit all the more.’

Especially the nominative examples, *uir tuos* in (9) and *fici aridae* in (10) are readily interpretable as left-dislocation. This is due to the independent role

---


22 Translations of Cato’s *De Agricultura* come from Hooper and Ash.
of the nominative. Reading such examples as left-dislocation is facilitated if what follows is a complex sentence. These factors contribute to (10) having a detached feel to it. The initial element *fici aridae* is left unexpressed in both the *uti* clause, where it is the subject, and the main clause where it is object (see chapter 5.2.2). On the other hand, the fronted object *pueros pusillos* in (11) and the fronted dative complement *Bacchae bacchanti* in (12) can only be interpreted as arguments of the subordinate clause predicate.

Another frequent type of preposed subordinate clauses are autonomous (free) relative clauses (without nominal heads). These typically express topical elements, especially when they are in the nominative (Rosén 1992: 252). There are two types of autonomous preposed *qui* clauses (Eckstein 1921: 146 fn. 13). In the first type, the referent of *qui* is a constituent of the main clause and is usually referred to by a demonstrative pronoun in the following clause, as in (13) and (14) (for further examples, see Vonlaufen 1974: 15):

(13) non quae indotata est, ea in potestate est uiri

_plaut. Aul._ 534

‘A wife without dowry is in her husband’s power.’

(14) qui hac purgatione purgatus erit, sic eum curato

_cat. Agr._ 157.13

‘The following is the method of purging by this treatment.’

The pronominal resumption is not necessary and is often left out, when the two references agree in grammatical case (see Vonlaufen 1974: 15), as in (15) and the first part of (16):

(15) qui sic purgatus erit, diutina uaeetudine utetur

_cat. Agr._ 157.13

‘One so purged will enjoy good health for a long time.’

(16) qui ipsus sibi satis placet, nec probus est nec frugi bonae,
qui ipsus se contemnit, in eost indeles industrie

_plaut. Trin._ 321–322

‘The man who is content with himself is neither decent nor well-conducted. The man who despises himself has the possibility for industry within him.’
The other type of autonomous relative clause is a more independent *qui* (‘frei vorgestellte *qui*’ in Eckstein 1921: 146 fn. 13), which, in practical terms, means a clause beginning with *si quis* (for further examples, see Kühner-Stegmann 1971 II, 2: 282), seen, for instance, in (17) and (18):

(17) post mediam aetatem qui media ducit uxorem domum,  
    si eam senex anum praegnatem fortuito fecerit,  
    quid dubitas, quin sit paratum nomen puero Postumus  
    Plaut. *Aul.* 162–164

‘Suppose a man has passed middle age and marries a woman in her middle age; if such an old fellow gets his old lady pregnant by chance, do you have any doubt that the name in store for the boy is Postumus?’

(18) calcem partario coquendam qui dant, ita datur  
    Cato *Agr.* 16

‘The following are proper terms of a contract for burning lime on shares.’

In these sentences *qui* is equivalent in meaning to *si quis*. The construction is close to left-dislocation in that the *qui* clause is, to a large degree, independent, with a clear scene-setting function. In the matrix clause, there is no co-referent anaphoric, because the referent of *qui* is not a constituent of the matrix clause.

The two types of *qui* clauses are syntactically different, but they fulfil the same function, introducing topical referents into the discourse. In this function, they function in a similar way as left-dislocation does.23 However, neither type of autonomous *qui* clause will count as left-dislocation here, because they are clearly clausal—i.e., there is a finite verb that governs the relative clause. The interaction and borderline cases between autonomous relative clauses and LD will be discussed in further detail in section 2.2.

There are two constructions that are frequently used to express topics in the later history of Latin: *de* + ablative and *quod* periphrases. Both are topic expressions with overt syntactic marking, for which reason they do not fall within the scope of this study.

The construction *de* + abl. occurs occasionally in early Latin (see Rosén 1992: 253)—for example, Plaut. *Amph.* 479 nunc *de Alcumena dudum quod dixi*  

23 Indeed, similar constructions have been defined as LD in other studies (Tizón-Couto 2012; Westbury 2014).
**minus.** It is clear that *de* + ablative is used to perform the same function as left-dislocation—i.e., to introduce the element that is the topic of the following predication. In the example from the Amphitruo just quoted, *de* + ablative can be taken as an argument of the governing verb (*de Alcumena ... quod dixi*). In other instances, *de* + ablative cannot be construed as an argument of the verb and, because of this, is extra-clausal, like the dislocated constituent in left-dislocation—e.g., *Rud. 1397 de talento nulla causa est quin feras.* However, because of their overt syntactic marking, these are not defined as left-dislocation in this study. If *de* + ablative is extra-clausal (not potentially an argument of the verb), it cannot be referred to anaphorically in the matrix clause. An epigraphic example may be quoted from the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (*CIL* I² 581.1–2) *de Bacanalibus, que foide ratei esent, ita exdeicendum censuere,* ‘Concerning Bacchic festivals, with regard to those who were bound to Rome by treaty (i.e., the Italian socii), they (i.e., the senators) passed a resolution that the following proclamation should be issued’ (translated by Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 145). Cato used *de* in rubrics—e.g., *Agr. 157.1 de brassica Pythagorea, quid de ea boni sit salubritatisque* (‘Of Pythagoras’s cabbage, what virtue and health-giving qualities it has.’). Cicero, too, uses this type often (see Hoffmann 1989; Somers 1994).

Another type of topical construction is that introduced by *quod.* This expression occurs already in Plautus (examples from Rosén 1992: 254): *Epid. 130 quod ad me attinuit, ego curau; Poen. 1181a–1182 quod quidem ad nos duas attinuit, ... fuimus; Asin. 8 quod ad argumentum attinet, sane breue est; Aul. 770 ego te, Euclio, de alia re resciuisse censui, quod ad me attinet; Poen. 36–39 quodque ad ludorum curatores attinet, ne palma detur cuiquam artifici iniuria. The *quod* construction is a full clause and, hence, not defined as left-dislocation in this study. An epigraphic example is *CIL* I² 586 (*Epistula ad Tiburtes*) 5–7 *quod Teiburtes u(erba) f(ecistis), quibusque de rebus uos purgauistis, ea senatus animum aduortit ita utei aequom fuit,* ‘Inasmuch as you Tiburtines made a verbal report and concerning the matters about which you justified yourselves, the Senate took note of these just as was proper’ (translated by Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 150, with a detailed analysis of this opening). Such a *quod* clause can be seen as a standard variety construction for expressing topics and is frequently used by Cicero, especially in his letters (see Hoffmann 1989 and Somers 1994).

---

24 See further Molinelli 1999.

25 More examples of *de* + ablative in Plautus are given in Lodge 1962 (*Lexicon Plautinum*, p. 353).

26 On ‘as for’ constructions as the standard variety alternative for *LD*, see Lambrecht (1994: 182).
Defining Left-Dislocation

2.1 Syntactic and Pragmatic Aspects of Left-Dislocation in Latin

In this section, I present the syntactic definition for left-dislocation in Latin. This is followed by an exposition of the pragmatic framework that will be used in the analysis of this book. I then take a closer look on Latin relative clause syntax and its implications for Latin left-dislocation in section 2.2.

Left-dislocation is a sentence structure in which a referential constituent that could function as an argument or adjunct within the predicate-argument structure of the clause occurs outside the left-peripheral boundaries of the clause containing the predicate. This dislocated constituent is prototypically followed by a grammatically complete clause, in which a co-referential pronominal element typically occurs. This pronominal element represents the role of the referent of the dislocated phrase as an argument or adjunct of the predicate (Lambrecht 1994: 182; Lambrecht 2001: 1050; Westbury 2014: 98).\(^1\)

The following four attributes have been used to define prototypical left-dislocation (Lambrecht 2001:1050, modified in Westbury 2014: 101):\(^2\)

1. The extra-clausal position of a constituent preceding the matrix clause.
2. A possible canonical intra-clausal position for the dislocated constituent within the matrix clause.
3. Anaphoric co-indexation between the dislocated constituent and an overt pronoun within the matrix clause.
4. A separate intonation contour for the dislocated constituent.

A Latin example of a prototypical left-dislocation is (1):

(1) **Epidamniensis ill’ quem** dudum dixeram
geminum illum puerum qui surrupuit alterum,
*ei liberorum nisi diuitiae nil erat*

*Plaut. Men.* 57–59

---

1 For a convenient summary of earlier approaches, see Westbury (2014).
2 Lambrecht’s (2001) definition covers right-dislocation as well. Lambrecht (2001) uses the term **TOP** to refer to left-dislocation and **ANTITOP** to refer to right-dislocation. However, I shall not use Lambrecht’s term **TOP** as an equivalent to \( LD \), as I do not accept Lambrecht’s view on topic being the only possible function of \( LD \).
‘That man from Epidamnus I was talking about a moment ago, the man who kidnapped that other twin, he had no children except for his wealth.’

In this example, *Epidamniensis ille* is the dislocated constituent. This constituent has a possible intra-clausal position in the matrix clause, because *Epidamniensis ille* could, in principle, be adjoined to *erat* to produce the possessive dative construction. In the matrix clause, *ei liberorum nisi diuitiae nil erat*, we find the co-indexed anaphoric pronoun *ei*, which represents the role of the dislocated element as an argument of the verb. In the Latin evidence, we do not possess any direct evidence of intonation or prosody, so we must leave the fourth attribute out of the discussion.

The first attribute is the necessary condition that must be met for the construction to qualify as LD (Lambrecht 2001: 1050). In other words, the dislocated constituent must be optional with respect to the predicate argument structure of the clause: even without the dislocated constituent, the remaining matrix clause should retain its well-formedness (Lambrecht 2001: 1052 and 1065; Westbury 2014: 222). The extra-clausal status of the dislocated element is also shown by the presence of a co-indexed element within the matrix clause (Westbury 2014: 111). If an anaphoric pronoun in the matrix clause has the same function as the dislocated constituent (for example, the direct object), the dislocated constituent would necessarily be outside the clause, since the verb cannot have two co-referent objects. Case disagreement between the dislocated constituent and its function in the main clause is further proof for the extra-clausal status (Westbury 2014: 116).

The second attribute means that, in theory, the dislocated constituent would be able to occupy a position inside the clause and be a part of its structure, including compatibility with the selection criteria of the main clause verb. If the third criterion (the co-indexed pronoun) is fulfilled, the second attribute is naturally fulfilled, also because the presence of a co-indexed anaphoric guarantees that the dislocated constituent could occupy a position inside the clause.

Cross-linguistically, we find dislocated constituents that are not co-referent with an element in the matrix clause and, hence, do not fulfil the second criterion. These are called unlinked topics in Lambrecht (2001: 1058–1059). Such dislocations function as framing devices that constrain the interpretation of the following proposition to a certain semantic domain. The republican Latin

---

3 For further discussion on determining the extra-clausal position of LD, see Westbury (2014: 110–116).

examples, for the most part, possess the second attribute (possible position of
the dislocated constituent within the main clause), but there are occasional
examples of unlinked topics in Latin (see chapters 4 and 5 for examples).

The definition of left-dislocation presented here agrees in essential respects
with the concept of the Theme constituent in the Functional Grammar frame-
work. It is defined by Pinkster (1990: 37) as follows: ‘By a constituent with the
pragmatic function Theme we understand a constituent which does not form
part of the predication, but precedes it and creates, as it were, a kind of frame-
work within which the predication is to be interpreted.’ A Theme constituent,
too, can be anaphorically resumed in the following predication, but, just as in
LD, this is optional. Theme constituents also include constructions where the
Theme constituent is not a member of the following predication (unlinked top-
ics). In this book, I have used the term left-dislocation, but the two concepts are,
in fact, very close to each other, and the term Theme constituent could have
been used here equally well.

According to Hoffmann (1989: 188), Theme constituents in Latin can be
divided into five categories according to their formal properties: i) noun
phrases, ii) prepositional phrases, iii) relative clauses, iv) subordinate clauses
with quod and v) infinitive constructions. The category ‘prepositional phrases’
here means predominantly constructions with de + ablative. Of these five cate-
gories, it is mainly the first group (noun phrases) that falls into the scope of this
study. However, as will be shown, the demarcation between noun phrases and
relative clauses is not always clear-cut, so relative clauses will also be included
to some extent in my discussion. In addition, there are examples of infinitive
constructions, though these are limited in number and distribution. Categories
ii) and iv) are excluded from this study (see, above, section 1.5 for examples of
these).

The term Theme constituent was originally coined by Dik (1978), who in-
tended the term to make explicit and highlight his departure from the then-
dominant transformational grammar theory, whereby this phenomenon im-
plied a structural process of ‘dislocation’. According to this theory, the initial
element was extracted from its proper place in the clause and placed in a
left-dislocated position. However, more recently, the term left-dislocation has
been used quite generally without any connection to transformational gram-
mar theory.

5 See Pinkster (forthc. chapter 22).
6 In Dik (1997), Theme constituents are described as part of the more inclusive group Extra-
Clausal Constituents (ECCs).
Latin belongs to those languages that allow for null-instantiation of arguments (‘ellipsis’; for examples from other such languages, see Lambrecht 2001: 1056; Dik 1997: 395). This means that in the Latin material, there are several instances without an overt anaphoric element in the matrix clause. Thus, not all Latin examples fulfil the third criterion (presence of a co-referent element in the matrix clause), even when the dislocated element could occupy a place in the following clause. The implication of the unconstrained use of null-instantiation of arguments (ellipsis) is that, in Latin, it is not possible to identify LDs without an anaphoric element by syntactic criteria and tell them apart from fronted (but clause-internal) topics, if the dislocated constituent and the reference in the matrix clause agree in grammatical case.\(^7\) Latin is here similar to, e.g., Italian. The absence of spoken data and, hence, information about prosody, means that this distinction is completely beyond our reach, though there are instances where an interpretation of LD is attractive—e.g., Plaut. *Asin.* 444 *scyphos quos utendos dedi Philodamo rettulitne (sc., rettulitne eos)?*; *Cato Agr.* 109 *uinum asperum quod erit, lene et suave si uoles facere, sic facito (sc., sic id facito).*\(^8\) This means that we will not have in the Latin data instances without an overt anaphoric expression (like the Italian example *5e I Romani, sono pazzi,* in Lambrecht 2001: 1051) where the anaphoric expression would agree in case with the dislocated constituent.

On the other hand, in Latin, we have examples of null anaphora in LD when there is case disagreement between the dislocated constituent and the missing anaphora. This is because Latin, unlike several other languages, allows for a rather free use of null anaphora in various functions. Lambrecht (2001: 1057) provides examples of null anaphora of a direct object in French and Portuguese. The following are Latin examples of null anaphora of the subject (2)\(^9\) and dative complement (3):

\[(2) \text{ agrum quem Volsci habuerunt, campestris plerus Aboriginum fuit} \]

\[\text{Cato Orig. FRHist 24} \]

‘The land that the Volscians held, the greater part of it flat, belonged to the Aborigines.’

Translation CORNELL

---

7 If a language does not allow null-instantiation of arguments, a formal distinction can be made between topicalization and LD (Lambrecht 2001: 1052).

8 On the differences between Theme constituents (left-dislocation) and fronted topics in Latin, see Somers (1994).

9 This example is, strictly speaking, not a null anaphora, if the verbal inflection is interpreted as anaphora; see Lambrecht (2001: 1055–1056).
In (2), the null anaphora concerns the subject of *fuit* (sc., *is ager*) and, in (3), the dative complement of *licet* (sc., *ei*).

The dislocated element is typically in an absolute form (Dik 1997: 391–392), which, in Latin, is the nominative. However, it may also anticipate and formally express the function that it is going to fulfil in the ensuing clause (Dik 1997: 392). This type is more rarely discussed and identified in Latin studies as well as elsewhere. Lambrecht (1994: 194) gives as the example of the German construction *Den Apfel, den isst Hans* which has dual case marking.10 In this study, I present evidence for anticipation of matrix clause case as a syntactic category of left-dislocation in Latin (the accusative and the dative).11

To sum up, in this book, left-dislocation is a construction that contains a dislocated element followed by a complete clause. In most cases, though not necessarily, the following clause includes an anaphoric resumptive element that is co-referent with the dislocated one. If there is no such anaphoric element, we are dealing with either unlinked topics that set a larger frame of reference without being members of the following clause or an instance of case disagreement, in which case the break in syntactic structure is seen in the different grammatical case of the dislocated constituent and its role in the following clause.

### 2.1.1 The Dislocated Constituent and the Anaphoric Element

Languages differ in the extent to which they allow for dislocation besides that of nominal phrases (Lambrecht 2001: 1061). In addition to nominal phrases, even pronouns, prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases as well as non-finite verbal phrases can be dislocated (Lambrecht 2001: 1062–1063). In my Latin corpus,
the dislocated elements are typically nominal or pronominal phrases, together with occasional examples of infinitives (Sal. *Cat.* 12.5 *proinde quasi iniuriam facere, id demum esset imperio uti*, ‘As though to do a wrong were precisely what it means to exercise power’).

Pronominal dislocation is, to some extent, a special category. Pronouns as dislocated elements are not uncommon among the languages of the world (Lambrecht 2001: 1064). However, the examples of dislocated pronouns in Lambrecht (and elsewhere) are all personal pronouns. There seems to be no information as to the potential of other types of pronouns to be dislocated.\(^\text{12}\) The republican Latin corpus includes two instances of the personal pronoun *ego* as a dislocated element. The other dislocated pronouns are forms of the demonstrative and anaphoric pronouns *is, ille, hic* and *iste*. An example is given in (4):

\[(4)\quad \textit{ille qui} \text{ adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio},
\text{ is illi Poeno huius patruo hospes fuit}\]

\textit{PLAUT. Poen. 119–120}

‘The man who adopted this chap as his son was a family friend of that Carthaginian, the uncle of the young man.’

This construction is superficially similar to a nominal dislocation, in that the antecedent of the relative pronoun (*ille*) is taken up by a resumptive element in the matrix clause (*is*). In the present study, (4) and similar constructions will be treated as left-dislocation. A more detailed discussion of the syntactic structure of (4) is found in 2.2.2.2 below.

Several recent studies (Tizón-Couto and Westbury 2014; Hoffmann 1989; Somers 1994 on Latin) have included clausal dislocations, such as of conditional clauses and temporal clauses, in their definition of left-dislocation (or Theme constituents). My definition of left-dislocation is less inclusive. I recognize that clausal left-dislocation—in the Latin context, especially of conditional clauses—is closely related to left-dislocation and often performs the same function, but examples of this are nevertheless excluded from the corpus discussed in this book. Clausal LD contains, by definition, a finite verb, and, since they are clauses, they are not extra-clausal in the way meant in this study. Conditional clauses in the republican Latin corpus were briefly discussed in 1.5 above. Similarly, *quod* clauses of the type *quod ad me attinuit, ego curaui*

---

\(^{12}\) In Gregory and Michaelis (2001: 1670), all pronouns in LD are deictic (*you* and *I*), none anaphoric; in Barnes (1985), *moi* is very frequent in French, also *ça, c’est*.
(Plaut. *Epid.* 130) are excluded from this study (see 1.5 above).\(^\text{13}\) The question of clausal LD is also, to some extent, relevant to the discussion on relative clauses in section 2.2.

In most of the constructions discussed in this book, the dislocated constituent is the first constituent in the sentence where it occurs. However, in some of the constructions, another constituent precedes the dislocated constituent,\(^\text{14}\) typically a discourse particle (*sed, tum, nam*) or, if the dislocated constituent is followed by a relative clause, another member of the relative clause (e.g., Cato *Agr.* 133.1 *aboribus ab terra pulli qui nati erunt*).

But there are also cases where the subject of the matrix clause or of a subordinating conjunction precedes the dislocated element (e.g., *quid tu* in Plaut. *Trin.* 116–118 *quid tu, adulescentem, quem esse corruptum uides qui tuae mandatus est fide et fiduciae quin eum restituis, quin ad frugem conrigis?*, ‘Well then? Why don’t you change the young man back and bring him back to responsible behavior, when you can see that he’s decadent and when he was entrusted to your faith and reliability.’). Analysis as left-dislocation is not always evident in these cases. Due to the clause-like beginning, the constructions can arguably be interpreted as an anacoluthon, or a false start. For the purposes of this study, the placement of the main clause predicate is deemed decisive. If the main clause predicate does not precede the dislocated element, a clause has not been formed, so the element is considered dislocated.\(^\text{15}\)

Cross-linguistically, the resumptive anaphoric element is typically an argument of the matrix clause predicate. Most frequently, it is the subject or the object, but also indirect objects and even adjuncts (satellites) are attested (Lambrecht 2001: 1054–1055).\(^\text{16}\) All these functions are found in the Latin material. The dislocated constituent and the anaphoric element need not agree in case (Lambrecht 2001: 1069–1070), as seen in the Latin example (2) of section 1.1 above. The role of null anaphora in left-dislocation is discussed in further detail.

---

\(^{13}\) ‘As for’ constructions are excluded in Tizón-Couto (2012).

\(^{14}\) On elements that precede the dislocated constituent in Biblical Hebrew, see Westbury (2014: 224–225, 234).

\(^{15}\) Cf. Wackernagel (2009: 79) on the *attractio inuersa*: it is essential that only so little of the main clause precede the attracted head that the construction of the main clause is not yet properly felt and attraction can happen. Twice in the corpus, a full clause beginning with *ita* precedes the left-dislocation (Plaut. *Rud.* 1064–1066 *ita ut occipi dicere, illum quem dudum ⟨e fano foras⟩ leonem extrusti, hic eius uidulum eccillum ⟨tenet⟩*; Plaut. *Bacch.* 385–387 *et ita esse arbitror homini amico, qui est ita uti nomen possidet, nisi deos ei nil praestare*).

\(^{16}\) Duranti and Ochs (1979: 380–381) found no subject anaphors in their spoken Italian conversational data, but this is because there are no clitic forms of subject pronouns in the dialect they were studying, and the anaphor is always a clitic pronoun.
below in connection with relative clauses. Westbury (2014: 136) notes that, in addition to free, morphosyntactically bound, inflectional and null anaphora, the resumptive element can be a full noun (epithet). Of these, Latin has free anaphora, null anaphora and full nouns.

At this point, it is evident that the description of LD in Latin (as in other languages) has to take into account language-specific features of the construction. LD operates at the interface of syntax and discourse (Tizón-Couto 2012: 279; Gundel and Fretheim 2009: 155–157), and languages differ in how LD constructions are incorporated into their systems. In republican Latin, LD presents a curious mixture of discourse and syntax. Latin does not generally encode topical constituents with the help of dislocation, so LD in Latin clearly belongs to the domain of discourse more than it does to that of syntax. However, in the context of correlative clauses, Latin LD is a syntactic phenomenon. This dualistic nature necessarily carries implications for any discussion of the phenomenon in Latin.

To sum up the syntactic definition of left-dislocation, LD is a construction in which a nominal or pronominal element precedes the clause without being a part of its syntactic structure. That it is not a syntactic part of the following clause is indicated by either 1) a resumptive element in the clause or 2) by case syntax where there is no resumption but the dislocated element, because of its case, cannot be part of the following clause. Pronominal antecedents of relative clauses are included in my definition. Clausal left-dislocation is excluded (quod clauses), as are other extra-clausal elements with overt syntactic marking (de + ablative). The matrix clause predicate is judged to be essential in the sentence’s structure—it may not precede the dislocated constituent, whereas particles and even conjunctions can do this without establishing a clause.

A set of criteria is needed to establish a corpus for the study of left-dislocation, but this does not mean that left-dislocation is, or is perceived in this study as being, a category with definite boundaries. It will become evident over the course of the following chapters that the core types described above have various close relatives and that there are several ambiguous cases.

### 2.1.2 Information Structure and Discourse Function of LD

In this section, I outline the framework that will be used in describing the information structure and discourse function of left-dislocation in Latin. The approach is based principally on Lambrecht (1994, 2001) but also agrees in

---

17 For a concise exposition of the terms and approaches in research on information structure and pragmatics, see Gundel and Fretheim (2009, especially 147–150).
essential respects with Dik (1997), as well as Pinkster (1990 and forthc.), Hoffmann (1989) and Somers (1994), who have applied Dik’s theory to Latin evidence.\(^{18}\)

Lambrecht (1994) formulated the following principle:

‘Do not introduce a referent and talk about it in the same clause.’

Lambrecht 1994: 185

This principle was titled ‘The Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role’ and is meant to capture the communicative force that makes speakers guarantee that the receiver can identify the topic of the following proposition before proceeding on to the actual proposition.

To comply with the Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role, new elements can be introduced to the discourse, for example, by presentational sentences before they can become topics (Lambrecht 1994: 177). A Latin example of a presentational sentence is (5):

\[
(5) \quad \text{adulescens quidam est, qui in hisce habitat aedibus;}
\]

\[
\text{is rem paternam me adiutrice perditit.}
\]

Plaut. Trin. 12–13

‘There’s a certain young man who lives in this house; with my assistance, he squandered his father’s possessions.’

In a presentational sentence, the referent is introduced in an existential sentence, like \textit{adulescens quidam est}. After being introduced this way, \textit{adulescens} can become the topic of the following predication (\textit{is rem paternam me adiutrice perditit}). Left-dislocation is another construction used to promote topics. Naturally, however, these two options do not exhaust any language’s constructions for topic promotion.

The prevalent view in studies on left-dislocation is that the dislocated constituent functions as the topic of the construction where it occurs and that \textit{LD} is a means to activate that topic (Lambrecht 2001: 1072; Dik 1997: 389).\(^{19}\) The

\(^{18}\) I have chosen the framework and terminology developed by Lambrecht, because it is the most detailed one available, with an explicit formulation for pragmatics and useful tools for syntax. In addition, I have used Tizón-Couto (2012) and Westbury (2014).

\(^{19}\) Dik (1997: 389): ‘A constituent with Theme function specifies an ensemble of entities with respect to which the following clause is going to present some relevant information.’ In Latin studies, there is sometimes a confusion in terminology—e.g., Adams, Lapidge and
topic is the entity about which the predication expresses something. This follows the formulations of Lambrecht (1994: 118), ‘The topic of a sentence is the thing which the proposition expressed by the sentence is about’, and Pinkster (forthc. chapter 22), ‘Topic is the element of a clause about which the speaker chooses to present further information to the addressee.’ These formulations do not mean that there must be a topic in all sentences (Lambrecht 1994: 119–217; e.g., event-reporting sentences) or that the topic of a sentence must have an explicit verbal expression (topic expression) in the sentence (Lambrecht 1994: 130). LD as a means to promote topics is present also in Latin research that does not use the Functional Grammar framework.

The idea that there is, in a sentence, usually an entity ‘about which’ the sentence is goes back to antiquity. Demetrius (De elocutione 199–201) notes that, in a natural word order, there will come first τὸ περὶ οὗ (‘what one is speaking about’) and after that ὃ τοῦτο ἐστιν (‘what it is’). The initial constituent, τὸ περὶ οὗ, is the subject ‘about which’ something is going to be stated. In the 19th century, the concept of a ‘psychological subject’ was conceived and used by H. Paul to describe a concept that is essentially the same as Demetrius’s τὸ περὶ οὗ. The same vein of thought was influential in the thinking of the Prague school linguists, beginning with Mathesius (see Gundel and Fretheim 2009: 146–147). Topic roughly equals the notion of theme in Prague school terms. Latin scholars in the early 20th century, most importantly W. Havers, were influenced by Paul’s division of psychological subject from grammatical subject, and it is this difference that Havers (1926) saw lay behind the phenomenon of nominativus pendens. The psychological subject is first expressed in an independent nominative construction, before the following predication is formed in the speaker’s mind, and the correct case form is attributed to the co-referent pronominal expression in the following predication (Havers 1926: 209–210).

There is no agreement among scholars concerning the information structural status that a topic referent can or must have. The minimal requirement is that topics must be referential individuated entities (Gundel and Fretheim 2009: 150).
I will use categories taken from Lambrecht’s (1994: 165) Topic Acceptability Scale, the categories of which, in decreasing order of acceptability, are Active, Accessible, Unused, Brand New Anchored and Brand-New Unanchored. Lambrecht (1994: 166) stressed that Brand New elements are not acceptable as topics, unless they have a generic reference. This applies especially to unanchored Brand New elements (cf. Lambrecht 2001: 1073). On the other hand, Tizón-Couto (2012: 274, 278) observed much variation in the informational status of left-dislocated constituents: ‘As regards information status, the results suggest that the informative nature of left-dislocated constituents is considerably heterogeneous since they accommodate both recoverable and irrecoverable referents’ (Tizón-Couto 2012: 278). Dislocated constituents in republican Latin show a wide variety of informational statuses. This is connected with the nature of the material, which includes dramatic dialogue and laws and other instructions. That dramatic dialogue is fictional language means that its information structure does not exactly follow the rules of natural dialogue (see Somers 1994: 154–155 on Latin), and Brand New referents as topics may be more easily allowed than they would be in genuine speech. Brand New elements as topics are usually anchored in the context by a relative clause. Many, but not all, Brand New elements as topics receive a generic interpretation. In epigraphic texts, the communicative situation is, on the whole, different from spoken conversation, drama and other literary genres.

Geluykens (1992) made the interesting observation that the difference in the frequency and degree of grammaticalization of LD in English, Italian and French is matched by the difference in the informational status that is allowed in the dislocated constituents (see Westbury 2014: 180). It seems that English is the most restricted in all three respects, concerning the frequency and register variety, degree of grammaticalization and constraints on the informational status of the dislocated constituent.

It may seem, to some extent, questionable to claim that an entity promoted to topic status by LD must already be present in the discourse situation. If the element is present and accessible, what is then the function of the promoting device? Here, it is necessary to make a distinction between the informational status of a referent and its pragmatic function in the discourse setting. Referents can be present and active in discourse without being topics: ‘Notice that announcing a new topic for some predication via LD is not equivalent to introducing a new referent into a discourse’ (Lambrecht 2001: 1074; Gregory and Michaelis 2001: 1670 fn. 6, ‘a referent may be active but still new in discourse’).

Lambrecht (2001: 1073) further argues that, in addition to being discourse-old, the entity promoted to topic by means of LD must somehow be expected as a topic in the discourse (saliency, topicality). That is, ‘In order to be able to
construe a denotatum as the topic of a predication the hearer must take it to be a center of present concern in the discourse, i.e. its topic role must be to some degree expectable at the time of utterance (Lambrecht 1994).’

There is even evidence that LD sometimes promotes to topic status entities that are already active topics in the discourse context. This ‘overuse’ aims at producing a certain discontinuity and, by doing so, highlighting and emphasizing referents that will play a prominent role in the discourse afterwards (Westbury 2014: 189).

One example in which referents can be active but without anaphoric antecedents and, hence, not available as topics without some kind of explicit promotion is when they are physically present in the situation (Gregory and Michaelis 2001: 1691–1692). Such situationally evoked referents occur regularly in dramatic texts like comedy.

Referents established (or reinforced) as topics by means of LD seem to show topic continuity that extends beyond the LD sentence. This has been reported for non-standard spoken French by Lambrecht.24 In Barnes’s (1985: 56 and 111) corpus of standard spoken French, virtually all LDs are sentence topics (topics of their sentences) and most are discourse topics (topics for a longer chunk of dialogue). The notable exception is the nearly grammaticalized ‘c’est’ construction used in an identifying function, as an ‘all-purpose’ pragmatic connector. For English, the topic persistence of dislocated constituents has been established in Gregory and Michaelis (2001) in spoken conversational data. In their corpus of LD, 65% persist as topics in the following discourse context (repeated NP or at least one pronominal use; Gregory and Michaelis 2001: 1696).26 Tizón-Couto (2012: 267–268, 278) has made the same observation in Late Modern English data. A share of 54.26% of LD proper are mentioned at least once after their occurrence in the LD construction. We can conclude, then, that LD is typically used to promote topics that are going to enjoy topic status beyond the sentence where they have been introduced as such.27 This tendency can be

---

24 Lambrecht (1981: 64) ‘This saliency attributed to the topic would explain why the informational scope of a topic typically extends beyond the limit of the single clause in which it occurs, in other words why topics usually govern more than one sentence or more than one turn in a conversation.’

25 Pronominal ‘moi’ LD in Barnes’s spoken French corpus is not necessarily sentence topic but introduces the speaker’s viewpoint on the discourse topic (Barnes 1985: 40). Also, topic shift may happen with moi (Barnes 1985: 38).

26 In a subtype of LD (partially ordered set relation—i.e., contrastive), 73% such LD persist as topic (Gregory and Michaelis 2001: 1700).

27 Westbury (2014: 310–311) found that, in Biblical Hebrew, the dislocated constituent does
observed in Roman comedy as well, but it is not a relevant factor in all parts of the republican corpus.

While topic is, put simply, what the sentence is about, the other standardly recognized discourse function is focus (earlier and in semantically oriented research, often called rheme). Focus is the most salient piece of information in the predication. In Lambrecht's (1994: 206–207) words, focus is ‘that portion of a proposition which cannot be taken for granted at the time of speech’. The association between LD and topic function is strong, but we need to address the question of whether LD is used exclusively to convey a topic referent. Can LD be used to highlight even focal constituents? At least Lambrecht (2001: 1066, 1072) argued explicitly that LD cannot express a focus relation.29

Recently, however, evidence has been presented suggesting that LD may not be exclusively reserved for topics (Westbury 2014: 318–320 on Biblical Hebrew; Yamaizumi 2011: 82–85 on Japanese). Westbury (2014:186) suggests that LD activates a referent irrespective of pragmatic relation to the following proposition. This can be done within Lambrecht's own theoretical framework by adjusting his Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role (see above 2.1.2) to cover focus relations as well.30

The notion of ‘contrast’ is often used in research on pragmatic functions of discourse constituents and is most often associated with foci. However, an important subtype of topics promoted by LD is contrastive topic (Lambrecht 1994: 291–295), which stands in contrast with a previously occurring entity and, because of this, has immediate familiarity with foci (and is often interpreted as such). For example, a shift from one active (topical) referent to another is one of the functions of LD (Lambrecht 1994: 183).31 Contrast is a feature that both topics and foci can possess.32 The same point is made in greater detail in Vallduví

---

28 In Lambrecht's (1994: 213) formulation, focus is 'the semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition'.

29 Lambrecht (2001: 1066): 'Since focal denotata are by definition communicatively indispensable elements of propositions, and since propositions are expressed in clauses, focus constituents by necessity occur clause-internally (cf. Lambrecht 1994)'.

30 On inconsistency in Lambrecht's position concerning the possible extra-clausal status of topics but not of foci, see Westbury (2014: 186–189).

31 Lambrecht (1994: 129) notes that the first appearance of a referent that is a future topic at discourse level is often a focus expression. Lambrecht's example is 'Lotta guys don't ask. Me, I ask.' But is this focus or contrastive topic?

32 Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998) argue that the syntactic realizations of the two different types differ in individual languages (Finnish, Hungarian and Catalan), with some languages encoding 'kontrast' with a specific (non-canonical) syntactic structure and other encod-
and Vilkuna (1998), who argue that, if we identify two types of ‘focus’ (namely, ‘kontrast’ and ‘rheme’), it becomes possible to overcome many problems and contradictory theories and observations in the pragmatic research. Languages differ in how they use non-canonical sentence structures to encode these two relations. This approach makes it possible to account for the type often referred to as contrastive topics.

I do not consider it a priori impossible that LD could be used to highlight focal constituents (pace Lambrecht). It is true that, by allowing the possibility for LD to be focus, we ruin the neat one form–one function pattern postulated for LD by Lambrecht (1994). On the other hand, Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998: 102) stress that the structural resources of natural languages are limited, and interpretative categories cannot map with these in a neat one-to-one pattern: ‘Thus, it is natural to find that a single structural category is exploited by different interpretive categories or that one category interferes with the homogeneous across-the-board realization of the other.’ It is clear, at any rate, that Latin LD includes contrastive topics. Closer inspection will show whether there are examples where we cannot avoid interpreting dislocated constituents as foci. The possibility that Latin thematic nominatives may occasionally be rhematic rather than thematic has been mentioned by Serbat (1988: 361). This question will be further pursued in the following chapters.

I will recapitulate the above discussion. Left-dislocation serves primarily as a topic-promoting strategy, and Latin is shown to be no exception in this regard. There is an association between left-dislocation and entities that are, in one way or another, accessible in the discourse context. We will see that the informational statuses needed for a description of LD in the Latin material are Active, Accessible and Brand New anchored. The Latin material is thus well in accordance with observations made in other languages. LD in Latin, as in other languages, activates topics, but whether foci can be expressed with LD as well remains to be seen from the data.

The research carried out in the present study is qualitative in nature. This means that I shall give a description of syntax, information structure and pragmatic function for all passages. The number of examples is so low that statistical analysis is out of the question. I further believe that, in a corpus language

—

ing ‘rhemé’ in a specific (non-canonical) syntactic structure. Notions close to contrast have been mainly used in semantically oriented research, while rheme has figured prominently in pragmatic approaches (Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998: 100–101). These two have often been conflated in the single term focus, which has resulted in further confusion. In English, contrast and rhematicity are both expressed by prosodical means, blurring this distinction still further (Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998: 101).
and in heterogeneous text material, this is the only way to find out how the factors presented above affect the linguistic outcome and is also the only way to substantiate any claims made about a specific information structure or pragmatic organization of Latin L.D.

2.2 Left-Dislocation and the Latin Relative Clause

In 2.1, criteria were set for defining L.D in republican Latin. The matter is complicated by three characteristics of Latin syntax: the creative syntax of (autonomous) relative clauses, flexible word order (especially in metrical texts) and the unconstrained use of ellipsis (non-instantiation of arguments).

The majority of L.D constructions in republican Latin contain a relative clause. They do so even in the later period, but the frequency is notable in the archaic and classical period (noted already by Rosén 1992: 251, fn. 29; Halla-aho 2016). Therefore, L.D in Latin cannot be discussed without reference to Latin relative clause syntax. For the purposes of the present work, only relative clauses that precede their matrix clauses—or, in some cases, that are embedded in them—are relevant here. I use the term sentence-initial or preposed when referring to such relative clauses, without taking an explicit stance on whether the noun in each case is internal or external to the relative clause. Similarly, I use the term fronting and ‘fronted’ as a term to denote (surface) word order without implications as to where the head noun belongs structurally.

In republican Latin, it is mainly in Cato’s prose where L.D constructions without a relative clause occur. In comedy, there is a handful of examples without a relative clause. In inscriptions, L.D occurs nearly exclusively with relative clauses. This predominance of constructions with relative clauses is not necessarily surprising, given that L.D is typically used to introduce or define the dislocated element in the discourse, and relative clauses are often used in such functions: ‘Die Technik des vorangestellten R[elativsatzes] ist vorzüglich dazu geeignet, Begriffe, die im Matrixsatz eine Rolle spielen, vorab zu definieren und den nachfolgenden Matrixsatz für Aussagen über sie zu reservieren’ (Lehmann 1979: 10).

The frequent occurrence of relative clauses in L.D is not confined to Latin. For example, in Biblical Hebrew, relative clauses are found in 64/93 of prototypical L.Ds. The relative clause can be either restrictive or non-restrictive, but restrictive ones are more common (Westbury 2014: 229).33

33 In addition, headless (free) relatives make up 9/93 of Westbury’s prototypical L.Ds. Free
However, in the republican Latin corpus of LD there is evidently something more going on than this general tendency of relative clauses to occur in left-dislocation. In Latin, the connection between LD and relative clauses is especially pronounced. This situation may owe its origin to the prehistory and the Proto-Indo-European roots of the Latin relative clause. To achieve a correct description of left-dislocation in early Latin, one has to begin with the nature and mechanisms of the Latin relative clause. The short description that I offer here takes into account both the historical perspective and the synchronic description. No comprehensive account of Latin relative clauses is attempted. I will pay attention only to those features of relative clauses that are relevant when describing left-dislocation.

The questions that need to be addressed are as follows: how much is the occurrence of left-dislocation indebted either to the prehistory of Latin relative clauses or to their synchronic flexibility? Is left-dislocation in republican Latin merely a productive descendant of PIE correlative clauses? For a greater part of this book, the discussion will take place at the interface of relative clauses and left-dislocation.

2.2.1 The History of Latin Relative Clauses
Syntactic phenomena that are here defined as left-dislocation have been mainly discussed in a research tradition that is dependent on and influenced by the historical perspective. In this tradition, a large part of the constructions that are here defined as left-dislocation have been called ‘correlative sentences’ or ‘diptychs’. I will offer a short sketch of what is known or assumed about the Indo-European roots of Latin relative pronouns and clauses.

The pioneering work for Indo-European relatives was done by Delbrück (1893–1900), Sturtevant (1930), Hahn (1946, 1964) and Haudry (1973). Studies clarifying the most important aspects can be found in Lehmann (1979: 3–12), Hettrich (1988: 471–484), Pompei (2011: 430–432, 515–518) and Probert (2014). The following summary is directly dependent on this latter group of studies.

The Latin relative pronoun *qui* continues the PIE root *kwi- / *kwo-. This root is also preserved in Hittite and Tocharian. After Sturtevant (1930) presented the theory, it has usually been assumed that, because the root *kwi- / *kwo- was originally an indefinite pronoun, as a relative pronoun, it preceded its head

---

relatives without nominal heads are not included in my corpus of LD. On the other hand, 29/93 of dislocated NPs do not have any modifier (Westbury 2014: 229). Geluykens (1992) and Tizón-Couto (2012) do not pay attention to the occurrence of relative clauses.
noun and was restrictive. The other reconstructed root that produced relative pronouns in the daughter languages is *yos (preserved, e.g., in Greek and Sanskrit). This root presumably followed its head and was appositive. Latin and Hittite share features in relative clause syntax beyond the pronoun root *kwi- / *kwo-. Indeed, this fact prompted the theory that relative clause syntax was inherited with the pronominal roots. However, even languages that build their relative pronoun from the root *yos have correlative clauses of the type thought to be typical of the *kwi languages. Probert (2014) has suggested that types of relative clauses may differ according to surviving document types and that the preponderance of restrictive clauses in Latin and Hittite may be because, for these languages, the early texts consist mainly of legal texts (vs. epic poetry in Sanskrit and Greek).

Most scholars have explained parallelism between Latin and Hittite as a common inheritance. Sturtevant (1930: 144–146) already observed that the placing of the relative clause before the main clause and the appearance of the relative pronoun only after a couple of words in its clause is typical in both Latin and Hittite (both of these features can also be paralleled in Italic texts).

A syntactic type that is attested in both Latin and Hittite is the so-called correlative construction, seen in Latin example (6):

(6) **quoi homini** di sunt propiti, ei non iratos esse puto

`PLAUT. Curc. 557`

‘With him to whom the gods are well-disposed I don’t think they are angry.’

The construction consists of two parts: first, an embedded head in the relative clause (**quoi homini**) then a co-referent anaphoric expression in the matrix clause (**ei**). This bipartite construction, also called a diptych, is often assumed to be the original relative clause type in languages that build their relative pronouns from the root *kwi- / *kwo- (Fruyt 2005; Pompei 2011: 519). Other types of relative clauses are supposed to have emerged from this original correlative construction. According to Haudry (1973: 155–157), the next step in the development of the relative clause was the inverse diptych, whereby the order of the relative pronoun and the head noun is switched (e.g., *hominis quoi ... ei*). This construction, on the other hand, allowed a reanalysis, whereby the original rel-
ative adjective modifying its noun was interpreted as a relative pronoun and an indicator of subordination.\textsuperscript{35}

While agreement in both the relative pronoun and the correlative sentence type (as well as attractions) in Latin and Hittite is notable, a common inheritance from the parent language may not be the only imaginable explanation for this situation. The appearance of correlative clauses with the root *kwi- / *kwo- and adnominal non-restrictive relative clauses with the root *yos may be a consequence of the types of texts that happen to survive, not of the inherent qualities of the relative pronouns themselves (Probert 2014). It is even possible for similar phenomena to have emerged in the daughter languages through drift or as a result of a linguistic area (Probert 2014). This would mean that the normal diptych was not necessarily ever the only pattern of relativization in languages with the root *kwi- / *kwo-. Still, comparison between Latin and Hittite may be fruitful regardless of the ultimate reason for the similarities (Lehmann 1979: 3).

As the prehistory of Latin relatives is only of limited relevance to this study, I will not go into further detail in that area. The state of relative clauses in republican Latin and, in particular, their relevance to LD will be discussed in the following section.

\subsection{Types of Latin Relative Clauses}

First, a distinction must be made between two basic types of Latin relative clauses, adnominal and autonomous (see Pinkster 2012: 379–381).

Adnominal relative clauses function at the level of the noun phrase and may be restrictive or non-restrictive. Restrictive relative clauses reduce the number of possible referents. In non-restrictive relative clauses, the head noun is presented as being known and identifiable to the recipient, and the relative clause contains some additional piece of information about the head noun. As can be expected, restrictive relative clauses, as in (7), form the majority of relative clauses attested in Latin LD:

(7) \textit{plerique homines, quos cum nil refert pudet ubi pudendum est ibi eos deserit pudor, quom usus est ut pudeat}

\textit{Plaut. Epid. 166–167}

\textsuperscript{35} On autonomous relative clauses with reference to diptychs, see Pinkster (forthc. chapter 18).
‘Most people who are ashamed when there’s nothing for them to be shamed about, their sense of shame escapes them, when there is something about which they ought to be ashamed.’

In (7), the relative clause *quos cum nil refert pudet* is essential in defining the referent *plerique homines*. However, there are also unambiguous examples of non-restrictive relative clauses, as in (8):36

(8) **deos quidem quos maxume aequom est metuere, eos minimi facit**

*Plaut. Pseud. 269*

‘He cares absolutely nothing for the gods, whom one ought to fear absolutely.’

In (8), *deos* is not defined by *quos maxume aequom est metuere*. The number of possible referents is not reduced by the relative clause. Instead, the relative clause offers additional information about the gods. Hence, restrictiveness cannot be formulated as a rule.

Autonomous relative clauses, on the other hand, function at the level of the sentence and can occur either with the independent relative pronoun (*qui*, picked up by *is*), as in (9), or as a combination of the relative pronoun and a head noun (*quae merx*, picked up by *ei*), as in (10):

(9) **qui oletum saepissime et altissime miscebit, is tenuissimas radices exarabit**

*Cato Agr. 61.1*

‘The planter who works his olives very often and very deep will plough up the very slender roots.’

(10) **quae proba est merx, pretium ei statuit, pro uirtute ut ueneat**

*Plaut. Mil. 728*

‘Good merchandise he values in such a way that it might be sold for its worth.’

36 Same observations on a smaller corpus were made by Hahn (1964: 136–137).
This analysis follows Pinkster (2012 and forthc. chapter 18), who argues that (10) is an autonomous relative clause and, hence, of essentially the same structure as (9). According to traditional analysis, (10) is an adnominal relative clause with the head incorporated in the relative clause, so that it appears after the relative pronoun (*merx quae) instead of before it (*merx quae). While I accept Pinkster’s analysis, it is impossible to refer to previous research without acknowledging that the *homo qui / qui homo variation has largely been taken at its face value—i.e., as variation in word order (reflecting its assumed origin in diptychs and inverted diptychs; see above 2.2.1). The exact status of (10) as an adnominal or autonomous relative clause is not of central importance for this study. What is relevant is the status of the head noun in (11).

(11) senes qui huc uenient, i rem uobis aperient

Plaut. Trin. 17

‘The old men who’ll come here will disclose the matter to you’

Given the flexibility of Latin word order, (11) allows for an analysis as a construction equal to (10)—i.e., *qui senes. It is formally ambiguous, between a restrictive adnominal relative clause and an autonomous relative clause with a fronted head. In the latter case, it is not left-dislocation but a word order variation of (10) (see Probert and Dickey [2016: 393–394] and Pinkster [forthc. chapter 18]). This question will be dealt with in further detail below. In this study, (11) and similar ones are studied as left-dislocation, with the above reservations in mind.

2.2.2.1 Nominal Heads (Types A1–2 and B1–2)

In the following section, I have summarized in two tables the essential variations in relative clauses according to placement of the head noun and absence or presence of resumption.

In tables 2–3, type A refers to constructions with heads that are internal to the relative clause. Type B refers to constructions where the head noun is (demonstrably or possibly) external to the relative clause. Appended to these letters, 1 designates the presence and 2 the absence of a resumptive anaphoric element. The status of each construction as LD (or not) is indicated in the final column to the right (LD further signalled with bold typeface).

---

37 Cf. Vonlaufen (1974: 46) notes that, in constructions like senes qui ... ei ... aperient, it is unclear whether the noun senes belongs in the relative clause or in the main clause.
**TABLE 2**  Relative clauses with internal head nouns (A1 and A2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Relative pronoun + noun</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
<th>Case combination</th>
<th>Status as LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>qui homo</td>
<td>is (homo)</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>qui homo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**  Relative clauses with external head nouns (B1 and B2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Noun + relative pronoun</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
<th>Case combination</th>
<th>Status as LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>(ille) homo qui</td>
<td>is (homo)</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>(ille) homo qui</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I do not mark whether the resumptive element repeats the head noun. Vonlaufen (1974: 58–59) notes that repeating the noun is typical in legal and colloquial language, motivated by a search for clarity.

Construction A1 is the original correlative sentence, with a restrictive relative clause and a clause-internal head, as in (6) and (10) above. Construction A2 is similar to A1 in the organization of the relative clause, but there is no resumption in the matrix clause.

In construction B1, the head noun precedes the relative pronoun, and the combination is followed by resumption in the matrix clause. Construction B1 is a left-dislocation. In many examples of B1, the head noun cannot be internal to the relative clause and, hence, is a word order variation of type A1, usually because of a pronominal modifier.

Construction B2 is the normal preposed (sentence-initial) relative clause without resumption. Instances of B2 that show case disagreement are analysed as left-dislocation. This is in line with earlier studies on nominativus pendens or attractio inversa, which usually include such combinations of a head noun + relative clause, where the resumptive pronoun is lacking and the implied case does not agree with that of the initial noun. The initial noun is clause-external, because it cannot, in its current case form, be part of the matrix clause.
Examples for each type are given below, with case disagreement between the dislocated element and the resumption possible in all categories.

A1: Internal head with resumption

Case agreement NOM + NOM

(12) *et una binae singulis quae datae ancillae nobis, eae nos lauando, eluendo operam dederunt*  
*Plaut. Poen. 221–223*

‘And with us we had two slave girls each that we were given—they took care of washing and bathing us.’

Case agreement ACC + ACC

(13) *quam agrum poplicum iudicamus esse, eum agrum castelanos Langenses Veiturios po[s]i[dere fruique uidetur oportere*  
*ILLRP 517.23–24*

‘Whatever land we judge to be public state-land, that land we think the fort-holders, namely the Langensian Viturii, ought to hold and enjoy.’

Case disagreement NOM + ACC

(14) *qua res in se neque consilium neque modum habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes*  
*Ter. Eun. 57–58*

‘When a thing lacks method and measure, no method of advice can direct it.’

Case disagreement ACC + DAT

(15) *ut in tabellis quos consignaui hic heri latrones, ibus denumerem stipendium*  
*Plaut. Mil. 73–74*

‘So that I can count out the pay to the soldiers that I enlisted in my tablets here yesterday.’
A2: Internal head without resumption

Case agreement NOM + [NOM]

(16) omnibus modis qui pauperes sunt homines, miseri uiuont

Plaut. Rud. 290

‘People who are poor live wretchedly in all ways.’

Case agreement DAT + [DAT]

(17) quoi homini di propiti sunt, alicuad obiciunt lucri

Plaut. Persa 470

‘If the gods are well disposed toward someone, they throw some profit his way.’

Case disagreement NOM + [ACC]

(18) nam qui ero ex sententia seruire seruos postulat, in erum matura, in se sera condecet capessere [sc., eum condecet]

Plaut. Aul. 589–590

‘A slave who wants to serve his master according to his wishes must give first place to his master and second place to himself.’

Case disagreement ACC + [NOM]

(19) posthac quas faciet de integro comoedias, spectandae an exigendae sint uobis prius

Ter. Andr. 26–27

‘Whether the new comedies he writes in the future are to gain an audience or be driven off the stage without a hearing.’
**Bi: External head with resumption**

Case agreement NOM + NOM

(20) *senes qui* huc uenient, *i rem uobis aperient*  
*Plaut. Trin. 17*

‘The old men who’ll come here will disclose the matter to you.’

Case agreement ACC + ACC

(21) *deos quidem quos* maxume aequom est metuere, *eos minimi facit*  
*Plaut. Pseud. 269*

‘He cares absolutely nothing for the gods, whom one ought to fear absolutely.’

Case disagreement NOM + ACC

(22) *arboribus ab terra* pulli *qui nati erunt, eos in terram deprimito, extollito,*  
ut* radicem capere possint*  
*Cato Agr. 133.1*

‘Press into the earth the scions which spring from the ground around the trees, elevating them so that they can take root.’

Case disagreement NOM + DAT

(23) *ego qui* in mari prehendi, rete atque excepi uidulum, *ei dari negatis quicquam*  
*Plaut. Rud. 1291–1292*

‘You refuse to give anything to me, who caught the trunk in the sea with my net and took it out.’
B2: External head without resumption

Case agreement NOM + [NOM]

(24) etiam opilio qui pascit, mater, alienas ouis, aliquam habet peculiarem, qui spem soletur suam

PLAUT. Asin. 539–540

‘But mother, even the shepherd who pastures other people’s sheep has some lamb of his own with which he consoles his hopes.’

(25) sed puer ille quem ego laui, ut magnust et multum ualet

PLAUT. Amph. 1103

‘But the boy I washed, how big and strong he is!’

Case disagreement NOM + [GEN]

(26) ostium quod in angiporto est horti, patefeci fores [sc., eius ostii]

PLAUT. Most. 1346

‘I opened the wings of the door to the garden in the alley.’

Case disagreement ACC + [NOM]

(27) agrum quem Volsci habuerunt, campestris plerus Aboriginum fuit [sc., is ager]

CATO Orig. FRHist 24

‘The land that the Volscians held, the greater part of it flat, belonged to the Aborigines.’

All types are attested from early Latin onwards, but there is some variation in the frequencies of the different types depending on genre. Type A1 is common especially in legal texts, though, even there, types A2, B1 and B2 occur nearly as frequently. In other genres, the situation is different. In Plautus, the head-internal type (A1 and A2) is less frequent than left-dislocation (B1), but B2 (head-external without resumption) is the most frequent type.38 Preposed rela-

38 See Bertelsmann (1885); Vonlaufen (1974).
tive clauses of the correlative type probably present the original Indo-European construction, but, even if this is the case, by Plautus's time, their use was already restricted. Probert and Dickey (2016) discuss the presumed decline of correlative sentences toward later Latin, particularly concerning the agricultural writers (Cato, Varro, Columella, Palladius), and observe a concomitant decline in the use of left-dislocation in these writers.

A definition of (core) LD is indispensable for the present work, but this does not mean that ambiguous or closely related constructions will be neglected. Throughout the book, comparisons are made between LD and other constructions of the head-internal type (A1) and the classical type without resumption (B2).

As mentioned above, construction B1 (homo qui ... is) is a left-dislocation. The antecedent of the relative clause is external, and the whole combination of the antecedent together with the relative clause is left-detached. The resumptive element in the main clause is analysed as a sign of the detachment. In the historical perspective, however, due to the construction's assumed common origin with A1, a commonly held view is that instances of B1 in early Latin are, in fact, correlative clauses with fronted heads. In that analysis, construction B1 is a word order variation of A1, not a dislocation to begin with. A survey of the relationship between the two types (A1 and B1) in the different parts of the corpus will be presented in the following chapters. Nevertheless, it needs to be added at this stage that, even if the head in B1 was fronted out of the relative clause and had the same underlying structure as A1, one would still want to know what caused the head to be so fronted. It is usually assumed that this happened for 'emphasis', and it may be that such an emphasis is related to topic function.

However, it needs to be stressed at this point that not all heads of relative clauses (in type B1) can be analysed as having been fronted out of their relative clause, thus being word order variations of type A1 qui homo ... is. There is a clear-cut difference between the different parts of the republican Latin corpus concerning the possibility of analysing the dislocated element as a frontend head of the relative clause.

---


40 The third possibility is that the antecedent is a part of the relative clause, even if it cannot be an internal head; see Hahn (1964). From that perspective, the antecedent does not belong in the main clause but in the relative clause, irrespective of its syntactic qualities.
In the statutes and other legal texts, all examples of LD have a relative clause, and the head of the relative clause can (at least formally) be interpreted as a clause-internal head of an autonomous relative clause. Within preposed relative clauses, type A1 predominates in the legal texts. It is therefore possible to see here a phenomenon that is at least partly a matter of variation in word order. This question will be further pursued in chapter 4.

The picture provided by comedy is remarkably different from that seen in the statutes and other legal texts. The adnominal relative clause with an external head (without the possibility of an interpretation as a fronted internal head) is, in fact, the rule in comedy. There is only a handful of constructions that are open to either interpretation, adnominal and autonomous relative clauses. In the typical example of type B1 (with a nominal antecedent), the antecedent cannot be reconstructed as the clause-internal head of an autonomous relative clause.

My corpus of left-dislocation with relative clauses in comedy totals 67 examples. Of these, only eight are such that we can, in theory, move the head to the relative clause and have, as a result, a grammatical Latin sentence that fits the context. In the remaining examples, the head cannot be part of the relative clause, the reason being one of the following:

1) The antecedent of the relative pronoun is accompanied by a pronoun or other attribute: *isti Graeci palliati, plerique homines, amicitia nostra, tua ancilla*

2) The antecedent itself is a pronoun: *ille, hic, omnia, id*

3) The relative clause is clearly non-restrictive in meaning: *fel quod, deos quos* (assuming that internally headed relative clauses are always restrictive)

For these instances, then, it is clear that type B cannot be analysed as a word order variation of type A, even if we disregard the structural difference. Instead, there is an external head that is not part of the relative clause. This point was made already by Lindskog (1896) and later by Vonlaufen (1974: 28–30). It was also formulated explicitly by Touratier (1980: 147–153). Nevertheless, the issue continues to be open to discussion, and the explanation of the phenomenon as a fronted head continues to be offered.

---

41 Probert and Dickey (2016: 393) call these ‘ambiguous’ examples, between correlative sentences and left-dislocation. For a detailed definition of correlative clauses, see Probert and Dickey (2016: 391–392).

42 A fourth criterion is that the head and the relative pronoun are inflected in different cases, but such instances are ruled out already by one of the other criteria.

The question of definition is thus relevant only for those instances where it is possible to consider the alternative description of the head noun as part of an autonomous relative clause and, hence, to consider the entire structure as a variant word order of type A. The status of the head of the relative pronoun and the possible variation with the head-internal relative clause in each part of the corpus will be brought up in the following chapters. I take it as my starting point that the same factors that trigger the use of left-dislocation in Latin and cross-linguistically are responsible for the placement of the head in such constructions where it is possible that the head was originally clause-internal.

To sum up the points I have made in the preceding discussion, left-dislocation in early Latin has close ties and possibly even shares its origin with the correlative sentence type. There is much variation inside the corpus concerning the frequency and type of relative clauses. This means that each part of the corpus will need to be studied separately for a correct description. In any case, it seems clear that the existing patterns of relative clauses in early Latin cannot be regarded as synchronic variations of the correlative sentence type with a restrictive relative clause, even when we accept this pattern to have been the original one. It is possible that the legal texts show an earlier and more conservative stage of the language, whereas Plautus shows what was feasible in spoken conversation (or, alternatively, what a linguistically gifted individual was able to do with his language).

One final point needs to be added. An alternative perspective is to see these constructions as an extension of the correlative sentence type. This means that the exact status of the antecedent and its relationship with the following relative clause would be irrelevant. Instead, the resumptive pronouns would be directly triggered by the preposed relative clause and would, as it were, be included in the relative clause formula. An analysis along these lines can be found in Pinkster (2012), albeit without the notion of correlative sentences. Even if one prefers this correlative perspective, I think it is misleading to group together all examples of a preposed relative clause with a resumptive anaphoric pronoun, regardless of the grammatical case of the two references. The role of the anaphoric is more prominent in constructions without case agreement.

2.2.2.2 Pronominal Antecedents (Types C1–2)
A further issue of definition concerns the type where a demonstrative pronoun occurs as an antecedent of the relative clause, as in (28):

(28) *ille qui* adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio,
is illi Poeno huius patruo hospes fuit

Plaut. *Poen.* 119–120

‘The man who adopted this chap as his son was a family friend of that Carthaginian, the uncle of the young man.’

According to traditional analysis, this construction includes a pronominal antecedent (*ille*) and a relative clause (*qui adoptauit*) (Pompei 2011: 526–527; Bortolussi and Sznajder 2014: 188; Havers 1926: 232). However, Lehmann (1979) and Pinkster (2012) have pointed out that antecedents of relative clauses consisting of only a demonstrative pronoun are not heads of the relative pronoun but demonstrative pronouns that modify the referent of an autonomous relative clause (Lehmann 1979: 9; Pinkster 2012: 386–387 with references). The resumptive element in such cases refers to the autonomous relative pronoun, not to its pronominal modifier (*qui adoptauit ... is*). The demonstrative pronoun cannot act as the head of a restrictive relative clause, because the pronoun itself is a definite entity and is not in need of further definition with a restrictive relative clause (Pinkster 2012: ‘these pronouns cannot be modified with attributes’).

In this book, traditional analysis will be followed to allow for the analysis of pronominal constructions in terms of left-dislocation. Due to the apparent structural and functional parallelism with nominal heads, pronominal antecedents will be treated in this study as capable of performing a function similar to nominal left-dislocation. An important example is Plaut. *Asin.* 527 *illos qui dant, eos derides*, where the pronominal antecedent-modifier does not agree in case with the following relative pronoun but is instead in the accusative, as if governed by the main clause predicate *derides*.

In my view, this shows some degree of autonomy in the pronominal element, whether or not it is defined as the antecedent of the relative pronoun.

In table 4, I give a similar outline of the pronominal antecedents and resumptive elements as above with the nominal ones. The letter $C$ refers to the pronominal antecedent, and, as above in tables 2 and 3, appended to the letter, 1 refers to the presence and 2 to the absence of a resumptive element. The sta-

---

Pinkster (2012: 386–387) makes the same observation concerning Plaut. *Persa* 776 *bene ei qui unuidet mi et ei qui hoc gaudet* (ex. 26 in Pinkster) where the pronominal modifier is in the dative. Pinkster does not think that case disagreement prevents interpreting such instances as pronominal modifiers of autonomous relative pronouns.
TABLE 4 Relative clauses with pronominal antecedents (C1 and C2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Demonstrative pronoun</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
<th>Case combination</th>
<th>Status as LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>ille qui</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>ille qui</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>case agreement</td>
<td>not LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case disagreement</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status of each construction as LD (or not) is indicated in the final column to the right (LD further signalled with bold typeface).

From this table, we notice that the pattern of existing constructions is similar to that presented above for nominal relative types. Below, I give examples of each type:

C1: Pronominal antecedent with resumption

Case agreement ACC + ACC

(29) id quod in rem tuam optumum esse arbitror,\[1][\[29\]]
ted id monitum aduento

*Plaut. Aul.* 144–145

‘I’ve come to recommend to you what I consider to be in your best interest.’

Case disagreement NOM + ACC

(30) ille qui mandauit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus?\[1][\[30\]]

*Plaut. Trin.* 137

‘Haven’t you thrown the man who entrusted him to you out of his house?’
C2: Pronominal antecedent without resumption

Case agreement NOM + [NOM]

(31) et illas quas habet recte feras

*Ter. Eun. 78*

‘And you’ll bear the ones it does bring philosophically.’

Case disagreement ACC + [NOM]

(32) sed istum quem quaeris ego sum

*Plaut. Curc. 419*

‘But I am the man you’re looking for.’

For the purposes of the present work, the constructions seen in (29), (30) and (32) will be classified as left-dislocation. It is assumed that the combined effect of the pronominal attribute of the relative clause and the resumptive pronoun in the matrix clause lends such emphasis to the construction that it can be meaningfully studied together with nominal left-dislocation.

2.2.3 Notes on Word Order

The highly flexible word order of Latin causes further complications for the identification of LD in the context of relative clauses, because the surface constituent order of the sentence does not always mirror its syntactic structure.

In my corpus of republican Latin left-dislocation, this phenomenon can be seen clearly in a sentence like Plaut. *Aul. 34–36* et hic qui poscet eam sibi uxorem senex, is adolescents est illius aunculus, where the syntactic structure must be *hic senex qui*, because *qui hic ... senex* would be impossible (see Touratier 1980: 153–156). Another example is Plaut. *Mil. 1114* istuc quod das consilium mihi, te cum illa uerba facere de ista re uolo, where *istuc consilium* must be the head noun of relative pronoun *quod*. One more example can be quoted from Terence: *Ter. Andr. 47* quas credis esse has, non sunt uerae nuptiae. Despite its linear position, *has* does not belong in the relative clause.46

46 Examples of the same phenomenon not involving left-dislocation include Plaut. *Asin. 746* (agedum istum ostense quem conscripsti syngraphum inter me et amicam et lenam), Plaut. *Cist. 49* (semperque istam quam nunc habes acetatulam optinebis) and Plaut. *Asin. 179* (quam amabam abduxit ab lenone mulierem).
The three passages just quoted can be compared with the following examples, where an element of an autonomous relative clause is fronted. The first is Plaut. *Rud.* 1364 *tua quae fuit Palaestra, ea filia inuestast mea.* Here, the sense must be *quae tua Palaestra fuit, ea filia inuentast mea,* ‘The girl who was your Palaestra, (she) has been found to be my daughter.’ In other words, we have here an autonomous relative clause introduced by *quae,* with *tua Palaestra* as the subject complement (*tua* has been fronted as a focus). A related case is Plaut. *Rud.* 9 *qui est imperator Iuppiter, is ... disparat.* Here, it is clear that Iuppiter cannot be the internal head of a restrictive relative clause (*qui Iuppiter*), so the structure must be *Iuppiter qui,* but it remains unclear whether Iuppiter is a dislocated constituent (*Iuppiter, qui est imperator, is disparat,* ‘Iuppiter, who is the leader, he ...’) or the subject complement of an autonomous relative clause (*qui est imperator Iuppiter, is disparat,* ‘the one who is Iuppiter, the leader, he ...’). In the latter interpretation, the construction would be similar to *tua quae fuit Palaestra.*

Recognizing this pattern enables us to provide what I believe to be the correct interpretation of Plaut. *Asin.* 621 *patronus qui uobis fuit futurus, perdidistis.* Here, again, I believe that the surface word order obscures the structure of the clause. On purely formal grounds, *patronus* can easily be taken as the fronted head of the relative pronoun *qui.* However, considering what the sentence ought to mean, the sense should be ‘You lost the man who was going to be your patron’—i.e., it is again an autonomous relative clause in which *patronus* is the subject complement: *qui uobis fuit futurus patronus, perdidistis* (with *patronus* fronted as the focal constituent?). Another example of this type is Plaut. *Rud.* 965 *et qui inuenit hominem et dominus qui nunc est, scio (= qui nunc est dominus, scio).* It should be noted that, in such contexts, leaving out the pronoun *eum* from the matrix clause is a common practice, whereas, if taken as LD, *patronus qui* would be the sole representative of a pattern where an LD in the nominative is not picked up by an anaphoric in the accusative.

### 2.2.4 Attractio Inuersa

The considerations of relative clauses presented in the previous sections are crucial in the interpretation of *attractio inuersa.* In this section, I present the principal problems concerning this construction. These aspects will be developed further in chapters 3–5, in each from the particular viewpoint of the included material. The problems in the analysis of *attractio inuersa* concern the syntactic status of the head noun and, related to this, the cause of its grammatical case. Furthermore, the grammatical case(s) that can be the result of the alleged attraction need to be defined.
The first problem concerns the syntactic status of the head or antecedent of the relative pronoun and the probability of attraction as the cause of the construction. We may begin with the most famous example of this construction, (33), from Virgil:

(33) **urbem quam** statuo uestra est

*Verg. Aen. 1.572*

‘The city I build is yours.’

Translation FAIRCLOUGH and GOOLD

According to the traditional explanation, this is an attraction of the head to the case of the relative pronoun. The underlying construction is *urbs quam statuo uestra est*. The head noun *urbs* was attracted into the case of the relative pronoun *quam*, allowed by the syntactic licence of early Latin (and its imitation in Virgil). This position is taken by Wackernagel (2009: 79–81), Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 567–568), Kühner and Stegmann (1971 II, 2: 289–290) and Touratier (1980: 147–156).

On the other hand, this construction can be interpreted as an early type of the relative clause, discussed above, where *urbem* is an embedded nucleus of the relative clause (type A2). According to this interpretation, the head noun *urbem* was originally clause-internal but was fronted for emphasis. In this case, the underlying construction is *quam urbem statuo, uestra est*. This position was taken already by Bach (1888) and is also found in Lehmann (1979: 9), Hettrich (1988: 504–505), Watkins (1995: 541), Penney (1999: 251 with fn. 3; 2011: 229), and Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 18 and fn. 24).

An early Latin example is (34):

(34) **agrum quem** Volsci habuerunt, campestris plerus Aboriginum fuit

*Cato Orig. FRHist 24*

‘The land that the Volscians held, the greater part of it flat, belonged to the Aborigines.’

This example also happens to be compatible with both explanations, though this is not the case for all instances of *attractio inversa*. In examples like (35), the explanation as a fronted but structurally internal head cannot be applied.

---

47 For a short overview of this question, see Pompei (2011: 468–472).
48 See also Kroll (1913: 15); Lehmann (1984: 351).
chapter 2

hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos,
illi quia astant, hi stant ambo, non sedent

PLAUT. Capt. 1–2

‘Those two prisoners you can see standing here, they’re both standing, not sitting, because the people back there are standing.’

Usually the reason for this state of affairs is the presence of a demonstrative pronoun modifying the head noun, as in (35). We cannot reconstruct a sentence where hos ... captiuos is internal to the relative clause (*quos hos captiuos). Hence, it must be a constituent of the main clause, and the case form it has (viz., accusative) must be explained as an attraction to the case of the relative pronoun.

The impression one gets from certain remarks in earlier scholarship is that constructions that allow the internal head analysis would form the majority of the so-called attractions and that attraction proper would be needed as an explanation in only a small minority of the examples. This is not, however, the case (see the detailed discussion already in Touratier 1980: 147–156).

Other scholars have tried to explain even modified nouns as internal heads. Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 18) discuss attractio inuersa, taking as an example Plaut. Men. 310–312 nummum illum quem mihi dudum pollicitu’s dare, iubeas si sapias porculum adferri tibi. Following Watkins (1995), they wish to derive the ‘attraction’, nummum illum quem, from the construction quem nummum mihi pollicitu’s dare, illo nummo iubeas porculum adferri, with fronting of nummum around the relative pronoun and deletion of both the noun and demonstrative from the main clause. This explanation, based on the transformational grammar theory, assumes that constituents can be deleted, something which is not accepted in this study. They further refer (ibid. 18 fn. 24, 19) in this connection to ‘an identifiable, and possibly rather stylized, transitional stage in the development of the relative sentence.

However, in Plautus, the

49 For a discussion, see Vonlaufen (1974: 46–56).
50 Penney (2011: 229) notes that examples like (34) allow two analyses, embedded nucleus and attraction, but, in other instances, attraction is the only option, because the relative clause is appositive. Hettrich (1988: 505 fn. 53), too, limits attraction as an explanation to those instances where a demonstrative precedes and prevents analysis as a fronted nucleus.
51 Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 18 fn. 24): ‘Relative sentences that can be seen as transitional in one way or another between the early type and the classical norm (where the relative clause usually, but not always, follows its antecedent, and the antecedent takes its case from the main clause in which it stands) are not uncommon in Plautus.’
placement and syntax of the relative clause already follow, to a large extent, the later classical forms. *Attractio inuersa* (and other possible transitional forms) are not at all common in Plautus. They must be considered exceptions, having contextual motivations, as will be argued in this work.

Constructions where the antecedent and the relative pronoun are in the nominative have often, in previous research, been analysed as *attractio inuersa* (an example is (2), in section 1.1: *mulier quae se suamque aetatem spernit, speculo ei usus est*). However, the question as to which grammatical cases can be the result of attraction has rarely been explicitly raised, and one has to deduce previous views from the range of examples given by each scholar. This has resulted in ambiguity and confusion in statements made about this construction and in material used to support those statements (discussion in Norberg 1943:79–82). The state of affairs usually implied in previous research is that the result of attraction is normally the nominative or the accusative, more rarely the dative.

Vonlaufen (1974: 26–29) and Lehmann (1984: 351) think that nominative constructions are attractions. On the other hand, Lindskog (1896), Havers (1926: 249–250) and Gonda (1965: 6) have argued that only the accusative, together with the few instances of the dative, should be analysed as attraction. They think that the nominative constructions are better taken as examples of *nominatius pendens*. In the nominative constructions, the problem concerning the status of the antecedent of the relative pronoun is less marked, because of the potential of the nominative case to appear on its own, without being caused by attraction or the like. I agree with this view and will argue that only the instances where the resulting case is the accusative (or the dative) should be called *attractio inuersa*. This is because the nominative is the default case in early Latin and thus does not need external motivation. It is capable of functioning on its own, as evidenced by those (admittedly rare) cases of *nominatius pendens* where there is either no relative clause or the relative pronoun is in some case other than the nominative. I prefer to interpret constructions where both the antecedent and the relative pronoun are in the nominative as left-dislocation in the nominative (i.e., thematic nominatives; see below 3.2).

To interpret nominatives with relative clauses this way rather than as attractions is the most economical definition. The nominative as a naming case has

---

52 Penney (1999: 251 fn. 3) agrees with Hettrich (1988: 595 fn. 53) that it is not necessary to make a distinction between examples like *pulli qui nascentur* (embedded nucleus) and *agrum quem uir habet* (attraction) but that both can be taken as relative clause with embedded nucleus.
the potential to appear on its own without external motivations such as attraction (a point made in Serbat 1991: 28; cf. Rosén [1992: 251], who nevertheless considers nominatives with relative clauses as attractions). This can be seen in examples where no relative clause is present—e.g., in Plaut. Men. 57–59 Epidamniensis ill’ quem dudum dixeram … ei liberorum nisi diuitiae nil erat where Epidamniensis ille, where the nominative is followed by relative pronoun in the accusative. Both of these types are rare in early Latin, but the nominative without relative clause becomes more frequent in later Latin (Hallaaho 2016; see Havers 1928; Svennung 1935: 187; Norberg 1943: 64–74; for variety in the syntax of the nominative Adams 2013: 215–216). That is, the dislocated constituent can be in the nominative in all contexts, irrespective of the function and case form of the co-referent element in the main clause or the case form of the relative pronoun. Hence, attractio inversa is defined in this study as a construction that has some other case than the nominative.

In attractio inversa, the antecedent’s syntactic status is relevant to the explanation of its case form. If we assume that the head is fronted but still structurally internal to the relative clause, we can simply explain the case form as a result of the head being part of the relative clause and thus having the same grammatical case as the relative pronoun. In that case, we would only need to assume, for instance, a fronting of the head for emphasis. Attraction as an explanation is needed if the antecedent of the relative pronoun is not a fronted (originally embedded) head, so the case form of the relative pronoun does not automatically account for the case form of the antecedent.\textsuperscript{53}

### 2.3 Earlier Studies on Left-Dislocation in Latin

In this section, I outline the history of research on Latin left-dislocation. Earlier studies did not use the term left-dislocation, while more recent research has used a variety of terms, depending on the theoretical model used by each scholar. Even more importantly, the constructions here subsumed under the term left-dislocation have not always been recognized to be part of a single phenomenon, and their relationship to one another has rarely been explicitly addressed. The studies usually concentrate on one part of the material discussed in this study. The most common division is into two groups: first, attractions and other relative clause phenomena and, second, the nominativus pendens (with or without a relative clause). Only a few of the more recent

\textsuperscript{53} See 3.2.1.3 on the plausibility of attraction as an explanation.
studies have identified here what is essentially one construction with several different forms (most importantly, Rosén 1992).

Research on the topic goes back to the 19th century. The earliest two studies, Bertelsmann (1885) and Bach (1888), both concern relative clause phenomena from different perspectives. Bertelsmann (1885) is a study on relative clause syntax in older Latin, concentrating especially on the forms of relative clause ‘correlation’—that is, the order of the relative clause and matrix clause, as well as the presence or absence of anaphoric resumption in the latter. In principle, his corpus covers LD with relative clauses in comedy, but it is necessarily incomplete for that phenomenon. Nevertheless, Bertelsmann remains the only study with numerical data on different types of relative clauses in republican Latin.54

Bach (1888) focused particularly on attractio inuersa but also included the nominative attractions, which means that this study covers a considerable body of material with relative clauses in republican Latin. Like Bertelsmann, Bach is valuable mainly as a source of examples. His collection of material should be considered nearly complete for attractio inuersa in republican Latin.

Lindskog (1896) is the first serious attempt to find a historically and syntactically adequate explanation for attractio inuersa. Lindskog rejected the idea that attractio inuersa is a word order variation of the head-internal relative clause, the theory presented by Bach (1888); rather, Lindskog correctly points out that an explanation as a fronted head does not apply to all instances, notably to those where the head is accompanied by a demonstrative pronoun. Furthermore, similar attractions are found in other languages besides Latin (at least in Greek and German),55 where an explanation as a fronted head of the relative pronoun is impossible (Lindskog 1896: 51–52).

Lindskog’s analysis is based on a limited number of examples, but it is nevertheless insightful. In fact, Lindskog proposed a grouping of examples that is essentially similar to what I am presenting in this work. Lindskog distinguished between three different syntactic types. I call the first group (type 1 in Lindskog [1896]) anticipation, comprising the constructions where the head noun of the relative clause agrees in case with its reference in the matrix clause (but not necessarily with the relative pronoun). As Lindskog put it, in these constructions, ‘Das voraufgehende Substantivum ist schon bewusstermassen als

54  For figures on correlative sentences (including autonomous ones) in Cato and Varro, see Probert and Dickey 2016.

55  Wackernagel (2009: 81) cites the German example ‘Den liebsten Buhlen, den ich han, der liegt beim Wirt in Keller’ (‘The favourite sweetheart [acc.] that I have, he lies in the cellar of the tavern’).
Bestandteil in den Satz eingefügt.’ Lindskog draws attention to cases where all three references agree in case, and the motivation for the case of the head noun is impossible to decide on (these are included in my ‘anticipation’ group).

Lindskog’s second group is different: ‘Der Sprechende hat sich noch nicht klar gemacht, in welchem Verhältnis das Substantiv, mit dem er gleichsam den Satz anschlägt, zu dem Prädikate desselben steht’ (Lindskog 1896: 54). These can be divided into two groups (2a and 2b), according to whether the head noun takes the nominative as the default case or whether it takes the case form (usually the accusative) of the relative pronoun. The first of these two groups, (type 2a in Lindskog [1896]) consists of the constructions where the head noun and the relative pronoun are both in the nominative. These Lindskog explains as reflecting the neutral character of the nominative case. He does not consider them as examples of attraction. The nominative is the ‘relationslos Kasus’. However, Lindskog admits that, for most of these, an explanation as attractions cannot be ruled out. Finally, group 2b comprises ‘genuine’ attractions, where the head noun takes the case of the word closest to it both physically and semantically, the relative pronoun, thus being influenced by the predicate of the relative clause instead of that of the matrix clause. Lindskog further drew attention to the fact that attractions can be followed by pronominal resumption.

Lindskog’s analysis of case syntactic phenomena is pertinent, but he still thought (Lindskog 1896: 55) that attractions in the accusative are more common than the default nominatives, shown not to be the case in this study. Whereas Bach linked *attractio inuersa* to parataxis and an original indefinite meaning of the relative pronoun (e.g., *urbem quam statuo uestra est* as derived from *urbem (ali)quam statuo, uestra est*), Lindskog (1896: 52, 56) sees a force behind this phenomenon that might be called a freer and more psychological parataxis, drawing from the lesser syntactic rigour of spoken language (Alltagssprache, Umgangssprache), whereby the entire content of the sentence is not expressed simultaneously—this is reminiscent of Lambrechts’s Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role, on which see above 2.1.2.

Havers (1926) is the first study dedicated to *nominatiuus pendens*. Havers presented a non-exhaustive collection of examples from different genres and time periods. Several observations made in this study remain valid today. Havers coined the term ‘isoliert-emphatische Nominativ’ for *nominatiuus pendens*. This term, although it never became established, effectively combines the two salient features of the construction: ‘isoliert’, for what today would be called extra-clausal, and ‘emphatisch’, as a recognition of the pragmatic force of the construction. For Havers, case disagreement between the dislocated constituent and its pronominal reference is a necessary qualification of an isolated-
emphatic nominative. According to Havers, case agreement is a signal that the isolated constituent is not genuinely isolated, because the dislocation would otherwise fit in the matrix clause in its present case form. This means that all combinations of nominative + nominative are excluded from his examples and discussion. However, Havers made the important point that combinations of an antecedent and a relative pronoun in the nominative (followed by a reference in some other case in the matrix clause) should not be analysed as *attractio inuersa* in the nominative but rather as ‘isolated-emphatic’ nomina- tives. This is the view that will be taken in the present work as well (for further discussion, see 3.2.1.3).56

Hahn (1964) is a study on the origins of the Latin relative pronoun. Hahn used Latin constructions traditionally classified as *attractio inuersa* to argue for the original indefinite meaning of the Indo-European *qui- / quo-* stem. This argument is based on the similarity between Hittite and Latin. In support of this view, she presented 27 examples of *attractio inuersa* from comedy, Cato and Varro (Hahn 1964: 131 ff.). Hahn brought forth several syntactic properties of these constructions that are rarely, if ever, mentioned elsewhere, properties that will be described in this work with a fuller corpus. These include the case syntax of the relative clause construction (Hahn 1964: 132–133), the different pronouns used in resumption (Hahn 1964: 133), absence of resumption (Hahn 1964: 133–134) and pronominal antecedents (Hahn 1964: 134–136). Hahn argued that this final group (pronominal antecedents) must be an independent Latin development, as Hittite only rarely has pronominal antecedents. She furthermore argued that the construction known as *attractio inuersa* is, in reality, not true attraction but an inherited construction whereby the original indefinite meaning of the pronominal stem remains visible.57 Hahn (1964: 137–139) touched on the issue of the register of the construction and whether it should be labelled archaic or colloquial (‘precisely because it is early or because their style is closer to ordinary speech than that of the writers of later poetry and prose’), concluding that the construction belonged to Umgangssprache, because it is found in less polished authors like Plautus and Lucilius.58

---

56 In addition, there is a good collection of material with discussion in Svennung (1935: 178–188), under the rubric ‘Konstruktionsloser Kasus, durch ein Demonstrativum eines folgendes Satzes wiederaufgenommen’.

57 Hahn (1964: 136 fn. 108) thought that the order of the antecedent and the relative pronoun was unimportant.

58 Hahn (1964: 137–138) pointed out that early manners of expression may linger on in common speech. However, Verg. *Aen.* 1.573 *urbem quam statuo uesta est* is seen by Hahn as an archaism, as the context in Virgil rules out a colloquialism.
There are two articles on Latin Theme constituents in the Functional Grammar framework. Hoffmann (1989) offers a typology of Latin Theme constituents (see above 2.1 and 2.1.2). Somers (1994) discussed a large number of Themes and fronted topics in Cicero’s letters. Somers’s study is mainly on de periphrases and quod clauses, as these are the prevalent types in Cicero’s letters. The material is therefore syntactically different from that studied in this work, but Somers nevertheless offered certain interesting observations, her focus being on finding syntactic and pragmatic differences between Themes and fronted topics. In a language like Latin, these are not distinguishable, if the Theme constituent satisfies the verb’s selection restrictions and there is no anaphoric resumption in the main clause (Pinkster 1990: 37 fn. 8; Hoffmann 1989; Somers 1994: 152).

Neither of these studies discusses early Latin in detail, and they cite only isolated examples from Plautus and Cato.

Another important study is Rosén (1992), which deals mainly with proleptic accusatives but in the context of other dislocation constructions and includes both attractio inversa and nominatius pendens. Rosén is one of the few scholars apart from Havers who has explicitly addressed the question concerning the identity of nominative dislocation with relative clauses—i.e., those constructions that are open to interpretation as attractio inversa (Rosén 1992: 251–252). Her view was that, because attractions demonstrably appear with other cases than just the accusative, the nominative should be included as well. According to Rosén, nominatives with relative clauses do not typically occur as ‘nominativisierende Prolepse’—i.e., as nominatius pendens. She thus classifies nominatives with relative clauses as nominative attractions (Rosén 1992: 252), further arguing (Rosén 1992: 255, 261) that the initial element can be either thematic or rhematic. It is rhematic, if the co-referent element in the main clause is in the same case as the initial element (typically, the nominative). If it is in a different case, it does not have any rhematicizing function, so the initial element is thematic.

Bortolussi and Sznajder (2014) discuss left-dislocation and other fronting phenomena in the Vulgata, concentrating on Jerome’s translation technique from Biblical Hebrew, where left-dislocation is a regular construction. They also

59 Cicero uses Brand New information in fronted constructions only in the structuring function—i.e., referring to the structure of the text (Somers 1994). Interestingly, it seems that left-dislocation in comedy does not contain any examples of such a structuring function.

60 ‘Proleptic accusative’ refers to a construction where the subject of the subordinate clause appears as an object of the main clause predicate (e.g., fac me ut sciam), see Halla-aho (forthc.).
consider the possibility that there is a diachronic correspondence between left-dislocation in Latin and old French but conclude that this is not the case.

### 2.4 Concluding Remarks

In this study, left-dislocation is defined as an extra-clausal element preceding its matrix clause and, in most cases, taken up by a resumptive element in this matrix clause (usually, the main clause). However, relative clause syntax interferes with left-dislocation in Latin due to the history of the Latin relative clause constructions; this fact will be considered in the syntactic description of left-dislocation.

I will assume that both the *senes qui*-type and the *ille qui*-type constructions have, in their surface structure and use, enough parallelism with left-dislocation as to be reasonable to include them in this discussion. I furthermore assume that the reasons why the head was fronted in the *senes qui* type are the same that elsewhere gave rise to left-dislocation proper (cf. Probert and Dickey 2016: 393).

Considering these aspects in relative clause syntax, it seems reasonable to surmise at this point that left-dislocation in Latin is a mixed category, partly representing an extension of certain types of preposed (cor)relative clauses and partly caused by what might be recognized as true dislocation. Throughout the work, comparison will be made between LD and other types of relative clause constructions.

The hypothesis is that the occurrence of left-dislocation in Latin is pragmatically conditioned. Based on cross-linguistic evidence and previous research on Latin, it is expected that left-dislocation will, for the most part, be connected with topic status.
CHAPTER 3

Left-Dislocation in Comedy (with an Appendix on Lucretius)

3.1 Introduction

Left-dislocation in comedy is by far the largest group in the corpus, consisting altogether of 77 examples. It is also the most varied in all respects, especially concerning the range of possible case combinations between the dislocated element, the relative pronoun and resumption in the main clause. Almost all the examples are from Plautus. Only five of the 77 examples of left-dislocation come from Terence (table 5). The majority of the 77 instances contain a relative clause (67 examples). There are ten examples without a relative clause, all of which come from Plautus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>With a relative clause</th>
<th>Without a rel. clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next section (3.2), I discuss the syntax of left-dislocation in Plautus and Terence. I begin with a description of case syntax. This is followed by an analysis of relative clause syntax, whereby different types of antecedents and relative clauses are analysed. Left-dislocation with relative clause presents specific syntactic questions that are not relevant to LD without a relative clause. Therefore, dislocations without a relative clause are discussed separately (3.2.3). The final part of the syntactic description concerns syntactic functions, forms of resumptive elements and other relevant features of the matrix clause.

In section 3.3, I investigate the information structure and pragmatic organization of the passages containing left-dislocations and the function of LD in those passages. I will analyse in detail the context of each occurrence.
3.2 Syntactic Description of Left-Dislocation in Comedy

In earlier research on LD in Latin, attention was paid to case syntax as an essential part of the syntax of this construction. Bach (1888: 33–34) concluded that, in Plautus, the antecedent of the relative pronoun follows the construction and case of the relative pronoun in most cases except where the main clause case extends to the antecedent as well. Bach’s analysis is based on the idea that attraction of the antecedent to the case of the relative pronoun is the default strategy in Plautus.

The most pertinent discussion on the different combinations of cases is found in Lindskog (1896), where the material is divided into three groups: 1) case agreement between antecedent and main clause reference, 2) nominative in the antecedent and the relative pronoun as a default case and 3) attraction of the antecedent to the case of the relative pronoun (see 2.3 above). Lindskog naturally used different terminology, but his three categories match the threefold classification I suggest in this work—note, however, that Lindskog discussed only relative clause constructions, as he was writing about the attrac-tio inuersa.

Havers (1926) was aware of the importance of case syntax for ‘isolated nominatives’, but his definition of isolated nominatives did not include constructions where the isolated element and the subsequent reference were both nominatives. This approach, which stresses the independent role of the nominative, is closely related to the way I describe thematic nominatives in this study, even if I do not share Havers’s view on excluding combinations that have the nominative in both the dislocated constituent and the resumption.

In a great part of subsequent research on Latin left-dislocation little or no attention has been paid to combinations of case forms. I argue that a detailed analysis of case syntax is essential for reaching a correct understanding of the phenomenon of left-dislocation. Such an analysis makes it possible to discern the patterns in which left-dislocation occurs, establishing that case variation is not random.

Although left-dislocation can be captured cross-linguistically in a relatively simple syntactic definition (see chapter 2), in Latin, the ubiquitous presence of relative clauses complicates the situation. When we have only the dislocated constituent and the following main clause reference, there are only two options for analysis. Either the dislocated constituent anticipates the main clause case, or it is in an independent case, which in Latin is the nominative. However, when we add to this picture a relative clause that is appended to the dislocated element, the relationships between the cases become more complicated, as the intervening relative clause breaks the connection between the dislocated
element and the matrix clause. At the same time, the dislocated constituent becomes affected by the governing force of the two clauses.\footnote{Cf. Bach (1888: 8): ‘Quodsi notio aliqua duarum enuntiationum in unam coalescentium sententiam communis est, contentio, si ita dicere licet, exoritur, utri sit attribuenda.’}

In the following, I present, first, an overview of case distribution in comedy. The dislocated constituent can be in the nominative, accusative or dative, but the variation is not random. I have performed an analysis of the case syntax and the possible combinations of cases in the dislocated constituent, the relative pronoun and the matrix clause reference. Based on this analysis, I have divided the examples into three major groups. This division is based, first, on the case of the dislocated element (nominative, accusative or dative). Second, nominatives have been further divided into different groups according to main clause case (nominative, accusative, genitive or dative, or prepositional phrases). Dislocated constituents in the accusative and dative have been further divided into two groups according to the source of the case case form (relative pronoun or main clause reference). In addition, some neuter accusatives are grouped separately.

The nominative case can occur in a variety of syntactic contexts, but there are constraints for the use of the accusative and dative. The dislocated element in the accusative is supported either by the coreferent element in the main clause or by the relative pronoun in the accusative. Similarly, the dative in the dislocated element is supported either by the main clause reference or by the relative pronoun.\footnote{There are two further instances where the head of the relative pronoun has been attracted to the dative, but these are not otherwise parallel to attractions.} I suggest that the most economical way of classifying left-dislocations into syntactic categories is a three-fold grouping: thematic nominatives, anticipation of main clause case and attractions.

- A dislocated element in the nominative is called a \textit{thematic nominative}, regardless of what comes after it—i.e., regardless of the case of the relative pronoun and the main clause reference.
- Support from the main clause case (accusative and dative) is called \textit{anticipation}.
- Support from the relative pronoun (accusative and dative) is called \textit{attraction}.

Only examples where support for the accusative case of the dislocated element comes from the relative pronoun alone are defined as attractions. Those where the support comes from both the relative pronoun and the main clause (i.e., when all three references are in the same case) have been classified as anticipation. The decision to take the main clause case as decisive is based on the
Table 6  LD with relative clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Thematic nominatives</th>
<th>Anticipation (acc/dat)</th>
<th>Attraction (acc/dat)</th>
<th>Neuter accusatives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7  LD without relative clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Thematic nominatives</th>
<th>Anticipation (acc/dat)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Neuters are classified according to the main clause case—i.e., anticipation.

existence of constructions where the support for accusative (2 occurrences) or dative (3 occurrences) dislocation comes from the main clause reference across an intervening relative pronoun in the nominative (e.g., Plaut. *Trin.* 326–328).

The term ‘thematic nominative’ is meant to replace the old term *nominatiuus pendens* (and its translation ‘hanging nominative’), inspired by the concept of Theme in the Functional Grammar tradition (Pinkster 1990: 37).

The study of Latin left-dislocation has largely concentrated on relative clause constructions, so observations on case syntax here have likewise been made on relative clauses, but the behaviour of case syntax even in constructions without relative clauses is informative. There, we see that the dislocated constituent in most cases anticipates the main clause case. In two examples, we find a thematic nominative with a different case in the main clause reference.

Examples where both the dislocated constituent and the relative pronoun are in the nominative but the matrix clause reference is not have often, in earlier scholarship, been interpreted as attractions of the head from the main

---

3 As I will show below, however, the thematic nominative can be a focus constituent as well.
clause case into the nominative. However, because of the special role of the nominative in the Latin case system, seen in its potential to occur on its own in left-dislocation (both with relative clauses and without them), I have decided to reserve the term attraction for instances where the combination head + relative pronoun is inflected in some case other than nominative. Attractions will be discussed separately below, and, in that connection, the motivation for not treating nominatives as attractions will also be specified.

Many of the dislocated constituents are in neuter (nouns or pronouns). If not otherwise indicated, I have treated neuters together with the appropriate syntactic categories and assumed that the dislocated constituent shares the same case with the relative pronoun.\(^4\)

The resumptive element is most often an anaphoric pronoun (*is*), but it can even be a noun. In addition, the pronominal adjectives *nullus* and *omnis* are interpreted as constituting a resumptive element and, thus, a dislocation.

The total of 67 examples with relative clauses includes constructions where the antecedent of the relative pronoun is a demonstrative pronoun.\(^5\) From a purely syntactic viewpoint, these cannot be considered dislocations on an equal basis with nominal ones (see 2.2.2.2). It is, however, assumed that the pronominal construction can perform the same communicative functions as the nominal dislocations, even though their syntactic structure is different.

### 3.2.1 Distribution of Cases in LD with Relative Clauses
The attested combinations of case forms are presented in the tables below. Each table has five columns. The first gives the reference of the example, and the second records the quality of the antecedent (nominal or pronominal). In the third column, I have cited the words that precede the dislocated element. The fourth column gives the case of the dislocated constituent and the relative pronoun and the fifth the case of the resumption in the main clause. Nearly always, the order of the columns is also the linear order of the elements in the sentence. The classification has been done first with respect to the case form of the dislocated constituent and, afterwards, on the basis of the resumption in the main clause.

\(^4\) However, a separate category must be established for certain constructions with neuter accusatives. In these, the dislocated constituent must be assumed to be in the accusative together with the relative pronoun (while the main clause resumption is not in the accusative), but, due to formal similarity, it would be misleading to classify these together with attractions.

\(^5\) These include two instances of *omnia* and one of the quantifying pronominal *aliquantillum*. 
### Table 8
Dislocated constituent in the nominative + resumption in the nominative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (7)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Aul.</em> 34–36</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>hic qui ... senex</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Most.</em> 858–859</td>
<td></td>
<td>serui qui</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Trin.</em> 16–17</td>
<td></td>
<td>senes qui</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ter. Adelph.</em> 22–24</td>
<td></td>
<td>senes qui</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Mil.</em> 1292–1294</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>quaeuis alia [mora] quae</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Rud.</em> 1195–1196</td>
<td></td>
<td>ego (qui)</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Stich.</em> 119–120</td>
<td>ex malis multis</td>
<td>malum quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (4)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Trin.</em> 672</td>
<td></td>
<td>ille qui</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Pseud.</em> 430–432</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>istaec quae</td>
<td>istaec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Rud.</em> 142–143</td>
<td></td>
<td>ill’ qui</td>
<td>nullus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Poen.</em> 119–120</td>
<td></td>
<td>ille qui</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Cas.</em> 654–655</td>
<td></td>
<td>tua ancilla quam</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.1.1 Thematic Nominatives

In the first instance, the group that has the dislocated constituent in the nominative has been divided into four subgroups, according to the case form of the coreferent element in the matrix clause (nominative, accusative, dative, genitive or null anaphora).

#### A Dislocated Constituent in the Nominative, Resumption in the Nominative

There are twelve examples where the dislocated element and the resumption are both in the nominative (table 8). Of these, eleven have the relative pronoun in the nominative, and one has it in the accusative.6

I cite four examples in full:

---

6 In addition, Plaut. *Men.* 983a repeats the *sententia* of *Most.* 858–859.
(1) **Phaniscus**

serui qui quom culpa carent tamen malum metuont,
i solent esse eris utiles

*Plaut. Most.* 858–859

‘Those slaves who fear a trashing even when they’re free from guilt are generally useful to their masters.’

(2) **Pardalisca** [...] 

tua ancilla quam tu tuo uilico uis
dare uxorem, ea intus—

*Lysidamus*

quid intus? quid est?

*Pardalisca*

imitatur malarum malam disciplinam,
uiro quae suo interminetur

*Plaut. Cas.* 655–658

‘Your slave girl, the one you want to give in marriage to your overseer, inside she—

What’s she doing inside? What is it?

She’s imitating the bad behavior of bad women, since she’s threatening her husband.’

(3) **Prologus** [...] 

ille qui adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio,
is illi Poeno huius patruo hospes fuit

*Plaut. Poen.* 119–120

‘The man who adopted this chap as his son was a family friend of that Carthaginian, the uncle of the young man.’

(4) **Callipho** [...] 

nam istaec quae tibi renuntiantur, filium

te uelle amantem argento circumducere,
fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia

*Plaut. Pseud.* 430–432

‘Well, as for those reports you get, that your lovesick son wants to swindle you out of your money, perhaps those words are lies.’
TABLE 9 Dislocated constituent in the nominative + resumption in the accusative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (4)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Curc.</em> 296–297</td>
<td>tum</td>
<td>isti qui ... serui</td>
<td>et datores et factores omnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Cas.</em> 222–223</td>
<td>quin, si tu uoles, domi quia</td>
<td>fel quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Asin.</em> 237</td>
<td></td>
<td>serui qui</td>
<td>uiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Aul.</em> 733–734</td>
<td></td>
<td>istuc facinus quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (3)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Rud.</em> 252</td>
<td></td>
<td>hoc quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Trin.</em> 136–137</td>
<td></td>
<td>ille qui</td>
<td>eum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ter. <em>Adelph.</em> 740–741</td>
<td></td>
<td>illud quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Epid.</em> 166–167</td>
<td></td>
<td>plerique homines quos</td>
<td>eos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Dislocated Constituent in the Nominative, Resumption in the Accusative

The second group consists of examples where the dislocated element is in the nominative, but the resumption in main clause is in the accusative (table 9).

I cite two examples in full:

(5) Megaronides [...] inconciliast in eum qui mandatus tibi, ille qui mandauit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus?

Plaut. *Trin.* 136–137

‘Haven’t you got the man who was entrusted to you into trouble and haven’t you thrown the man who entrusted him to you out of his house?’

(6) Palaestra

hoc quod est, id necessarium est perpeti

Plaut. *Rud.* 252

‘It's necessary to endure the present state of things.’
Dislocated Constituent in the Nominative, Resumption in the Dative

In this group, the dislocated element is again in the nominative, but the resumption in the main clause this time is in the dative (table 10). There are seven dislocated constituents in the nominative with resumptions in the dative.7 Of these, six have the relative pronoun in the nominative and one in the accusative. There is also one example where all three references have different case (Plaut. *Men*. 57–59).8

I cite the following examples in full:

---

7 The sense in Ter. *Andr*. 987a–988a requires genitive for the detached constituent (*amicitia nostra ... aliquam partem*). This example is discarded, however, because of the probable late date of the alternative ending to *Andria*, from which this example is derived (see Victor 1989).

8 I have not included Plaut. *Men. arg*. 1–2 *Mercator Siculus qui erant gemini filii, ei surrupto altero mors optigit* because the Plautine *argumenta* probably stem from the 2nd century CE and are thus much later than the comedies themselves.
Lycus

hi qui illum dudum conciliauerunt mihi
peregrinum Spartanum, id nunc his cerebrum uritur,
me esse hos trecentos Philippos facturum lucri

Plaut. Poen. 769–771

‘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.’

Gripus

istic scelestus liber est: ego qui in mari prehendi
rete atque excepī uidulum, ei dari negatis quicquam

Plaut. Rud. 1291–1292

‘That criminal is free; yet you refuse to give anything to me, who caught the trunk in the sea with my net and took it out.’

Dislocated Constituent in the Nominative, Resumed by a Genitive in a si Clause

There is one example where a constituent in the nominative is resumed by a genitive in the si clause—i.e., the matrix clause of the left-dislocation (table 11).

Ergasilus

tum pistores scrofipasci qui alunt furfuribus sues,
quarum odore praterire nemo pistrinum potest:
eorum si ego quoisquam scrofam in publico conspexero,
ex ipsis dominis meis pugnis exculcabo furfures

Plaut. Capt. 807–810

‘Next point: the millers feeding sows, who raise pigs with the husks, because of whose stench no one can go past the mill; if I see a sow of any one of them in public, I’ll knock the husks out of their owners themselves with my fists.’

In (9), the matrix clause where the dislocated element pistores scrofipasci is first picked up is a subordinate clause introduced by si. In the main clause, the same constituent is resumed again with the prepositional expression ex ipsis dominis, which is itself co-referent with pistores scrofipasci.
Table 11  Dislocated constituent in the nominative + resumption in the genitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. Capt. 807–810</td>
<td>tum</td>
<td>pistores scrofipasci qui</td>
<td>eorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E  Dislocated Element in the Nominative, no Overt Resumption (or b2/c2 with Case Disagreement)

There are two instances where the dislocated constituent in the nominative is not picked up by a resumptive pronoun in the main clause (table 12). These are open to interpretation as LD, because the dislocated constituent as such cannot function as part of the main clause due to its case. In this sense, they are similar to attractions without resumption. There is one example where the implied case form is the genitive, and one where the implied form is the dative.\(^9\) In each of these, we must understand or supply a reference in the correct case to make the sentence understandable.

The first example is (10):

(10) **Tranio** [...]**

*ostium quod* in angiporto est horti, patefeci fores
eaque eduxi omnem legionem, et maris et feminas

Plaut. *Most.* 1046–1047

‘I opened the wings of the door to the garden in the alley, and I led our entire forces out, both the males and the females.’

Here, the *fores* belong to the *ostium*, though this is not made explicit. This example, however, can be alternatively interpreted as a nominal resumption, whereby *fores* takes up *ostium*.

In Plaut. *Rud.* 1240–1241, a dative is expected to go with *licet* (*ille qui consulte, docte atque astute cauet, diutine uti bene licet partum bene, ‘The man who is on his guard wisely, cleverly, and astutely can for a long time make use of what he’s gained appropriately.’*). A genitive or a dative complement is not an

---

\(^9\) Hahn (1964: 133–134) thinks that constructions with missing (implied) datives are not easily interpreted and should perhaps be classified as *anacolutha*. In addition to Plaut. *Rud.* 1240–1241, she refers to an example in Lucilius.
indispensable part of the clause in the same way the direct object is with transitive verbs (this applies to the case of Men. 310–312, nummum illum quem, as well, the only attraction where the element to be supplied is something other than the subject). Hence, the status of these as left-dislocation is not unambiguous. They can be classified as normal sentence-initial relative clauses (types B2 and C2 in my classification; see chapter 2.2.2) with case disagreement, if it is allowed that such constructions are possible and offer a better analysis than left-dislocation.

Finally, there is one example that has been analysed in previous studies as an object ellipsis after a nominative attraction (Plaut. Asin. 621 patronus qui uobis futurus, perdidistis, with implied resumption in the accusative). I argue that this is not the correct interpretation (see 2.2.3 above; Hahn 1964: 131 fn. 79 with the same point but a different conclusion).

3.2.1.2 Anticipation of Main Clause Case
I then move on to those examples where the dislocated constituent has a non-nominative case.\(^\text{10}\)

\[\text{Dislocated Constituent in the Accusative, Resumption in the Accusative}\]

The examples are given in table 13.

In (11), all references are in the accusative, whereas (12) has the relative pronoun in the nominative between illos and eos.

---

\(^\text{10}\) Cf. Westbury’s corpus (2014: 233), where, in 10/93 prototypical dislocations, an ‘accusative marker’ connects the LD with the functions of the resumptive element.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (6)</td>
<td>Plaut. Capt. 110–113</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>istos captiuros ... quos</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Pseud. 269</td>
<td></td>
<td>deos ... quos</td>
<td>eos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Men. 678–679</td>
<td>immo edepol</td>
<td>pallam illam ... quam</td>
<td>eam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ter. Heaut. 130–134</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>gnatum unicum quem</td>
<td>eum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Trin. 116–118</td>
<td>quid tu</td>
<td>adolescentem quem ... qui</td>
<td>eum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Bacch. 214–215</td>
<td>etiam</td>
<td>Epidicum quam ... fabulam</td>
<td>nullam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (7)</td>
<td>Plaut. Epid. 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>istanc quam</td>
<td>eam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Capt. 941–942</td>
<td></td>
<td>id quod</td>
<td>et id et aliuod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Persa 766</td>
<td></td>
<td>omnia quae</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Aul. 144–145</td>
<td></td>
<td>id quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Mil. 152</td>
<td>sed ego</td>
<td>hoc quod</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Men. 162</td>
<td></td>
<td>id ... quod</td>
<td>id ... id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. Poen. 391</td>
<td></td>
<td>omnia illa quae</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal (1)</td>
<td>Ter. Eun. 951</td>
<td>dicam</td>
<td>uirginem istam quae dataset</td>
<td>eam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. Asin. 527</td>
<td></td>
<td>illos qui</td>
<td>eos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. Most. 1160–1162</td>
<td></td>
<td>faenus, sortem sumptumque omnem qui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) **Menaechmus**

immo edepol **pallam illam**, amabo te, **quam** tibi dudum dedi, 
mihi **eam** redde

**Plaut. Men. 678–679**

‘No, please return that mantle I gave you a while ago.’
(12) Cleareta [...]  
*illos qui dant, eos derides; qui deludunt deperis*  
*Plaut. *Asin.* 527*

‘You laugh at those who give, and those who trick you you love.’

(13) Hegio  
*quod bene fecisti referetur gratia. id quod* postulas,  
et *id et aliud quod me orabis impetrabis*  
*Plaut. *Capt.* 941–942*

‘For your kindness toward us you’ll receive thanks. What you’re requesting, this and anything else you ask me for, you’ll get it.’

As can be seen from table 13, in most of these constructions, the relative pronoun is in the accusative as well, only twice in the nominative and once in the ablative (*qui* in *Most.* 1160–1162). The accusative is thus usually supported by two further occurrences of the same case in the same sentence. These examples could be called attractions as well, but, due to reasons given in 3.2.1.3 below, I prefer to see in them an anticipation of the main clause case (or possibly the combined effect of both the relative clause and the main clause).

**G Dislocated Constituent in the Dative, Resumption in the Dative**  
In this small group (table 14), the dislocated element is in the dative. There is no ambiguity here concerning the support for the dative case in the dislocation, because the intervening relative clause always begins with a relative pronoun in the nominative.

Here is one example in full:

(14) Lysiteles  
*adulescenti hinc genere summo, amico atque aequali meo,*  
*minus qui caute et cogitate suam rem tractuit, pater,*  
bene uolo ego *illi facere, si tu non neuis*  
*Plaut. *Trin.* 326–328*

‘If you’re not against it, father, I want to do a good turn to this young chap from a family of the highest standing, a friend and contemporary of mine, who hasn’t handled his affairs very cautiously and thoughtfully.’
### Table 14 Dislocated constituent in the dative + resumption in the dative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (3)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Trin.</em> 326–328</td>
<td></td>
<td>adulascenti ... qui</td>
<td>illi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Bacch.</em> 385–387</td>
<td>et ita esse arbitror</td>
<td>homini amico qui</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Poen.</em> 64–67</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>illi seni qui</td>
<td>(ei)(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) This correction goes back to Acidalius (16th century) and is printed by Leo, Lindsay and de Melo.

It should be noted that, in Plaut. *Poen.* 64–67, the matrix clause following the dislocated element *illi seni qui* is another relative clause: *(ei) filius unicus qui fuerat*. Another instance in comedy where the matrix clause is a subordinate clause is *Capt.* 807–810 *(a si clause).*

#### Neuter Accusatives with Case Disagreement

Above, it was pointed out that a special group of neuter accusatives does not fit into any of the three major categories. These are collected in table 15.

\[(14bis) \textit{Leonida} [...] \]

\textit{sed uina quae heri uendidi uinario Exaerambo,}
\textit{iam pro is satis fecit Sticho?}

\textit{Plaut. *Asin.* 436–437}

‘But the wine I sold to the wine-merchant Exaeramus yesterday, has he settled with Stichus for it now?’

In neuter examples such as these, I assume, following Lehmann (1984: 351), that the antecedent shares the case of its relative pronoun. Hence, all five combinations of antecedent and relative pronoun are in the accusative. However, because of the formal similarity of neuter nominative and accusative, it would be misleading to classify these as attractions.

#### 3.2.1.3 Attraction of Antecedent *(Attractio Inversa)*

Finally, there are 13 dislocations in a non-nominative case where the case is not supported by the resumption (explicit or implicit) in the matrix clause but where it is, instead, supported by the case of the relative pronoun. These are called attractions. This group includes examples without an overt resumptive element. On this basis, attractions without a resumptive pronoun are inter-
preted as left-dislocation. The difference in case form between the antecedent and the matrix clause reference means that the antecedent cannot be part of its main clause. Of these 13 examples, 12 are in the accusative and one in the dative.

I Dislocated Constituent in the Accusative or Dative, Resumption in Some other Form

The examples are given in table 16.

There is considerable variation in the form of the resumption or implied resumption in the main clause. In three examples, there is a null anaphora of the subject in the main clause. These can be labelled the very basic type of attractio inversa: had the attraction not taken place, the resulting sentence would contain nothing out of the ordinary (*Naucrates quem ... non erat).

(15) AMPHITR尤O

Naucratem quem conuenire uolui in naui non erat

Plaut. Amph. 1009

‘I wanted to meet Naucrates, but he wasn’t on the ship.’

The other two are Plaut. Bacch. 935–936 (nam ego has tabellas opsignatas, consignatas quas fero, non sunt tabellae) and Ter. Eun. 652–653 (eunuchum quem dedisti nobis quas turbas dedit). In each case, the dislocated element is the subject of the following main clause.

In another three examples, there is an overt subject in the main clause, the personal pronoun ego. Hence, the antecedent of the relative pronoun, though
TABLE 16  Dislocated constituent in the accusative or dative + resumption in some other form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Antecedent + relative</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal (9)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Amph.</em> 1009</td>
<td>nam ego</td>
<td>Naucratem quem has tabellas ... quas</td>
<td>Ø [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Bacch.</em> 935–936</td>
<td></td>
<td>eunuchum quem</td>
<td>Ø [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ter. <em>Eun.</em> 652–653</td>
<td></td>
<td>hos quos uidetis ... captiuos duos</td>
<td>hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Capt.</em> 1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Pseud.</em> 526–529</td>
<td>em ... dolos</td>
<td>tibicinam illam ... quam</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Rud.</em> 1064–1066</td>
<td>ita ut occipi dicere</td>
<td>illum quem ... lenonem</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Poen.</em> 644–645</td>
<td></td>
<td>hunc chlamydatum quem nummum illum quem</td>
<td>Ø [ABL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Men.</em> 310–312</td>
<td>si me consulas</td>
<td>istum quem ... Periphanem Plotenum</td>
<td>Ø [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Epid.</em> 448–449</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACC + ACC</td>
<td>[NOM] / [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (3)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Curc.</em> 419</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>istum quem</td>
<td>Ø [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Trin.</em> 985–986</td>
<td>quia</td>
<td>illum quem</td>
<td>Ø [NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Pseud.</em> 592</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>hunc quem</td>
<td>hic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAT + DAT</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal (1)</td>
<td>Plaut. <em>Truc.</em> 742–745</td>
<td></td>
<td>illis quibus</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

correferent with the main clause subject, is not the subject but the subject complement of *ego sum* (cf. Hahn 1964: 134). Because of this, these examples, too, do not contain repetition, and the only nonstandard feature is the attraction of the antecedent to the accusative.

(16) LYCO [...]  

*sed* **istum quem** quaeris ego sum  

PLAUT. *Curc.* 419

‘But I am the man you’re looking for.’

The other two instances of this type are Plaut. *Epid.* 448–449 (*sed* **istum quem quaeris Periphanem Plotenum ego sum*) and Plaut. *Trin.* 985–986 (quaia **illum quem ementitus es**, *ego sum ipsus Charmides, quem tibi epistulas dedisse aiebas*).
In the next group, the dislocated constituent is again the subject of the main clause, but here it is picked up by a resumptive pronoun. The first example has an interrogative main clause:

(17) **Pseudolus** [...]  
    sed hunc quem uideo, quis hic est qui oculis meis obuiam ignobilis obicitur?  
    *Plaut. Pseud. 592*  

    ‘But who is this unknown person whom I see, who is thrown in the way of my eyes?’

The other example is Plaut. *Capt. 1–2* (*hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos, illi quia astant, hi stant ambo, non sedent*). It should be noted that the pronoun *hic* is used in these two passages in both the dislocated element and the resumption.

The analysis of those four examples above (Plaut. *Curc.* 419; Plaut. *Trin.* 985–986; Plaut. *Pseud.* 592; Plaut. *Capt.* 1–2), where the attracted element is a pronoun, assumes that a demonstrative pronoun can act as the antecedent of the relative pronoun. As such, it can also be attracted into the relative pronoun’s case form. However, as was pointed out in 2.2.2.2, this analysis may not be correct. Instead, we should identify here an autonomous relative clause modified by a pronominal attribute. According to this interpretation, there is no attraction; the pronominal attribute simply takes the case of its head, as is normal with attributes, this being the case of the relative pronoun in the autonomous relative clause. If this is the case, the two examples cited above (*istum quem* and *istum quem ... Periphanem Plothenium*) should receive different structural analyses despite their superficial similarity, because the first one (*istum quem*) has an autonomous relative clause and the second one an adnominal one modifying the head noun *Periphanem Plothenium*.

Finally, there are instances where the resumption has a non-nominative case. These are once each in the genitive (18), dative (19) and ablative (20), with one ablative implied (21). I cite all of these examples below:

(18) **Trachalio**  
    ut nequitur comprimi!

---

11 Hahn (1964: 135 fn. 104) notes that *Periphanem Plothenium* in *istum quem ... Periphanem Plothenium* can be taken as an apposition to the antecedent *istum*. 
ita ut occepi dicere, **illum quem** dudum ⟨e fano foras⟩
**lenonem** extrusti, hic **eius** uidulum eccillum ⟨tenet⟩

**Plaut. Rud. 1064–1066**

‘How impossible it is to restrain him! As I began to say, look, this chap’s holding that trunk of that pimp you threw out of the temple not long ago.’

(19) **Advocati**

**hunc chlamydatum quem** uides,
**ei** Mars iratust

**Plaut. Poen. 644–645**

‘This man in a cloak you can see, Mars is angry with him.’

(20) **Pseudolus**

**em ab hoc lenone uicino tuo**
per sycophantiam atque per doctos dolos
**tibicinam illam** tuos **quam** gnatus deperit,
**ea** circumducam lepide lenonem

**Plaut. Pseud. 526–529**

‘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.’

In (20), the construction is *circumduco* with the accusative of the person being deceived (*leno*) and ablative of the person or thing (the girl, *ea*) which the person is about to lose as the result of the trick.

(21) **Cylindrus**

**si me consulas**
**nummum illum quem** mihi dudum pollicitu’s dare,
iubeas si sapias porculum adferri tibi

**Plaut. Men. 310–312**

‘If you ask me, for that sesterce you promised to give me a while ago, you’d have a piglet brought for yourself if you’re smart.’

In (21), an ablative referring to *nummus* is expected to complete the thought (‘you should buy a pig with the coin you promised to give me’).
The attracted elements (antecedents of relative pronouns) can be divided into four groups: non-modified noun, personal name, noun with a pronominal attribute and pronominal antecedent (table 17). These represent the categories of antecedents in LD in comedy generally.

What possibly syntactic motivations lie behind attraction in these cases? In the majority of LD in comedy, the antecedent agrees in case with the relative pronoun (usually in the nominative). In addition to attractions, the accusative as the common case is attested in contexts of anticipation, where all three references agree in case. However, this agreement cannot be formulated as a general rule. There are seven examples where the antecedent does not agree in case with the following relative pronoun (Cas. 654–655; Epid. 166–167; Men. 57–59; Asin. 527; Trin. 326–328; Bacch. 385–387; Poen. 64–67), demonstrating that the antecedent does not necessarily agree in case with the relative pronoun. Case agreement is not required even between the pronominal antecedent and the relative pronoun, as can be seen from Asin. 527 (illos qui), where the pronominal antecedent (modifier) is in the accusative, together with the main clause reference, but the relative pronoun is in the nominative. No indicators in the syntactic context seem to account for the antecedent’s case being attracted specifically in the twelve instances cited above and not in the other ones. The search for the motivation behind this phenomenon will continue in 3.4 below, where the information structure and pragmatic function of LD in comedy is analysed.

At this point, it should be noted that there is a difference in the syntax of left-dislocation between those attractions where the main clause has an overt resumption and those where such a resumption does not exist. In attractions without resumption, attraction is the only sign of left-dislocation. In the constructions that have resumption, there is in fact a double left-dislocation,
caused by the simultaneous occurrence of resumption and attraction, which, by itself, is seen in this study to create a left-dislocation. Consider an example like (15). Here, if the case were changed from the attracted accusative to the expected nominative, the sentence would become a well-formed Latin sentence conforming even to the norms of classical Latin. However, if we take another example of the accusative attraction—say, for example, (17)—we see that we are not able to produce a standard construction just by changing the case form (*hic quem uideo, quis hic est); there remains a left-dislocation, because in these cases the attraction is followed by an overt resumption in the main clause.

Next, I discuss the constructions that could be analysed as nominative attractions. The question of the possible outcomes of the attraction has rarely been raised in earlier research. Nominatives are occasionally given as examples, too, but without any comment on the case form. However, Lindskog (1896), Havers (1926: 249–250) and Gonda (1965: 6) were of the opinion that nominatives should not be classified as attractions but rather as ‘hanging’ or ‘isolated-emphatic’ nominatives.

There are altogether 10 examples in Plautus where a combination of the dislocated element and the relative pronoun in the nominative is followed by a different case in the matrix clause and which would therefore formally qualify as nominative attractions. There are three accusatives in the matrix clause: Curc. 296–297 isti qui serui ... et datores et factores omnis; Asin. 237 domi serui qui ... uiros (both with a nominal resumption); Trin. 136–137 ille qui ... eum.\textsuperscript{12} Resumption in the dative occurs in Most. 250–251 mulier quae ... ei; Capt. 813–822 piscatores qui ... eis; Rud. 1291–1292 ego qui ... ei; Pseud. 716–719 eius seruos qui ... ei; Poen. 769–771 hi qui ... his; Mil. 765 id quod ... ⟨ei⟩. In addition, there is one instance of a genitive in the resumption (Capt. 807–810 pistores scrofipasci qui ... eorum).

In several of these constructions, the sentence is so long that changing the initial case form into that required by the main clause would result in a strange construction. This is why the two dislocations in Ergasilus’s song in the Captius (Plaut. Capt. 807–810 pistores scrofipasci qui ... eorum; 813–822 piscatores qui ... eis) cannot really be analysed as nominative attractions. In the Pseudolus example (Plaut. Pseud. 716–719 eius seruos qui ... ei), it is probably the combined influence of the genitive attribute eius and length of the construc-

\textsuperscript{12} The other examples of the pattern nominative (in the dislocated element) + nominative (in the relative pronoun) + accusative (in the matrix clause) are neuters where no formal difference in case can be seen (Cas. 222–223 fel quod; Aul. 733–734 istuc facinus; Rud. 252 hoc quod; Adelph. 740–741 illud quod).
tion that rule out the possibility of an initial dative (*eius seruo qui). This was observed already by Havers.¹³ In some of the other examples, it is possible to imagine a construction where the dislocated constituent is in the case required by the main clause—e.g., Plaut. Most. 250–251 (*mulieri quae ... ei).

The only examples where there could, in theory, be a nominative attraction without resumption and thus be parallel to the eunuchum quem / istum quen pattern are Plaut. Most. 1046–1047 ostium quod (expected case genitive); Rud. 1240–1241 ille qui cauet (expected case dative). In addition, there is one instance which would formally qualify as exactly the nominative counterpart of the eunuchum quem / agrum quem type: Plaut. Asin. 621 patronus qui uobis fuit futurus perdidistis. But as I have argued above (2.2.3), patronus must be understood not as the head of the relative pronoun but rather as the subject complement of an autonomous relative clause: qui uobis fuit futurus patronus, with an ellipsis of the object pronoun in the main clause.

It becomes apparent that attractio inversa is a small group with much internal variation. I will now look in more detail at this variation. It is possible to classify the attractions in comedy into three groups:

1) Potentially head-internal relative clauses (eunuchum quem)
2) Other clauses with relatively simple syntax and null anaphora in the main clause (pronouns and personal names)
3) Complex and unconventional constructions (mainly with resumption)

In the present corpus, there are four attractions in the accusative outside comedy. Two of these come from Cato (discussed in chapter 5.3), one from Lucretius (see 3.7) and one from Varro (5.4). The two examples from Cato are of the head-internal type (agrum quem). In other words, as eunuchum quem (Eun. 653) is from Terence, nearly all attractions that cannot be explained as autonomous head-internal relative clauses with fronted heads come from Plautus. This distribution calls into question the status of this construction in the syntactic system of Latin. In Plautus, the head-internal type is not attested at all. Instead, we find a great variation of constructions, ranging from the simple Naucratem quem conuenire volui in nau ne non erat (Plaut. Amph. 1099) to

such extreme forms as *em ab hoc lenone uicino tuo per sycophantiam atque per
doctos dolos tibicinam illam tuos quam gnatus deperit, ea circumducam lepide
lenonem* (Plaut. *Pseud.* 526–529). It might be said that Plautus makes use there of the ‘attractive potential’ of the relative pronoun. That such a potential for attraction existed in Latin more generally is testified by the constructions in Lucretius and Varro as well as by its appearance later in the history of Latin.\(^\text{14}\)

Of the ten examples in comedy where the dislocated constituent in the nominative (excluding the neuters) is followed by resumption in some other case and which would therefore qualify as nominative attractions, only three allow for analysis as a head-internal relative clause (*Most.* 250–251 *mulier quae; Asin.* 237 *domi serui qui;* without explicit resumption, *Most.* 1046–1047 *ostium quod*).

The nominative case has the potential to indicate a dislocated element even in instances where neither the relative pronoun nor the reference in the main clause are in the nominative (Plaut. *Epid.* 166–167; Plaut. *Men.* 57–59; without a relative clause, Plaut. *Pseud.* 64–71). There is a clear difference here compared to the behaviour of the accusative case, the use of which is always motivated either by the function of the coreferent element in the main clause or by the attraction induced by the case of the relative pronoun. Therefore, it seems best to restrict the term *attractio inversa* to cases where the dislocated constituent is in the accusative or the dative and precedes a relative pronoun in the relevant case. It would not be economical to explain combinations of a dislocation in the nominative together with the relative pronoun in the nominative as attractions.\(^\text{15}\)

Finally, there is one instance that is clearly an attraction into the dative and that fits the pattern of attractions seen above in the accusative group.

\[\text{(22) Astaphium}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{quia pol mauelim} \\
\text{mihi inimicos inuidere, quam med inimicis meis;} \\
\text{nam inuidere alii bene esse, tibi male esse, miseria est.} \\
\text{qui inuident, egent; illis quibus inuidetur, i rem habent}
\end{align*}
\]

\[^{\text{14}}\] Cf. Petr. 134,7 *hunc adulescentem quem uides malo astro natus est; AE* 1964, 160 = *AE* 1986, 166b *amicum hunc quem speraueram mi esse, ab eo mihi accusatores subjeci et iudicia instaurata.*

\[^{\text{15}}\] Hahn (1964: 133–134) notes that, if the antecedent and relative pronouns are in the accusative and the resumption in the nominative is not expressed, then the syntax is regular, because the subject in Latin can in fact be left unexpressed (e.g., resumption in the verbal ending or understanding the whole relative clause as the subject).
'Because I’d prefer my enemies envying me to me envying my enemies: it’s wretchedness to envy another having a good time, having a bad time yourself. Those who envy are in need; those who are envied have money.'

In addition, there are two other examples where the antecedent has clearly been attracted to the case of the relative pronoun. In other respects, however, they do not conform to the type *attractio inuersa*. For example, both contain a mention of the referent preceding the attracted constituent, *qui* in (23) and *te* in (24). Therefore, they are not defined here as LD constructions. In (23), the attracted antecedent is preceded by a relative pronoun in the nominative:

(23) **Stratippocles**

*quid illum facere uis, qui, tibi quoi diuitiae domi maxumae sunt, is nummum nullum habes nec sodali tuo in te copia est*

*Plaut. Epid. 329–330*

‘What do you want him to do? You, who have enormous riches at home, don’t have a single coin for your chum, and he doesn’t have any assistance in you.’

(24) **Megadorus**

*ego te hodie reddam madidum, si uiuo, probe, tibi quoi decretum est bibere aquam*

*Plaut. Aul. 573–574*

‘I’ll get you properly soaked today, as truly as I live, you with your decision to drink water.’

These are undoubtedly true attractions in the sense that the case form of *tibi* in both instances must be governed by the following relative pronoun in the dative. However, I would hesitate allocating them into the same group with the other examples of *attractio inuersa*. I conclude that the dative attraction is an exception rather than any established form of expression. Examples (23) and (24) nevertheless testify to the potential of the relative pronoun to attract the preceding element into its case.16

Next, I investigate issues relevant to relative clause syntax.

---

16 On the construction of *tibi quoi diuitiae*, see Hahn (1964: 137 fn. 112).
### Antecedents of relative pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Personal Animative</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Pronominals (omnis, aliquantillum)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pronominal modifiers of nominal antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>tuus</th>
<th>unus</th>
<th>eius</th>
<th>plerique</th>
<th>quaeuis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pronominal antecedents of relative pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ille</th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>(is)</th>
<th>id</th>
<th>ego</th>
<th>(omnis)</th>
<th>omnia</th>
<th>others (aliquantillum)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Relative Clause Syntax

#### 3.2.2.1 Types of Antecedents and Elements Preceding Them

In the corpus of 67 dislocations with relative clauses, there are two examples where the antecedent of the relative pronoun is a proper name (Plaut. *Amph.* 1099 *Naucratem*; *Epid.* 448–449 *istum ... Periphanem Plothenium*). Both of these examples appear in attractions in the accusative. The remaining antecedents are divided between animate nouns, inanimate nouns and pronouns (pronominals *omnis* and *aliquantillum*). The distribution is shown in table 18.

This means that there are, altogether, 41 nominal antecedents and 26 pronominal ones. Of the 41 nominal antecedents, 21 have a pronominal modifier, of which *ille, iste* and *hic* are most common (table 19).

The 26 pronominal antecedents are shown in table 20.

Altogether, then, a pronominal element is present in 47 of the 67 dislocations with relative clauses (21 modifiers of nouns and 26 pronominal antecedents, *ille* being the most common in both groups). This is well in accordance with the informational status of the LD constituents, which I will look at closer in the next section. A great part of the dislocated elements is actively present in the
situations where they occur, and the abundance of pronouns can be viewed as a reflection of this.

There are five instances where the head noun of the relative pronoun is postponed, appearing only at the end of the relative clause. Each of these, however, is modified by a pronominal attribute. Hence, the only possible interpretation is that the noun does not belong in the relative clause (Plaut. Aul. 34–36 et hic qui poscet eam sibi uxorém senex; Curc. 296 tum isti qui ludunt datatim servī scurramum in ui; Rud. 1065 illum quem dudum (e fano foras) lenonem extrusti; Capt. 1–2 hos quos uidetis stare captivos duos; Epid. 448–449 istum quem ...

Periphanem Plothenium). In these examples, it is not possible to rearrange the word order so that both the pronoun and the nominal head would be inside the relative clause (*qui hic senex; *qui isti serui; *quem illum lenonem; even *hic qui senex, etc.). Accordingly, they must all be understood as being outside the relative clause.

In one case, there is an ellipsis of the head noun (Plaut. Mil. 1293 nam quaeuis alia, quae mora est aeque, mora minor ea uidetur quam quae propter mulierem est). Here, mora must be understood as going with quaeuis alia. The word mora was mentioned on the preceding line, appearing as a subject complement in both the relative clause and the main clause. It is easy to supply it, giving quaeuis alia mora in the main clause (this has been counted as a nominal head).

A noteworthy example is Plaut. Pseud. 718–719 eius seruos qui hunc ferebat cum quinque argenti minis, tuam qui amicam hinc arcessebat, ei os subleui modo. The clause that precedes this one (qui a milite allatust modo) answers the question of what symbol Pseudolus is talking about. The genitive eius, then, refers to the soldier who brought the symbol. It is used to introduce his slave, to whom then the following relative clauses refer (qui ... ferebat, qui ... arcessebat) and who is picked up by the dative ei in the main clause.

There seems to be no discernable pattern between the types of antecedents and case syntax. Pronominal antecedents occur in all major groups of case combinations.

The dislocated constituent does not necessarily open the sentence where it occurs. The tables above show the initial elements for each example of left-dislocation. The most common element preceding the LD is sed (6 times), which can be used when continuing to a new subject or line of argument. This is well in accordance with the pragmatic constellation of the passages, as explained below in 3.3 (picking up a topic that is present in the situation, expressing contrast or simply introducing a previously unmentioned entity). Other particles or conjunctions occurring more than once are nam and

17 On nam and sed in thematic expression, see Somers (1994:157). These co-occur even with Theme constituents in Cicero's letters.
tum (each three times), quia (twice) and quid (twice). Once each are found et, igitur, immo edepol, etiam, tamquam, edepol uel, nunc, immo and neque.

In addition, the main clause subject occurs before the dislocated element four times (Plaut. Capt. 110–113 tu; Plaut. Trin. 116–118 quid tu; Plaut. Mil. 352 sed ego; Plaut. Bacch. 935–936 nam ego). In these instances, the main clause demonstrably begins before the LD. This means that, in principle, the dislocation could be a nominal phrase embedded in the subordinate clause, and the construction would be better described as a type of anacoluthon or simply as a superfluous pronoun in the main clause.\(^{18}\) However, the occurrence of the main clause predicate is here taken to be decisive for the beginning of the main clause. The construction in Plaut. Trin. 116–118 opens with quid tu (tu being the main clause subject) before the dislocated element, but this is continued by quin tu eum restituis after the left-dislocation. In Plaut. Asin. 237, we find a combination of quin as an emphatic adverb and the conditional clause si tu uoles. The subordinating conjunction quia is found twice (Plaut. Trin. 985–986; Aul. 733–734). In these passages, the subordinate clauses are forgotten and dropped off after the LD. In addition, once, a conditional clause (si me consulas) is found alone before the dislocated element (Plaut. Men. 310–312).

The longest preceding element is found in Plaut. Pseud. 526–529 em ab hoc lenone uicino tuo per sycophantiam atque per doctos dolos. The construction is notable, with a LD of a rather complicated type (for a discussion, see below 3.3.3). Sometimes, another main clause constituent has been fronted and precedes the dislocated element (Plaut. Capt. 136–137 foris; Stich. 119–120 ex malis multis; Stich. 619–620 uel inter cuneos ferreos; Asin. 237 domi). There are, however, no examples where the dislocated constituent would be unambiguously embedded in the matrix clause and hence not classifiable as an LD (but cf. Men. 1051, cited by Pinkster 2012: 379; see also below).

3.2.2.2 Head-Internal Relative Clauses

It has been suggested in previous research (especially concerning attractio inuersa but also other forms of left-dislocation) that the whole phenomenon can, in fact, be best explained as a head fronted out of its relative clause. Because of the highly flexible word order of Latin, the linear order of words is not necessarily indicative of their place in the syntactic hierarchy. In other words, a head noun that appears before the relative pronoun in linear order may actually belong inside the relative clause.\(^{19}\) This would also imply that it

---

19 For the opposite phenomenon, the head noun postponed, appearing inside the relative
is an autonomous relative clause, following the view of Pinkster (2012; forthc. chapter 18)—hence, basically of a different type altogether than the head-external adnominal relative clause. In my discussion, I have initially taken the word order at face value—i.e., as a head noun occurring before the relative pronoun as an external head. In this part, I take a closer look at the structural placement of the heads.

Ultimately, there is no answer to the question of which one is a head-internal relative clause and which one is not, if the formal criteria are satisfied. This aspect has a direct influence on the definition of left-dislocation in Latin, because head-internal relative clauses are not defined as being part of L.D. However, as left-dislocation in Latin is not a phenomenon with fixed and clear boundaries, it is necessary to investigate the head-internal relative clauses as well and to set those in comparison with head-external clauses.  

Left-dislocation in comedy cannot generally be explained as heads that have been fronted out of their relative clauses. This is because the head of the relative pronoun is very rarely an unmodified noun that would be compatible with placement inside the relative clause. Of the 67 dislocations with a relative clause, 47 heads of relative clauses have a pronominal modifier or are themselves pronouns (see tables 19 and 20 above). In these cases, the head cannot be part of the relative clause, because sequences like *qui ille homo are impossible.  

In addition to the aforementioned criteria, case disagreement between the head and the relative pronoun rules out the head's placement inside the relative clause. There are seven such instances, but these are all ruled out already by one of the other criteria.

Eight examples then remain in which the head noun is potentially clause-internal (Plaut. Trin. 17 senes qui ... i; Ter. Adelph. 22 senes qui ... i; Plaut. Most. 250 mulier quae ... ei; Plaut. Stich. 119 malum quod ... id; Plaut. Asin. 237 domi serui qui ... eos; Plaut. Asin. 436 uina quae ... pro is; Plaut. Most. 1046 ostium quod ...

---

20 Pinkster (2012; forthc. chapter 18) argues that the head-internal relative clause is an autonomous relative clause and, hence, a different type from the head-external clause. Pinkster acknowledges the possibility that internal heads occur in clause-external position (cf. ex. 12 in Pinkster 2012; see 2.2.2.1 above).

21 See, however, Pinkster (forthc. chapter 18) for additional examples of anaphoric pronouns in relative clauses, attested from Apuleius onward. There is one early example from Plautus (Trin. 1022–1023 quorum eorum); see Pinkster (forthc. chapter 18); Touratier (1980: 153–156).
Six of the dislocated constituents are in the nominative, one is a neuter accusative and one an accusative attraction. Two of the eight head nouns have a generic reference.

At this point, these potentially head-internal constructions should be compared with those that actually show the head after the relative pronoun. Plautus has 22 examples of such constructions and Terence 10 examples (table 21).

An example of a head-internal relative clause with resumption (type A1 in my classification; see 2.2.2.1) in Plautus is given in (25):

(25) et una binae singulis quae datae ancillae nobis, eae nos lauando, eluendo operam dederunt

Plaut. Poen. 221–223

‘And with us we had two slave girls each that we were given—they took care of washing and bathing us.’

An example of A1 in Terence in (26):

(26) Adhuc, Archylis, quae adsolent quaeque oportent signa esse ad salutem, omnia huic esse uideo

Ter. Andr. 481–482

‘So far, Archylis, the usual and proper symptoms for a safe delivery, I see them all here.’

Note that at Plaut. Most. 858 serui qui cannot be a head-internal relative clause because of the quom clause that is embedded in the relative clause. Pinkster (forthc. chapter 18) classifies this example as a restrictive adnominal relative clause—hence, not an autonomous head-internal relative clause.

The examples of the head-internal type in Plautus have been collected by combining examples given in Bertelsmann (1885) and Lodge (1962) Lexicon Plautinum (p. 470 1: antecedens in enuntiato relativio insertum est). My type A1 corresponds to Bertelsmann’s types A. I, 1 and A. I, 2. The figures for Terence have been produced by combining the examples from Bertelsmann and McGlynn (1963) Lexicon Terentianum (see p. 83). Examples cited by Bertelsmann that are irrelevant (e.g., changes in the text or interpretation) have been excluded.

Of type A2 in Plautus (head-internal relative clause without an overt resumption), 22 examples can be found and, of type A2 in Terence, 15 examples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Preceding words</th>
<th>Relative + head</th>
<th>Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE DISAGREEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Plautus) + 7 (Terence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Cist.</em> 610–612</td>
<td>medioxumam quam ... uxorem</td>
<td>ex ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Mil.</em> 727–729</td>
<td>quae ... merx</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Mil.</em> 72–74</td>
<td>ut in tabellis</td>
<td>quos ... latrones</td>
<td>ibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Cist.</em> 675–677</td>
<td>quamme ... cistellam</td>
<td>ea (nescio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Persa</em> 7</td>
<td>qui ... seuos</td>
<td>illum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Truc.</em> 227–228</td>
<td>quemquem hominem</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Mil.</em> 735</td>
<td>qui homines</td>
<td>is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Most.</em> 416–418</td>
<td>sic ut ego efficiam</td>
<td>quae facta</td>
<td>omnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Eun.</em> 57–58</td>
<td>quae res</td>
<td>eam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Heaut.</em> 654–655</td>
<td>quam ... adolescentulam</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Andr.</em> 93–95</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>qui ... animus</td>
<td>ipsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Hec.</em> 386–388</td>
<td>quaeque fors fortunast</td>
<td>eam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Eun.</em> 524–525</td>
<td>nisi si illa forte</td>
<td>quae ... paruola soror</td>
<td>hanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Andr.</em> 481–482</td>
<td>Adhuc Archylis</td>
<td>quae ... signa</td>
<td>omnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Phorm.</em> 88</td>
<td>in quo haec discebat ludo</td>
<td>ei loco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEUTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Plautus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Persa</em> 114–115</td>
<td>mane</td>
<td>quod ... negotium</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Cas.</em> 100–101</td>
<td>quin potius</td>
<td>quod ... negotium</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Amph.</em> 402</td>
<td>quod ... uium</td>
<td>id</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE AGREEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (Plautus) + 3 (Terence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Stich.</em> 58–59</td>
<td>qui ... seruos homo</td>
<td>seruos is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Curc.</em> 531</td>
<td>quoi homini</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Curc.</em> 557</td>
<td>quoi homini</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Poen.</em> 221–223</td>
<td>et una binae singulis</td>
<td>quae datae ancillae</td>
<td>eae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Amph.</em> 947–948</td>
<td>ut</td>
<td>quae ... uota</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Pseud.</em> 767–770</td>
<td>quiomo</td>
<td>illi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Merc.</em> 93–94</td>
<td>ubi</td>
<td>quas merces</td>
<td>omnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Capt.</em> 358</td>
<td>quod ... beneficium</td>
<td>gratia ea est grauida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Amph.</em> 532</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>qua nocte</td>
<td>eadem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Aul.</em> 790</td>
<td>qui homo</td>
<td>nullust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. <em>Pseud.</em> 318–319</td>
<td>quia pol</td>
<td>qua opera</td>
<td>una opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Phorm.</em> 460–461</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>quod ... consilium</td>
<td>id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Hec.</em> 72–73</td>
<td>inuiriam est ... aut</td>
<td>qua uia</td>
<td>eadem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. <em>Adelph.</em> 854</td>
<td>i ergo intro</td>
<td>et qui rei est</td>
<td>ei rei nunc sumamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The combination of a relative pronoun and a head noun can be (and often is) in a case different from that of the main clause resumption. It is even possible for neither reference to be in the nominative, especially when an oblique case is shared by the two references. These examples include constructions where a conjunction precedes the relative clause (ubi, quia, quin). For left-dislocation, constructions beginning with conjunctions are borderline cases but have nevertheless been included (conjunctions quia and quid are attested with dislocations).

The head-internal relative clause is a subtype of the autonomous relative clause (Pinkster 2012; forthc. chapter 18). This type of relative clause functions at the level of the clause, as opposed to the head-external adnominal one, which functions at the level of the noun phrase. This means that the head-internal type can be used in a greater variety of syntactic contexts than left-dislocation can. For example, the head-internal type often has a subordinate clause as its matrix clause. There are three instances of such relative clauses in an ut clause and one in a nisi si clause. In addition, in one case, the autonomous relative clause is the subject complement in an impersonal copula construction (Ter. Hec. 72–73 iniuriam est ... qua uia ... eadem). It is unclear to what extent the word order is optional in such embedded constructions—i.e., whether it is possible to front the head out of the relative clause, if the latter is embedded.

We will return to the similarities and differences between the relative clause types below in section 3.5, where the information structure and pragmatic organization of LD and related constructions will be discussed. It will be possible to make certain distinctions concerning typical patterns of pragmatic organization for each type.

3.2.2.3 Restrictive and Non-restrictive Relative Clauses

The adnominal relative clause in Latin can be either restrictive or non-restrictive. In my corpus of LD in comedy, a great majority of relative clauses are restrictive. With pronominal antecedents, a restrictive relative clause is the only possible option, but restrictive relative clauses predominate even with nominal antecedents. The definition of a relative clause as restrictive or non-

---

25 In addition, dislocations are preceded several times by sed, nam and tum; cf. 3.2.2.1. On the other hand, two A1-type examples include nam but none have sed or tum. Does this reflect the pragmatic status of left-dislocation vs. A1?

26 For Plautus, even this seems to have been possible, to judge from (12) in Pinkster (2012: 379), quin modo eripui, homines qui ferebant te sublimen quattuor, apud hasce aedis (Plaut. Men. 1051), but such instances are probably exceptional and would have the feel of an anacoluthon.

In the case of *deos quos, dei* must have existed as a group of entities in need of no further definition in the minds of Plautus and his audience. As for *fel quod amarum est*, a restrictive interpretation is impossible on semantic grounds. All *fel* is *amarum*, so the relative clause cannot be restrictive. Two relative clauses are attached to personal names. They must equally be defined as non-restrictive (given that these are not homonymous with another person in the play and that the relative clauses do not imply a change in the person in the sense of Pinkster forthc. chapter 18).

Often, it is unclear at first sight whether a relative clause is restrictive or non-restrictive (and whether the definition is syntactic or semantic). For example, in the following instance, the relative clause must be classified as non-restrictive, since *gnatum unicum* is identifiable without it.

(27) **Menedemus [...]**

sumptus domi

tantos ego solus faciam? sed *gnatum unicum*,
quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius,
quod illa aetas magis ad haec utenda idoneast,
eum ego hinc ieci miserum iniustitia mea!

*Ter. Heaut. 130–134*

‘All this vast household expenditure to be for me only, while my only son, who should have shared the enjoyment equally—no, had more of it—since youth in the time for enjoyment,—I have driven the poor boy out by my injustice, mine?’

---

27 To these should possibly be added *Epidamniensis ille* (Plaut. Men. 57). Hahn (1964:136–137) is in favour of the restrictive interpretation of the Ergasilus passage (Plaut. Capt. 807 ff.), though she acknowledges the possibility of a non-restrictive interpretation, because Ergasilus probably thinks that all millers and fishmongers are what he describes.
Similar cases are Plaut. Trin. 116–118 (adulescentem quem), 326–328 (adulescenti ... qui). I have classified all three as non-restrictive.

### 3.2.3 Left-Dislocation without a Relative Clause

The final group to be discussed is left-dislocation without a relative clause. There are ten such examples, presented in table 22.

The first of these, (28), has both a dislocated element and a resumption immediately following, in the nominative.

(28) **HANNO**

factum, quod (ego) aegre tuli.
nam mihi sobrina Ampsigura tua mater fuit;
pater tuos, is erat frater patruelis meus,
et is me heredem fecit quom suom obiit diem,
quo me priuatum aegre patior mortuo

**Plaut. Poen. 1067–1071**

‘Yes, which was hard for me: your mother, Ampsigura, was my second cousin; your father, he was my first cousin, and he made me his heir when he passed away: it’s hard for me to be deprived of him through his death.’

In (29), both references are in the dative:
(29) **nosto seni huic stolido, ei profecto nomen facio ego Ilio**

*Plaut. Bacch. 945*

‘This stupid old man of ours, I’ll definitely give him the name of Ilium.’

We notice that, in left-dislocation without a relative clause, the two references usually agree in case (once in the nominative, twice in the accusative and twice in the dative, as well as three neuters). The only example of case disagreement is (30).

In (30), the dislocated element (in a love letter) is a long list of nouns in the nominative that are then picked up by the genitive *harunc uoluptatum*.

(30) **Pseudolus**

‘nunc *nostri amores, mores, consuetudines iocus, ludus, sermo, suauisauatio, compressiones artae* amantum corporum teneris labellis *molles morsiunculae*, nostr[or]um orgiorum (*osculat*)iunculae, papillarum horridularum *oppressioucule* harunc uoluptatum mi omnium atque itidem tibi distractio, discidium, uastities uenit, nisi quae mihi in te est aut tibi est in me salus.’

*Plaut. Pseud. 64–71*

‘Now, as for our passions, ways, and habits, jest, play, chat, and sweet kisses, the tigh squeezing of loving bodies, the tender little bites with gentle lips, the little kisses of our secret meetings, the little pinchings of firm little breasts, a disserverance, disunion, and desolation of all these pleasures is coming to me and in the same way to you, unless I have some help in you or you in me.’

Other lists are given in Plaut. *Asin*. 198 (without a relative clause) and *Most*. 1160–1162 (with a relative clause).

---

28 It should be noted that the genitive, being an adnominal case, is not of the same status as a resumptive case with the accusative and dative (which are cases of verbal complements).
### 3.2.4 Further Observations on Syntax

#### 3.2.4.1 Form of Resumption

In 67 of the 77 cases of dislocation, there is an overt resumptive element in the main clause (in 58 of the 67 with relative clauses). Table 23 shows the distribution of different types of resumptive elements (those given after + are in instances without relative clauses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>is</th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>nullus</th>
<th>nominal</th>
<th>omnis</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] The inclusion of *omnis* as a resumption is not unproblematic (see Probert and Dickey 2016: 391 fn. 7), but I have decided to include it. There are not many such examples in the corpus.

In *Plaut. Epid.* 85, there is no overt resumption, but a dative (*mihi*) is expected to go with *placet* (a pattern that agrees with *Plaut. Rud.* 1240–1041 *ille qui ... licet*). We have seen ellipsis twice now with dative complements.\[29\]

\[29\] See further sub-section 5.3.3 for *rex Iuba ... uisum est* in Sallust (another elliptical dative).

\[30\] In addition, there is a nominal element in the second resumption in *Capt. 807–810 pistores scrofipasci qui ... eorum ... ex ipsis dominis.*
nominal resumptions are open to an alternative interpretation, as second coreferent objects.

The resumptive pronoun is always placed preverbally, and the same applies to the nominal resumptions. There seem to be no discernible patterns between the form of resumption and case syntax.

Finally, there are ten examples without any coreferent element in the main clause. Seven of these are accusative attractions, discussed already in 3.2.1.3. Two other examples with relative clauses were discussed in 3.2.1.1 (E), and one example without a relative clause in 3.2.3.

3.2.4.2 Syntactic Functions and Matrix Clauses
The tables presented above are an easy way to illustrate the variety in case agreement. However, they do not necessarily tell us all about the role of the constituent in each clause. Therefore, I present here an analysis of the syntactic functions of the relative pronoun and the anaphoric reference in the matrix clause. There is difference between these references. The matrix clause reference expresses the proposition and takes the discourse forward. In the matrix clause, we can observe the actual role of the dislocated constituent in the discourse fragment. The relative clause serves to identify the referent or characterize it in some way that is relevant to the given situation. This happens in all instances irrespective of whether the relative clause is restrictive or non-restrictive.

Already Bach (1888: 28) noted that the relative pronoun is nearly always in the nominative or accusative. The relative pronoun is the subject in 33 instances. Of these, the relative pronoun is the subject of the copula in only eight instances.

The accusative relative pronouns are, for the most part, direct objects of the relative clause predicate (27 examples). This predicate is typically in the first or second person, and there is one impersonal construction (Plaut. Pseud. 269 quos aequom est metuere). Third-person predicates appear, too, but in, e.g., quos deserit pudor (Plaut. Epid. 166–167), the object quos, in accusative, is the psychological subject of the relative clause. In addition, the accusative can be part of an accusativus cum infinitivo (AcI) construction (three examples). The remaining relative pronouns are dative complements.

All of the accusatives in attraction are direct objects of the relative clause predicate (7/12 in second person singular, 3/12 in first person singular, 1/12 in second person plural, 1/12 in 3rd person singular, though the subject there is tuos natus). This is nothing extraordinary, but there are certain expressions that occur in attractions more than once. One such case is quem uides, another quem quaeris. Here also, the semantics of the verbs are closely related to the
action happening on the stage (see further 3.4, where attractions are discussed in greater detail). Hence, it seems that not all accusatives have, even in principle, the force to attract the antecedent into their case.

In the dative attraction illis quibus inuidetur, quibus is the dative object of inuidetur.

In the matrix clauses, the resumptive element is the subject in 19 instances (5 times of the copula) and a subject complement in three instances (both including elliptical uses). It is the direct object in 21 instances, one of which is the psychological subject (eos desert pudor). The datives in main clauses are usually close to the object or contain the psychological subject in their function (e.g., with predicates praeestare, surrupitur, praeuorti decet). Notably, the dislocated constituent, which is the topic in the majority of cases, is the subject of the main clause in one third of the examples (22/77 examples, if we count the subject complements as well). This is slightly surprising, given that topics are usually associated with the subject function.

In left-dislocation without relative clauses, the anaphoric element is the direct object four times, the subject twice, the dative complement three times, and a genitive attribute once.

The matrix clauses are assertions in most cases. In addition, we find questions (eum exturbasti?; quin eum restituis?; pro is satis fecit?; quis hic est?; qui eum quaeras?) as well as four exhortations (is indito; mihi eam reddi; id arte ut corrigan; iubeas si sapias porculum adferri). The assertions are given in past, present as well as future tense. There is one instance of an AcI in the main clause (nisi deos ei nihil praeestare). The matrix clause predicate is typically in first or third person singular or in third person plural, but the second person is also attested. In two places, the matrix clause itself is a subordinate clause (a si clause in Plaut. Capt. 807–810 and a relative clause in Plaut. Poen 64–67).

3.2.5 Conclusion

Here, I sum up the findings of this section. The dislocated constituent can be in the nominative, accusative or dative. The nominative can appear in all contexts, whereas the accusative and the dative must be supported by either the case of the matrix clause or that of the relative pronoun. The syntactic division into three groups was found to be an economical way to account for the syntactic variation. These three groups are 1) thematic nominatives (dislocated elements in the nominative), 2) anticipation (accusative or dative anticipating its role in the matrix clause) and 3) attraction (accusative or dative supported by the case of the relative pronoun). Pronominal modifiers of nominal antecedents are frequent. Pronominal antecedents are found in all case combinations.
Resumption happens usually with *is*. In addition, *hic* and *iste* occur in combinations where the same pronoun can be found in both the antecedent and the resumption.

Attraction can occur either with or without resumption. This construction type has much variation in its syntax but, on the other hand, certain phrases occur more than once.

Left-dislocation without a relative clause, though infrequent, shows the same syntactic patterns as left-dislocation with relative clause (excluding attraction): thematic nominatives and anticipation of the main clause accusative and dative. This observation, together with the fact that left-dislocation including a relative clause cannot, in most cases, be explained as a fronted head of a head-internal relative clause, supports the conclusion that left-dislocation in comedy is not caused primarily by relative clause syntax.

3.3 Information Structure and Pragmatic Functions of Left-Dislocation in Comedy

This chapter is about the information structure and pragmatic organization of the passages that contain LD constructions in comedy. In this part, the discussion moves from the syntactic description of LD to the function it has in comic dialogue. For both dimensions, information structure and pragmatic organization, the framework and terminology has been adapted from Lambrechtt (1994, 2001). The theoretical framework and the concepts and terms used in this analysis have been outlined in sub-section 2.1.2. I recapitulate the main concepts here.

Information structure refers to the status of the linguistic element in the discourse. The element may be actively present in the discourse or accessible through some other element. In dramatic texts, one way of being actively present (sometimes without a preceding verbal reference) is that the element is present on stage. On the other hand, in lively dramatic dialogue, we also find instances of dislocated elements that have not yet been mentioned in the play and are therefore Brand New elements. As for information status, the categories used in this analysis are Active, Accessible and Brand New anchored (BNA) (following Lambrechtt 1994). In comedy, these are defined as follows. An element that is Active has been mentioned in the immediately preceding part of the dialogue where the element appears in a left-dislocation. Another type of Active referent is an element that is present on stage (situationally evoked). An Accessible referent has been mentioned farther back in the conversation or is an entity the identity of which is known—for example, one of the main
characters of the play (even if not on stage). A Brand New element has not been mentioned earlier in the play and is not accessible in any other way. In comedy, when such referents occur in left-dislocation, they are always anchored in the situation, typically with the help of a restrictive relative clause. Generic statements (*sententiae*) are shown to be rather frequent among LD in comedy. In them, the dislocated element is not necessarily connected to the preceding or the subsequent context.

Pragmatic organization refers to the function the element has in the discourse. The two basic concepts of discourse function are topic and focus. The topic is the element about which the linguistic expression predicates something. The focus is the most salient thing that is predicated about the topic. These concepts are useful tools in pragmatic analysis, but it is clear at the onset that their application is not straightforward, and it will be difficult or pointless to identify one or both in certain constructions.

The element that is the topic in a given predication can relate to the preceding or the subsequent context in various ways. The element may not have been previously mentioned (Brand New referent) but is promoted to topic in the left-dislocation where it appears. On the other hand, the element can be Accessible or Active (and, hence, discourse-old) but not yet topical before its appearance in the LD construction. If the element is already topical, left-dislocation serves to highlight the topical referent and bring a certain amount of disruption into the conversation.

Concerning the following context, the minimal requirement of a topic is that it be the topic in the sentence where it appears. In that case, the referent disappears from the conversation after having been mentioned once. These are typically occasional remarks that do not have any impact on the play’s action. Another type of topic is one where the topical element is mentioned anaphorically at least once in the immediate subsequent context, typically the next sentence after its establishment as topic.

In a clear majority of LD in comedy, the dislocated constituent is Active or Accessible in its informational status and is the topic of at least its own sentence. Typically, the constituent also remains the topic of one or two sentences after its promotion to topic via LD. Not infrequently, such a constituent continues as the topic of the ensuing dialogue.

A considerable number of LD constructions are generic statements. They are not about any given entity in the play, but general truths about human life and mankind.

Previously unmentioned Brand New referents are thought not to be common as topics, but it has been observed that the informational status of dislocated constituents contains much variation. It seems that, due to effective
anchoring with relative clauses, Brand New referents may appear as topics even in contexts that are not generic (cf. Lambrecht [1994: 167–168], who notes that anchored Brand New referents are acceptable as topics). That we are dealing with dramatic dialogue, which is essentially a fictional and artistic language despite its close relationship with spoken registers, may have something to do with this, as was earlier suggested by Somers (1994: 154–155; see 2.1.2 above).\textsuperscript{31} Brand New referents promoted to topics via LD do not tend to remain topics beyond the sentences where they occur.

Sometimes, LD introduces a topic that is clearly contrastive. Contrastive topics are supposed to be kept apart from foci and contrastive foci, though this is not always possible.

It seems that there are occasional examples where the dislocated constituent fits the definition of a focus better than it does that of a topic. As was pointed out in section 2.1.2, the possibility of dislocated constituents that are foci in their predications is not ruled out in principle, even with the theoretical arguments presented against this possibility (Lambrecht 2001). Focused elements as dislocated constituents form a minority, and certain examples are open to more than one interpretation between the topical and focal poles of the continuum. However, there is enough to show that LD in Latin is not reserved exclusively to topics. Foci occurring as dislocated constituents may be Brand New referents.

Is it possible to discern recurring patterns and to show that the occurrence of LD is not a random syntactic irregularity? In the following discussion, I focus on the ways in which typical combinations of information structure and pragmatics are formed. Based on a close analysis of the combination of the dramatic and linguistic context, information structure and pragmatic function, I suggest identifying six types of left-dislocation in comedy (outlined in table 24).

Analysing discourse-related features, such as information structure and pragmatic organization, necessarily brings a certain amount of subjectivity into the discussion. Different scholars will have different opinions on what counts as Active or Topic in a given fragment of discourse.

Defining what a topic, a focus or an active referent is, at the theoretical level, is different from actually identifying them in a Latin text in a consistent way. Therefore, to make the discussion more useful and accessible, I will offer in the following analysis paraphrases of the dramatic situations from which the examples come.

\textsuperscript{31} Somers (1994: 155) states that another type where Brand New information may be found as a Theme constituent is when the information is about the text’s structure, not its contents (type \textit{haec quae dicam}).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic category</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active elements promoted to discourse topics</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-activating an Accessible referent or introducing a BNA referent as topic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex referential situations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic statements</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive contexts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will become evident that syntactic, information structural and pragmatic factors must be considered together to accurately define how and why left-dislocation is used in Roman comedy.

### 3.3.1 Active or Accessible Elements Promoted to Discourse Topics

In the passages discussed in this section, the dislocated constituent is actively present in the conversational context and enjoys what might be called a topical status even before its appearance in the left-dislocation. It is then promoted to topic with the help of the left-dislocation. Importantly, after its occurrence as a dislocated element, it remains the topic of the dialogue for some time.

The first example comes from *Casina*:

(31) **Lysidamus**

  possum scire ego istuc ex te quid negoti est?

  **Pardalisca**

  dicam

  **tua ancilla quam** tu tuo ulico uis
dare uxorem, **ea intus**—

  **Lysidamus**

  quid intus? quid est?

  **Pardalisca**

  imitatur malarum malam disciplinam,
uiro quae suo interminetur

  _Plaut. Cas._ 654–658
‘Can I know from you what’s the matter?
I’ll tell you. Your slave girl, the one you want to give in marriage to your
overseer, inside she—
What’s she doing inside? What is it?
She’s imitating the bad behavior of bad women, since she’s threatening
her husband.’

In this scene with Lysidamus and Pardalisca, the latter (a slave-girl) is telling
the old man Lysidamus that terrible things are happening inside the house.
Lysidamus’s slave girl Casina (tua ancilla) has a sword and threatens to kill
her future husband. This is potentially dangerous for Lysidamus, because Lysi-
damus’s plan is to sleep with her before she is given in marriage to his overseer
Olympio. Tua ancilla (i.e., Casina) and her terrible plan have been mentioned
earlier on l. 650–651 (malum pessumumque hic modo intus apud nos tua ancilla
hoc pacto exordiri coepit). Then, on l. 655, Pardalisca, after some hesitation,
resulting from fear, resumes this topic, and re-introduces tua ancilla with a
restrictive relative clause and a resumptive pronoun, ea. Casina and her plans,
which are actually only a trick by Pardalisca, remain the topic of the dialogue
between the two until l. 716, when Pardalisca leaves the scene.

The next example comes from the Menaechmi:

(32) Menaechmus
immo edepol pallam illam, amabo te, quam tibi dudum dedi,
mihi eam redde

Plaut. Men. 678–679

‘No, please return that mantle I gave you a while ago.’

The mantle, palla, which Meneachmus has stolen from his wife to give to his
mistress Erotium, has been the centrepiece of action and dialogue since l. 609.
In (32), Menaechmus is addressing Erotium to get back the mantle he had given
her earlier. In the preceding lines, Menaechmus first asks her whether she has
any idea why he has come, to which she answers in the affirmative, to get plea-
sure from her. Menaechmus then tells the true reason, referring to pallam illam.
The mantle is the topic of the ensuing discussion (until l. 700, when both leave
the scene).

The next example comes from Pseudolus:
Callipho and Simo are discussing the unpleasant fact that people all around the city are gossiping about Simo’s son’s plans to set free a slave girl with whom he is in love. Callipho first expresses his deep contempt for those who spread and listen to these accusations (Pseud. 427–429 homines qui gestant quique auscultant crimina, si meo arbitratu liceat, omnes pendeant, gestores linguis, auditores auribus). He then continues to talk about the gossip and takes it up with istaec quae tibi renuntiantur, followed by a clarification (filium … uelle … circumducere), after which the antecedent istaec is resumed with another occurrence of istaec. The rumour and closely related matters remain the topic until l. 445, when Pseudolus joins the conversation and, again, from l. 481 onward.

In these three examples, we can see how LD is used by Plautus to promote an active, even topical, element to new discourse topic. In all three instances, the motivation behind using LD is clearly pragmatic. LD is essential in establishing the element as the topic of discourse, which it remains for the rest of the conversation. These examples correspond well to what Lambrecht (2001: 1073) says about the typical contexts of LD: the element’s promotion to topic via LD is somehow expected (cf. Westbury 2014: 189 on the ‘disruptive’ potential of LD in such contexts).

In the following two examples, the dislocated elements are established as topics immediately after their first mention. The first example comes from Terence’s Heautontimorumenos:

Menedemus [...] sumptus domi tantos ego solus faciam? sed gnatum unicum, quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius, quod illa aetas magis ad haec utenda idoneast, eum ego hinc ieci miserum iniustitia mea!

The following example comes from Plautus’ Pseudolus:

Callipho [...] nam istaec quae tibi renuntiantur, filium te uelle amantem argento circumducere, fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia

‘Well, as for those reports you get, that your lovesick son wants to swindle you out of your money, perhaps those words are lies.’
‘All this vast household expenditure to be for me only, while my only son, who should have shared the enjoyment equally, no, had more of it, since youth in the time for enjoyment,—I have driven the poor boy out by my injustice, mine?’

In these lines the old man Menedemus reveals to his friend Chremes the cause for his self-tormenting actions. He has come to realize that it was wrong to drive his son away from home, a son who had every right to enjoy his careless life there, even more so since he is young and more capable of such enjoyment than his old father. The son had first been mentioned on ll. 93–94 (filium unicum adulescentulum habeo). He is clearly the topic of the statement in (34), and this initial state of affairs is naturally important for the whole play.

A similar organization appears in Plautus’s Trinummus:

(35) Megaronides
quid tu, adulescentem, quem esse corruptum uides
qui tuae mandatus est fide et fiduciae
quin eum restituis, quin ad frugem conrigis?
plaut. Trin. 116–118

‘Well then? Why don’t you change the young man back and bring him back to responsible behavior, when you can see that he’s decadent and when he was entrusted to your faith and reliability.’

Here, Megaronides castigates his old and good friend Callicles for not taking better care of a third person’s son, who had been entrusted to his care. The young man was mentioned in the preceding speech by Callicles among the matters left to his care when their master went away. The young man is established as the topic on l. 116. Megaronides asks his friend why Callicles would not try to guide the young man toward a more honourable way of life. It is his actions that are relevant here and that form a central theme in the play as a whole. In the following sentence in Megaronides’s speech, the same topic continues (119 ei rei operam dare te fuerat aliquanto aequius), and the young man remains the topic of the conversation between the two old men until l. 139. This passage also includes example (60).

It is noteworthy that, in their syntactic and pragmatic organization, (34) and (35) are such close parallels, occurring as they do in two different authors.

The adulescens mentioned in the following example is the same as that in (35) above, later in the play this time:
Lysiteles

adulescenti hinc genere summo, amico atque aequali meo,
minus qui caute et cogitate suam rem tractauit, pater,
bene uolo ego illi facere, si tu non neuis

Plaut, Trin. 326–328

‘If you’re not against it, father, I want to do a good turn to this young chap from a family of the highest standing, a friend and contemporary of mine, who hasn’t handled his affairs very cautiously and thoughtfully.’

These words are spoken by the young man Lysiteles, and they serve to introduce his request to his father. The adulescens whom Lysiteles wants to help is established as the topic of the following discussion until l. 344, and again from l. 360 onward (cf. Nixon’s translation, ‘There’s a young fellow here’). That something like a request is coming has been hinted at on l. 324 (res quaedamst quam uolo ego me abs te exorare). The depraved young man Lesbonicus was the topic of a conversation between Callicles and Megaronides in act 1, for which see (35), but is here mentioned for the first time in Act 2, after a long sung monologue by Lysiteles and a dialogue between Lysiteles and his father Philto. We may notice in this connection that, both here and in Captiui (see below), the same person or persons is given two times in an LD construction.

In the Aulularia, one of the central themes in the play is a crime (facinus)—in fact, two of them but of different kinds. In the following example, istuc facinus is Accessible in the context and is the topic of the sentence.

Lyconides

quia istuc facinus quod tuom
sollicitat animum, id ego feci et fateor

Plaut, Aul. 733–734

‘Because that deed which is upsetting you, well, I did it and I admit it.’

This line comes from the beginning of the famous scene between the young Lyconides and the old man Euclio. Lyconides has come to confess his criminal action, raping Euclio’s daughter Phaedrium. With the above words, he introduces his confession. The crime, istuc facinus, introduced here, forms the central topic of the following discussion, though it denotes a different act for the two interlocutors. To Euclio, it refers to the gold that was stolen from him, misinterpreting Lyconides’s words as a confession that it was he who stole the gold.
In the fourth act of *Miles gloriosus*, Pyrgopolinices, the braggart soldier, and the slave Palaestrio have just had a meeting with Milphidippa, the ‘maid’ of the young ‘wife’ of Periplectomenus (both women are, in reality, prostitutes hired to play the trick on Pyrgopolinices). The plan is to persuade the soldier that the young wife is madly in love with her and then get the soldier to get rid of her mistress Philocomasium, so that she can return to her true lover Pleusicles.

(38) **Pyrgopolinices**

*istuc quod* *das consilium* *mihi,*
*te cum illa verba facere* *de ista re* *volo*

*Plaut. Mil.* 1114–1115

‘As for the advice you give me, I want you to talk to her about that.’

The advice, *istuc consilium*, here refers to Palaestrio’s plan to get rid of Philocomasium in a friendly way so as to let her keep what the soldier has given her. This plan was first introduced by Palaestrio near the beginning of the act, on l. 978 (*immo uin tu lepide facere?—loquere et consilium cedo*). The soldier brings up the question of how to get rid of the former mistress again on l. 1095 (beginning the the third scene), when Milphidippa has left the to fetch her mistress (*quid nunc mi es auctor ut faciam, Palaestrio, de concubina?*). At this point, Palaestrio re-introduces his plan (*quid me consultas quid agas? dixi equidem tibi* ...), part of which is to tell the girl that her mother and sister have arrived to take her home. Palaestrio claims to have met the sister and the captain of the ship, too. After this, there is a digression on the part of Pyrgopolinices, who is eager to know what the sister and the captain look like, in search of further pleasures. With the LD in (38), Pyrgopolinices returns to the plan of getting rid of the girl on good terms. The construction serves to pick up the topic of Palaestrio’s advice (*consilium*) on ll. 1097–1101. The *consilium* remains the topic until the end of the scene (l. 1136). It is also an important to the play’s plot.

In Plaut. *Stich.* 75, LD is used to re-establish a topic mentioned quite some time earlier:

(39) **Antipho**

*principium* *ego quo pacto cum illis occipiam, id ratiocinor*

*Plaut. Stich.* 75

‘I’m considering the beginning, how I should start with them.’
In this construction, there is no relative clause modifying *principium*. Instead, the indirect question *quo pacto ... occipiam* helps to identify *principium*. The predicate *ratiocinor* governs both the indirect question and *principium*, which refers here to Antipho’s plan to take his daughters back home, while their husbands remain abroad in a military campaign. The plan has been mentioned in the preceding dialogue between the two sisters on l. 14, so it is by now somewhat distant. The construction probably serves to show the prepondering state of mind of Antipho and is needed to remind the spectators of his plan.

In the following example, a simple neuter pronoun is used as a reactivating device.

(40) **Palaestrio**

*igitur id quod agitur, ⟨ei ⟩ hic primum praeuorti decet*  

*Plaut. Mil. 765*

‘Then we should give priority here to what’s being done.’

Palaestrio here resumes the actual topic of the conversation between himself, Pleusicles and Periplectomenus from l. 612. In between, there has been a long digression on various topics. The short phrase *id quod agitur* here constitutes a radical shift back to the topic that had been abandoned 150 lines earlier. Palaestrio goes on to explain his master plan to Pleusicles and Periplectomenus. It is to be noticed that the resumption in main clause ⟨*ei*⟩ is a conjecture. While not in any way surprising in view of the radical topic shift, the resulting construction is syntactically alone in its category. There are no other examples of neuter pronouns as LD elements that are picked up by a dative in the main clause. Hence, it is possible that the conjecture cannot be trusted.

A large part of the attractions belong in this group, too. All of them show some degree of topic-continuity. In Ter. *Eun. 652–653 eunuchum quem dedisti nobis quas turbas dedit*, LD is used to introduce the eunuch and to establish him as the discourse topic. However, perhaps more interestingly, most of the attractions share an element of surprise connected with visual observation. We find this in Plaut. *Pseud. 592*, where *hunc quem uideo* is uttered by Pseudolus when Harpax enters the stage. In Plaut. *Poen. 644–645, hunc chlamydatum quem uides* refers to Collybiscus, who is on the stage but has remained unseen by the others. The line is a reaction to the question on l. 644 *sed quid nunc nunc vultis* and involves

---

32 By Acidalius in the 16th century, printed in Lindsay and de Melo.
a shift to a new discourse topic.33 Sudden recognitions take place in Plaut. *Epid.* 448–449 *istum quem quaeris ... Periphanem Plothenium* and Plaut. *Trin.* 985–986 *illum quem ementitus*. In the latter passage, the antecedent *ille* is established at the same time as a discourse topic. The attractions will be discussed in further detail in section 3.4. Therefore, I cite here in full only Plaut. *Curc.* 419:

(41) **Lyco [...]**

*sed istum quem quaeris* ego sum

*Plaut. Curc.* 419

‘But I am the man you’re looking for.’

This line comes from the meeting of Curculio the parasite and Lyco the banker. The encounter begins with some initial joking, and here Lyco finally identifies himself as the banker whom Curculio (here, pretending to be a slave called Summanus) is looking for. On ll. 404–406, Curculio stated his intention (*sed hunc quem quaero commonstrate si potes, inibis a me solidam et grandem ... gratiam; Lyconem quaero tarpezitam*) to find the banker, and here, more than ten lines later, he gets the answer: his interlocutor is, in fact, the banker. The element *istum quem quaeris* is therefore highly topical. After the recognition, the topic shifts from Lyco’s identity to the tablets Curculio is bringing.

In the following example, the topical element is Active but remains the topic only for the sentence where it is mentioned.

(42) **Lar familiaris [...]**

*et hic qui poscet eam sibi uxorem senex,*

*is adulescentis est illius aunculus,*

*qui illam stupravit noctu, Ceres uigiliis*

*Plaut. Aul.* 34–36

‘And this old man who’s going to ask for her hand, he’s the uncle of that young fellow who violated her chastity by night during the vigil held in honor of Ceres.’

The prologue of the Aulularia is spoken by the *Lar familiaris*. He here provides essential information on the identity of one of the main characters. The old

---

33 Lehmann (1984: 351) suggests that attraction itself is involved in producing the topical function.
man from next door, *hic senex*, was introduced on l. 31 (*hic senex de proxumo*, where we can imagine the Lar pointing at the neighbour’s door while saying this) as part of the Lar’s plan to arrange a happy marriage for the daughter of his master. In this passage, more information is given about the old man: he happens to be the uncle of the young man who raped the girl in question and who, according to the Lar’s plan, should eventually marry her. The old man does not continue as the topic, however: the Lar shifts the topic to the master of his own house (again, *hic senex* on l. 37, but a different one), who is shouting inside the house and closes the prologue.

3.3.2  **Re-activating an Accessible Referent or Introducing a Brand New Referent as Topic**

In the prologues of comedies, the speaker of the prologue introduces the setting and persons of the play to the audience. Several instances of LD are found in Plautine prologues (or elsewhere in the initial scenes). In these passages, the dislocated constituents refer to central persons in the story. Typically, LD is not used when the persons are initially introduced, but in the second reference, when the person, already once mentioned and introduced, is picked up again to offer some additional information.

This organization appears in the prologue of *Menaechmi*.

(43) *Prologus*

*Epidamniensis ill’ quem dudum dixeram geminum illum puerum qui surrupuit alterum, ei liberorum nisi diuitiae nil erat*

*Plaut. Men. 57–59*

‘That man from Epidamnus I was talking about a moment ago, the man who kidnapped that other twin, he had no children except for his wealth.’

After speaking on various other themes, the speaker of the prologue here returns to the merchant from Epidamnus. This merchant, who kidnapped the other twin, was first introduced on l. 32. Here, re-established as the topic of the discussion, he is first defined by two relative clauses then referred to in the dative *ei ... nil erat*. He and his subsequent actions (including death, *ingressus rapidum fluuium*, in the same passage) are the topic of the following lines (60–66). The merchant himself is relevant to the plot only in terms of being the abductor and adoptive father of the lost boy and is thus instrumental to separating the twins from each other.

The following lines come from the prologue of *Poenulus*:
(44) **Prologus** [...]  
*ille qui* adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio,  
is illi Poeno huius patruo hospes fuit  

*PLAUT. Poen. 119–123*

‘The man who adopted this chap as his son was a family friend of that Carthaginian, the uncle of the young man.’

This sentence establishes the connection between Hanno the Carthaginian and Antidamas, the adoptive father of Agorastocles. In the immediately preceding lines the speaker of the prologue has made a pun about his own words and before that he has been describing the actions of Hanno in his attempt to find his lost daughters. The adoptive father has been first introduced on ll. 73–74 (*domino hic diuiti quoidam seni, cupienti liberorum, osori mulierum*). Then, on l. 119, a relative clause is used to identify the man in question, after which the connection between him and Hanno (*illi Poeno huius patruo*) can be stated: he was Hanno’s family friend. Note that three persons are mentioned in (44): *ille qui / is, hunc/huius* and *illi Poeno ... patruo* (in contrast with *Poen. 124 hic qui hodie ueniet*, without resumption; see the discussion in 3.6). 

A similar organization can be found in the next example:

(45) **Hegio** [...]  
aduorte animum sis: *tu istos captius* duos,  
heri *quos* emi de praeda de quaestoribus,  
is indito catenas singularias  
istas, maiores, quibus sunt iuncti, demito  

*PLAUT. Capt. 110–113*

‘Pay attention, will you? Those two prisoners I bought from among the spoils from the quaestors yesterday, put of these separate chains on each of them and take off the heavier ones they’re bound with now.’

With these lines, Hegio opens what, in modern editions, is the second scene of the first act. After the prologue, the parasite Ergasilus’s long monologue has filled the first scene in act one. The captives, Philocrates and Tyndarus, are still present on stage, bound in chains. They are the topics of Hegio’s short speech here (ll. 114–118), but the topic afterwards shifts.

In the following examples, LD is used to introduce a Brand New element as topic. We return first to *Captuui*. With the left-dislocation in (46), the two captives are introduced for the first time, in the first two lines of the play.
Prologus

hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos,
illi quia astant, hi stant ambo, non sedent

PLAUT. CAPT. 1–2

‘Those two prisoners you can see standing here, they’re both standing, not sitting, because the people back there are standing.’

The speaker of the prologue is here probably pointing to the two captives, Tyn-daros and Philocrates, who are the topic of the play. They are standing in front of Hegio’s house, chained together. The expression is thus used to introduce the entire play and its central theme. Nevertheless, in the main clause, the speaker of the prologue does not, in fact, continue to speak about the two captives. Instead, he connects their standing posture to the fact that some spectators are still standing at the back. He then continues introducing characters of the play, interrupting this introduction by making remarks to the audience.34

In the following example, the entity introduced for the first time in the LD construction has an essential role in the play (or at least the first part of it, after which the theme of the secret doorway is abandoned).

Palaestrio [...]

nam unum conclave, concubinae quod dedit
miles, quo nemo nisi eapse inferret pedem,
in eo conclave ego perfodi parietem
qua commeatus clam esset hinc huc mulieri

PLAUT. MIL. 140–143

‘Well, one room which the soldier gave to his concubine, and into which no one except for herself could set foot, in that room I made a hole in the wall so that the girl would have a passage from here to here in secret.’

34 In this connection can be mentioned the beginning of the argumentum of Menaechmi (Plaut. Men. arg. 1–2 Mercator Siculus quoi erant gemini filii, ei surrupto altero mors optigit). There, the Sicilian merchant is established as the starting point of the play. Three things are told about him: he had twin sons, one was kidnapped and he (the father) then died. As the Plautine argumenta were composed and added to the plays much later (probably in the 2nd century CE), this construction has not been included in the corpus of republican Latin left-dislocation. It nevertheless shows the potential of LD in Latin. The construction is used to introduce a person and to predicate three things about him at once. On the other hand, the language used in an acrostich argumentum such as this one may not reflect genuine linguistic strategies.
In these lines, Palaestrio tells us about the trick he has played to enable the secret meetings of the young lovers. He first introduces the room, *unum conclaue*, given to the girl by her master the soldier, and, after a further detail (that no one except the girl could enter that room), reveals what is important in the first part of the play, that he, Palaestrio, has cut a hole in the wall between the two houses (the other one belonging to Periplectomenus, an old man who is sympathetic to the lovers’ case).

Several of the LD constructions occur in what are traditionally called ‘running slave scenes’. In these scenes, a slave or a parasite is making hasty progress through the stage, either in pursuit of his own plans or on a mission given to him by his master. It seems that running slave scenes in Plautus contain several nonstandard syntactic phenomena. The following three examples of this type contain two LD constructions each and, in addition to them, certain other constructions of interest.

The following, one of the attractions, comes from the monologue of the slave Chrysalus at the beginning of scene nine in act four of the *Bacchides*:

(48) **Chrysalus** [...

\[\text{nam ego has tabellas opsignatas, consignatas quas fero}
\text{non sunt tabellae, sed equos quem misere Achiui ligneum}\]

*Plaut. Bacch. 935–936*

‘These tablets, which I am carrying signed and sealed, aren’t tablets, but the wooden horse which the Achaeans sent.’

In this monologue, Chrysalus reveals his clever plan to the audience. In doing this, he compares the persons and other elements involved in his plan to the heroes of the Trojan War. The *tabellae opsignatae* that the slave is carrying with him contain a letter from Mnesiloachus to his father Nicobulus in which the former asks for money to settle his dealings with a girl. Chrysalus describes the *tabellae* as the Trojan horse, as it is with them that he plans to trick the old man and help his young master Mnesiloachus. The tablets are introduced with this phrase (thus, they constitute Brand New anchored information) and are of great importance to the plot later. The rest of Chrysalus’s monologue goes on to draw further parallels between the present situation and the legendary war, Chrysalus himself playing the part of Ulysses (for a closer analysis of this passage, see 3.4).

The same monologue contains another LD:
The stupid old man whom Chrysalus here gives the name *Ilium* is not the topic of the following lines but is part of the more general topic of the Trojan war and the comparison of its characters with those of the present situation. The old man Nicobulus is accessible as one of the central figures of the play and is easily identifiable by the sole characterization *nostro seni huic stolido*. Nicobulus had left the stage after l. 924, following which Chrysalus entered the stage and initiated his monologue.

I continue with what are, in effect, two rather similar passages: Plaut. *Capt.* 807–822; *Curc.* 288–297.

In the second scene of the fourth act of *Captiui*, the parasite Ergasilus is making his way through the streets to find his master Hegio and to tell him the good news: that Ergasilus has just seen Hegio's long lost son in the harbour. Ergasilus makes violent threats to people blocking his way on this happy mission and lists groups of persons he is particularly angry with (millers who keep sows and feed them on husks, fishermen who sell rotten fish and butchers who bereave sheep of their children):

---

(50) **ERGASILUS**

\[
\text{tum piores scrofipasci qui alunt furfuribus sues,}
\]

\[
\text{quorum odore praterire nemo pistrinum potest:}
\]

\[
\text{eorum si ego quoiusquam scrofam in publico conspexero,}
\]

\[
\text{ex ipsis dominis meis pugnis exculcabo furfures}
\]

*Plaut. Capt.* 807–810

---

**HEGIO**

basilicas edictiones atque imperiosas habet:

satur homo est, habet profecto in uentre confidentiam

*Plaut. Capt.* 811–812

---

(51) **ERGASILUS**

\[
\text{tum piscores qui praebent populato piscis foetidos,}
\]

\[
\text{qui aduehuntur quadrupedanti, crucianti cantherio,}
\]

\[
\text{quorum odos subbasilicanos omnis abigit in forum,}
\]

\[
\text{eis ego ora uerberabo surpiculis piscariis,}
\]

\[
\text{ut sciant alieno naso quam exhibeant molestiam}
\]

*Plaut. Capt.* 813–817
tum lanii autem qui concinnant liberis orbas ouis, qui locant caedundos agnos et dupla agninam danunt, qui Petroni nomen indunt uerueci sectario, eum ego si in uia Petronem publica conspexero, et petronem et dominum reddam mortalis miserrunos

PLAUT. Capt. 818–822

‘Next point: the millers feeding sows, who raise pigs with the husks, because of whose stench no one can go past the mill; if I see a sow of any one of them in public, I’ll knock the husks out of their owners themselves with my fists.’

‘He has royal and imperious proclamations; the man is full, yes he has boldness in his belly.’

‘Next point: the fishmongers, who ride here on a jogging, jolting gelsing and who offer the people stinking fish whose stench drives all loafers in the arcade out into the market, I’ll whack their faces with their fish baskets so that they know what a nuisance they are to the public nose. Next point now: the butchers who arrange for sheep to be bereft of their children, who arrange for the lambs to be slaughtered and then sell the meat for double the price, who call the wether followed by the flock their Petro; if I set my eyes on this Petro in a public street, I’ll make both Petro and its master the most wretched of mortals.’

The insults and threats, though not important by themselves, uttered here by Ergasilus in one type of ‘running-slave scene’ (Ergasilus is not a slave but a parasite) appear at a crucial moment in the play, when Hegio is about to find out that his son has come back. This monologue describes Ergasilus’s state of mind during his progress from the harbour to Hegio’s house. He is aggressive in his eagerness to announce the happy news and to be appropriately rewarded with a feast by his master. The three groups he mentions are all treated syntactically in a similar fashion. Each group is introduced with a thematic nominative followed by a relative clause. The referents of these groups have not been mentioned previously and are not relevant entities in the play outside this scene. After the defining relative clause, the referent is taken up in the genitive (eorum ... conspexero) in the first group (the millers) and in the dative (eis ... uerberabo) in the second group (the fishermen). As for the third group, lanii (the butchers) is first followed by three relative clauses but is then dropped out, and,

35 See also the analysis of this passage in Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 16–18).
in the main clause, the anaphoric expression is used to refer to a constituent mentioned in the second relative clause (Petro).\(^{36}\) This third example has not been classified as left-dislocation, because *eum ... Petronem* in the main clause refers back to *lanii* at the beginning, and the construction thus comes closer to anacoluthon than left-dislocation. Eckstein (1921: 171) notes on this passage ‘Sehr geschickt verwendet Plautus die altrömische Technik, um eine Spannung zu bewirken, die auf unerwartete Weise gelöst wird’. The syntactic organization of the passage imitates the language of edicts and legal language, and this is commented on by Hegio: *basilicas edictiones* on l. 811, cited above, and *edictiones aedilicias* on l. 823 (cf. also Ergasilus’s own words on l. 803 *prius edico*).\(^{37}\) Constructions where head nouns are followed by several relative clauses and taken up in the main clause by an anaphoric expression were recognized as something that would have been at home in an aediles’s edict or, more generally, in a Roman law text (on these, see chapter 4).

A similar dramatic situation with similar syntactic means is found in *Curculio* (lines preceding the LD in (52) quoted as well):

_**Curculio […]**_

tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant, 
qui incendunt suffarciinati 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 capitullo calidum bibunt, 
tristes atque ebrioli incedunt: eos ego si offendoro, 
ex unoquoque eorum crepitum exciam polentarium

**Plaut. Curc. 288–295**

‘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

\(^{36}\) Hahn (1964: 131 fn.) makes the same observation about the syntax of the Petro passage.

\(^{37}\) De Meo (1986: 71–72) points out the parody of legal language in Plautus, *Captiui* 8:23 ff.: ‘Le categorie cui l’ordine è indirizzato sono introdotte in serie, come nei paragrafi delle vere leggi, con nominativi piazzati all’inizio e privi di normali legami sintattici con la principale, alla stessa maniera di certe prescrizioni legali, e con largo uso di relativi e di anaforici (...). Basta confrontare con qualcuno dei numerosi capoversi, sintatticamente quasi tutti di analoga struttura [note 9], della Lex agraria del 111 a.C. (15 + 24 + Lex Cornelia 31 *uiatores praecones*).’ On these passages, see further chapter 4.
your way and block your path, who prance about with their clever say-
ings, whom you can always see drinking 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.’

(52) tum isti qui ludunt datatim serui scurrarum in via
et datores et factores omnis, subdam sub solum
PLAUT. CURC. 296–297

‘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.’

Here, Curculio, another parasite, proceeds through the crowd in great haste,
at the same time making disparaging remarks about Greek persons and slaves
who are blocking his way without having anything 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 uideal, can be
constructed as the subject of the following regular main clause, operto capit-
ulo calidum bibunt, tristes atque ebrioli incedunt. Formally, this means that the
construction is a standard sentence-initial relative clause (type B2 in my classi-
fication). Therefore, this example has not been included in the corpus of LD. It
must be noted, however, that the description of these Greeks is so long that the
subject status of isti Graeci on l. 288 (to go with bibunt and incedunt on ll. 293–
294) is open to some doubt. The colon marked in the editions is one sign of
this. These Greeks continue as objects in the following sentence (l. 293 eos).
Again, we may quote Eckstein’s (1921: 169) observation on the passage: ‘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.’

The long characterization of isti Graeci palliati is followed by a construction
that can be defined as left-dislocation, isti qui ludunt … serui, picked up by et
datores et factores omnis, which I have interpreted as a nominal resumption of
isti serui, meaning that isti qui ludunt … serui is co-referent with datores and fac-
tores (as in de Melo’s translation ‘those slaves … who play ball … all the throwers
and players’). Alternatively, it could be taken as co-ordinate with isti serui (all
the slaves and all the throwers and players), in which case it would not be a
left-dislocation (see parallels in 3.2.4.1).

The elements introduced as topics via LD in running slave scenes are top-
ics in only the utterances where they occur and thus do not exhibit topic-
continuity. This is a consequence of the function of LD in such contexts: to introduce new referents (or re-introduce Accessible information) effectively in the course of a single heated monologue.

There are further examples where an Active or Accessible element is promoted to topic of one to two subsequent sentences: Plaut. *Poen.* 64–67 *sed illi seni qui mortuost, (ei) filius unicus qui fuerat*; Plaut. *Epid.* 51 *istanc quam emit*; Plaut. *Amph.* 1009 *Naucratem quem ... in naui non erat* (an attraction); Ter. *Eun.* 951–952 *uirginem istam, Thaidi hodie quae dono datast, scis eam hinc ciuem esse?*. 

The next group contains examples where a Brand New element is promoted to topic via LD and is the topic of only its own sentence. These are often side remarks that do not otherwise relate to what is happening on stage. While the LD element is the topic of the sentence where it occurs, the conversation afterwards goes on without further mention of the detached element. These instances show that LD constructions may be used to promote topics in a variety of settings, and an LD construction does not necessarily mean that the dislocated constituent is high in topicality.

(53) **Leonida [...]**

```
   sed uina quae heri uendidi uinario Exaerambo,
   iam pro is satis fecit Sticho?
```

PLAUT. *Asin.* 436–437

‘But the wine I sold to the wine-merchant Exaerambus yesterday, has he settled with Stichus for it now?’

In this passage, the slave Leonida pretends to be the overseer Saurea and is making enquiries about several persons and their duties. Neither the *uina* mentioned here, nor *uinarius Exaerambus* were mentioned before (or are mentioned after) this scene in the play. The *uina* are first introduced and defined, then a question about them is expressed.38 Similar organizations are found in Plaut. *Most.* 840–841, where *haec quae possunt* refers to a painting on the wall and is thus Active in the situation (with an element of contrast), Plaut. *Mil.* 352 *hoc quod ago id me agere oportet*, referring to the slave’s activity on stage, and Plaut. *Most.* 1046–1047 *ostium quod*, a Brand New element but anchored in the situation with the relative clause, just like *uina quae* in (53).

---

38 The same conversation contains *scyphos ... rettulitne* (l. 444), with a similar organization except that there is no resumption (type B2).
Further examples of sentence topics (side remarks) occur in Plaut. *Men.* 310–312 (attraction of an Accessible referent nummum illum quem), *Asin.* 237 (domi serui qui sunt) and *Bacch.* 214–215 (*Epidicum quam ego fabulam*), the latter of which are both Brand New referents. The reason behind LD in these constructions is probably that the element has not been mentioned before and needs to be introduced in a concise and effective way, as it will not remain the topic, so that a more elaborate introduction of the entity in question is not dramatically motivated. The sentence is a side remark without much relevance to the on-going conversation or the play’s plot. Note, however, that both examples from *Asinaria* and *Bacchides* have a nominal resumption, meaning that the combined effect of semantics and pragmatics must be assumed to be the motivation behind LD in their instances, because the nominal resumption offers extra information on the referent.

In Plaut. *Pseud.* 64–71 (*nostri amores*), we find a listing LD where syntax is clearly the most important factor for the use of resumption (with a list of Brand New elements as the dislocated constituent).39 A shorter list occurs in *Most.* 1160–1162, where the topical element *faenus, sortem sumptumque omnem* is picked up from l. 1140, but is not topical beyond this sentence.

There are several passages in comedy where entities that are Brand New elements in the conversation seem to appear as topics (e.g., running slave scenes, as well as the sentence topics and side remarks just discussed). This raises the question of the potential for LDs to promote to topic status even elements that are new in the situation. Can new referents occur as topics in LD constructions? Brand New referents as LDs should not be possible (or the preferred strategy), at least if one agrees with Lambrecht (1994: 184) that, for the receiver of the message, the mental effort of coping with the Brand New element and simultaneously receiving information about that element is no an easy task, so speakers or writers tend to avoid predicating things about entities that are new in the situation. A context where the referent of the detached element can be given a generic interpretation is an easily imaginable place for a Brand New topic, but this is not the case in the above-mentioned examples. We will have to assume that, in a fictional context, the restrictive relative clause alone was enough to identify such a referent.

We have seen that in the two running slave scenes discussed above there was a strong anchoring expression (a defining relative clause) attached to the LD element. Because of this, the constructions are not actually surprising, even

---

39 One more listing LD occurs in *Asin.* 198 (*diem aquam solum lunam noctem*, a generic statement).
in the absence of a generic interpretation. In the next example, the situation is clearly different from the ‘running slave scenes’ discussed above. This construction does not contain a relative clause. Instead, there is an indirect question, as was also the case in (39) above:

(54) Pyrgopolinices ubi tu es? 
    Artotrogus eccum. edepol uel elephanto in India quo pacto ei pugno praefregisti bracchium

    ‘Where are you?’ ‘Look, here I am. Or take the elephant in India, how you broke its arm with your fist.’

The slave Artotrogus continues the fictitious list of Pyrgopolinices’s deeds, mentioning an elephant in India whose leg the soldier broke. The elephant is definitely new to the context. However, its appearance is not as surprising as might appear at first sight. It continues the list of Pyrgopolinices’s brave actions from l. 16 nempe illum dicis cum armis aureis quoius tu legiones difflausti spiritu, quasi uentus folia au peniculus tectorium. The words edepol uel before the dislocated constituent elephanto serve to take the audience’s thoughts to the discourse topic of this scene, the fake bravery of the braggart soldier. Thus, the audience is prepared to receive something completely ungrounded in the context. How to assign pragmatic functions in this sentence is not immediately evident. Is the elephant the topic, or should we rather think that this is an example of a sentence-focus structure, providing one more point in the list of Pyrgopolinices’s heroic deeds, which is the general topic of this dialogue?

3.3.3 Complex Referential Situations
In certain examples, it seems that the primary motivation behind the use of LD is the complex situation being described and the multiple persons and things referred to. In one sense, one can say that the motivation behind LD is originally syntactic and comes from the author’s wish to combine several ideas in one sentence. It is probable that the complicated syntax also contributes to a comical effect.

The first example comes from Pseudolus:

(55) **CALIDORUS** quid istuc est?
  **PSEUDOLUS** epistulam hanc modo intercepi et symbolum
  **CALIDORUS** symbolum? quem symbolum?
  **PSEUDOLUS** qui a milite allatust modo
eius **seruos qui** hunc ferebat cum quinque argenti minis,
tuam **qui** amicam hinc arcessebat, ei os subleui modo
  *Plaut. Pseud. 715–719*

> ‘What's that?
  I just intercepted this letter and token.
  Token? What token?
  The one that was brought from the soldier just now. I just fooled his slave, who was carrying it with five silver minas and who was trying to fetch your girlfriend from here.’

In these lines, Pseudolus tells his master Calidorus that, by fooling the soldier's (*a milite, eius*) slave, Harpax (*seruos qui*), he has been able to procure the means for buying Calidorus's girlfriend from the pimp. This is an important turn in the play, and the syntactic construction reflects the number of facts Pseudolus has to relate: 1) the soldier, whose *symbolum* and letter Pseudolus has acquired, 2) more importantly, his slave, who brought the token with five silver minas to snatch away Calidorus's girlfriend and 3) Pseudolus has succeeded in fooling the slave.

Another example of a complex referential situation is the next one:

(56) **LYCUS**
  hahahae! iam teneo quid sit, perspexi modo
  **hi qui** illum dudum conciliauerunt mihi
  peregrinum Spartanum, id nunc **his** cerebrum uritur,
  me esse hos trecentos Philippos facturum lucri
  *Plaut. Poen. 768–771*

> ‘Hahaha! Now I've got what this is, I've just seen through it. 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.’

Here, the pimp Lycus thinks he has spotted the trick played upon him; *hi qui are* the advocates whom Agoracles has brought to the pimp's house. The advocates and Lycus had met before, when the former had introduced the fake soldier (*peregrinum Spartanum*—in reality, Agoracles's slave Collybiscus) to him. The
advocates, to which *hi qui* refers, are now present, but Lycus makes a point about their earlier meeting and about his suspicions that, meanwhile, the three hundred Philippics of the fake soldier have become an interest to the advocates as well (*his cerebrum uritur*). Several things are being predicated by Lycus: 1) here are the advocates who earlier introduced the Spartan soldier, 2) their brain is ‘burning’ and 3) the reason for this is that they have realized how much profit Lycus is going to make from the foreigner’s money. This complex idea results in the expression where the advocates are first introduced with a thematic nominative then referred to in the dative in the following main clause.

In this section belong also two attractions: Plaut. *Pseud*. 526–529 (*tibicinam illam*; see the discussion on *Pseudolus* in 3.4.4); *Rud*. 1064–1066 (*illum quem ... lenonem*, topic shift).

### 3.3.4 Generic Statements

There is a group of LD constructions that are not predications about entities present in the play but are instead general statements about human life. These make up a considerable portion of the LD constructions in comedy. It may be hypothetized that LD is one means of expressing such *sententiae*. It may be noted here that the frequency of correlative sentences as *sententiae* is notable (Probert and Dickey 2016). Lambrecht (1994: 167) also refers to the occurrence of Brand New referents as topics of generic statements.

The first example comes from Terence:

(57) **Micio** [...]

*in uitast hominum quasi quom ludas tesseres:*

*si illud quod maxume opus est iactu non cadit,*

**illud quod** cecidit forte, **id** arte ut corrigas

*TER. Adelph. 739–741*

‘Human life is like a game with dice; if you don’t get the throw you most want, you must show your skill in making the best of the throw which you do get.’

This wise advice is uttered by Micio as a response to his brother’s shock at the turn things have taken with Micio’s son. It presents a general statement about human life, contrasting *illud quod maxume opus est* with *illud quod cecidit forte*. The latter is topical in this utterance, while focus is on the latter part of the sentence (*arte ut corrigas*).

The following is a generic statement without a relative clause:
(58) **Virgo**

tamquam *hominem*, quando animam eculuit, quid *eum* quaeras qui fuit?

*Plaut. Persa* 638

‘Like a man who has breathed his last, why would you ask who he was?’

The remaining generic statements occur in *Most.* 858–859; *Mil.* 1292–1294; *Epid.* 166–167, *Pseud.* 269; *Bacch.* 385–387; *Persa* 766; *Rud.* 252; *Stich.* 119–120; *Cas.* 222–223; *Asin.* 198. In five instances, there is an element of contrast, as there is in (57): *Most.* 250–251; *Trin.* 672; *Asin.* 527; *Truc.* 742–745; *Rud.* 1240–1241. Not only nominal and pronominal antecedents of relative pronouns can have a generic meaning but even dislocated constituents without a relative clause, as in (58) above.

### 3.3.5 **Contrastive Contexts**

In addition to several of the examples mentioned above, there are further instances where **LD** is found in a clearly contrastive context. A contrastive element can be a topic of its sentence, which seems to be the case in the following passages. Contrastiveness appears to be the main motivation behind the use of **LD** in these passages, the dislocated elements being contrastive sentence-topics. In the first three examples, the passage contains a contrastive pair, of which the second member is expressed with **LD**.

The first of these is a contrastive side remark:

(59) neque umquam quicquam me iuuat quod edo domi:
    foris aliquantium etiam *quod* gusto *id* beat

*Plaut. Capt.* 136–137

‘And nothing I eat at home ever pleases me. But the tiniest morsel I taste outside makes me happy.’

A topic shift takes place in (60):

(60) **Megaronides** [...]

inconciliastin eum qui mandavit tibi,
    *ille qui* mandavit, *eum* exturbasti ex aedibus?

*Plaut. Trin.* 136–137

‘Haven’t you got the man who was entrusted to you into trouble and haven’t you thrown the man who entrusted him to you out of his house?’
Megaronides, the speaker here, reproaches his friend, Callicles. The latter had been entrusted with the house and family of a common acquaintance, after his departure to Seleucia. The son of this person, now supposed to be taken good care of by Callicles, is continuing his debauched lifestyle and has, in fact, sold his father’s house to the very same Callicles. Megaronides here points out that Callicles has made a victim of the young man who had been entrusted in his care (*eum qui mandatust tibi*) and driven out of his house the very man who had entrusted his son to him. On l. 137, Megaronides changes the topic from the son (who has been the topic of the preceding discussion) to the father, with the help of a thematic nominative: *ille qui mandauit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus* (topic in only this sentence or possibly the following: *edepol mandatum pulchre et curatum probe*).

There is marked contrast between *istic scelestus* and *ego* in the following passage:

(61) **Gripus**

*istic scelestus liber est:* **ego qui** in mari prehendi
rete atque excepit uidulum, **ei** dari negatis quicquam

*Plaut. Rud.* 1291–1292

‘That criminal is free; yet you refuse to give anything to me, who caught the trunk in the sea with my net and took it out.’

Toward the end of *Rudens*, the unfortunate slave Gripus here laments his fate by bringing up, though by himself, the important fact that it was he who had caught the trunk from the sea (and thus was the cause of the happy reunion) but that, to him, nothing has been given. Instead, the pimp Labrax, who caused all the trouble, gets to walk free.

Not all contrastive contexts contain a pair of clauses. Contrastiveness may be sentence-internal, as in Plaut. *Rud.* 142–143 *ille qui inuitauit, nullus uenit* (if it is accepted that *nullus* constitutes a resumption). A concluding statement with a contrastive element occurs in Plaut. *Poen.* 391 *omnia illa quae dicebas tua esse, ea memorares mea.* In Plaut. *Rud.* 1195–1196, the contrast is between the relative clause *ego hodie ⟨qui⟩ nec sperauit nec credidi* and the main clause is *improuiso filiam inueni tamen* (‘I, who neither hoped for it nor believed it, even so found my daughter unexpectedly today.’).41 The passage is from Daemones’s

---

41 In this example, ⟨*qui*⟩ is an addition by Sonnenschein. It is printed in de Melo but not in Leo or Lindsay. The conjecture has some support from (61) above (ego qui ... ei), perhaps strengthened by the fact that they come from the same play.
short monologue, where he praises the lucky turn in recent events. Finally, we
may include in this group one of the examples without a relative clause: Plaut.
*Epid.* 85 neque ego nunc quo modo me expeditum ex impedito faciam consilium
placet. Here, the reason for the emphatic *ego* appears to be the change in the
form of the first-person reference. Until the lines quoted above, Epidicus had
been addressing himself in the second person (l. 81 *quo in loco haec res sit uides,
Epidice*). Then, on l. 85, he changes the reference to the first person, using *ego* in
the nominative, even though the main clause predicate is *placet*. Thus, we can
see that, whenever *ego* is used as a dislocated constituent, it expresses contrast
of one kind or another (cf. *Rud.* 1291–1292; *Rud.* 1195–1196; *Epid.* 85).

In addition to the passages quoted here, several of those included in the
other pragmatic groups contain an element of contrast (*Most.* 840–841 *haec
quae possum*; *Ter. Heaut.* 130–134 *gnatum unicum*; as well as several of the
generic statements: *Rud.* 1240–1241; *Most.* 250–251, 858; *Trin.* 672; *Asin.*
527; *Truc.* 742–745).

There is one interesting and oft-quoted passage that does not quite fit into
any of the categories above. In (62), left-dislocation without a relative clause
occurs at an important turn of events, in the recognition scene between Hanno
and Agorastocles. In the preceding dialogue between Hanno and Agorastocles,
the latter has told Hanno the names of his parents, Iahon and Ampsigura.

(62) **HANNO**

    factum, quod ⟨ego⟩ aegre tuli.
    nam mihi sobrina Ampsigura tua mater fuit;
    pater tuos, is erat frater patruelis meus,
    et is me heredem fecit quom suom obiit diem,
    quo me priuatum aegre patior mortuo

    PLAUT. *Poen.* 1067–1071

    ‘Yes, which was hard for me: your mother, Ampsigura, was my second
cousin; your father, he was my first cousin, and he made me his heir when
he passed away: it’s hard for me to be deprived of him through his death.’

In this speech, Hanno reveals what he has recently come to realize himself:
Agorastocles is the lost son of his cousin. Hanno first identifies Agorastocles’s
mother as his second cousin. The words *mihi sobrina* clearly carry the focus
and, hence, are placed in initial position. Afterwards, he proceeds to the father,
introduced by *pater tuos*, then taken up emphatically: *is erat frater patruelis
meus*. The left-dislocation is used to change the topic from the mother to the
father. Hanno continues to speak about the father, who made Hanno his heir.
After the passage quoted in (62), Hanno goes on to mention the mark that Agorastocles should have on his left arm, if he really is the son of Iahon. Note that there is no definition of the referent, as *pater tuos* is identifiable without further information. The focus is on the identity of *pater tuos*: he was the speaker’s uncle.

### 3.3.6 Left-Dislocation as a Focusing Device

The preceding discussion has shown that the majority of L.D.s in comedy are topics of their predications. However, this should not mean that the same should automatically be presumed true for all examples. Is it theoretically plausible that a marked syntactic construction was used in Latin to encode two different pragmatic settings? In section 2.1.2, it was pointed out that there are varying views concerning the possible pragmatic functions of L.D. Lambrecht (2001) has argued that L.D is not, and cannot, be used to express a focus relation.\(^{42}\) But there is evidence to the contrary, so Lambrecht’s position does not have to be accepted without further consideration. It seems that a close inspection of the Latin material points to such a broader capability of L.D. In a small group of Latin examples, the best way to interpret the dislocated constituent’s pragmatic function is to take it as the focus.

The first two passages come from prologues and are practically identical in their wording, even though one comes from Plautus and the other from Terence.

(63) **Luxuria […]**

*sed de argumento ne exspectetis fabulae:*

**senes qui** huc uenient, *i rem uobis aperient*

*Plaut. Trin. 16–17*

‘But don’t wait for me to tell you the plot of the play: the old men who’ll come here will disclose the matter to you.’

In the prologue of *Trinummus*, Luxuria has finished telling the audience the initial setting of the play. Here, she goes on to point out that she will not detain the audience from the plot any longer. Instead, the old men soon coming on stage will provide that information. Therefore, the most natural interpretation

\(^{42}\) Elsewhere, Lambrecht himself (1994: 225) refers to the multiple discourse functions of syntactic structures. On topicalized constituents in English that are either focus or topic, see also Lambrect (1994: 31).
of the pragmatic setting seems to be that the topic here is the plot of the play, *argumentum fabulae*. It has been established as topic in the line immediately preceding: *de argumento ne exspectetis fabulae* (focus on *ne exspectetis*). In the next line, the *argumentum* remains the topic (*rem uobis aperient*). Most salient is that it is the *senes* soon coming onto the stage who will tell the audience about the plot. The *senes qui hoc uenient*, according to this interpretation, is the focus of the sentence.

(64) **Prologus**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dehinc ne expectetis argumentum fabulae} \\
\text{senes qui prumi uenient, i partem aperient} \\
\text{in agendo partem ostendent}
\end{align*}
\]

*Ter. Adelph. 22–24*

‘I will not detain you from the plot of the play. Part of it will be disclosed by the old men who first come on the stage; the rest will appear over the course of the action.’

In the prologue of Terence’s *Adelphoe*, the same phrase appears as did in the prologue of Plautus’s *Trinummus*. In Terence’s prologue, however, these words do not interrupt an account of the plot of the play, as they do in Plautus. Instead, this is simply a way to end the prologue and open the action, added to the final part of the prologue. Otherwise, the pragmatic setting is the same as in Plautus: the *argumentum fabulae* has been established as topic in the preceding line, and the dislocated constituent *senes qui prumi uenient* is the focus.

The pragmatic structure of these two passages, if correctly interpreted, is one where the verbal part of the predication is topical (telling the audience about the *argumentum*), and the focus is on a nominal constituent. This constellation is closely related to what has been called an argument-focus structure. Lambrecht (1994: 222) identifies as an argument-focus structure a pragmatic construction in which the focus identifies the missing argument in a presupposed open proposition. This type of argument-focus is not compatible with the old model, where the topic-comment equals the subject-predicate (Lambrecht 1994: 232).

It is possible to identify an argument-focus structure in the following passage from the *Menaechmi*. Peniculus’s line answers the question by Menaechmus. As such, it is unquestionably the missing argument in a presupposed open proposition and, consequently, an argument-focus.
‘What are you saying,’ asks Menaechmus, to which Peniculus replies, ‘Me? Whatever you want, that’s what I’ll say and not say.’ It is not possible to reconstruct id enim quod tu uis here as the topic and the verbal part aio atque … nego as the focus. Saying something is topical, since that is present already in Menaechmus’s question.

Another unambiguous instance of an argument-focus structure can be found in the following passage from Mostellaria:

'Take the principal.' ‘No, the interest is what I want first.’

Misargyrides has just mentioned the money that Tranio should pay to him. Tranio offers to pay back the principal (sortem), but Misargyrides will not settle for that: he wants the interest (faenus) first. The fact that Misargyrides wants money to be paid to him is the topic of the conversation, and it is present in the verbal part of Misargyrides’s line (id primum uolo). The nominal part, faenus, carries a contrastive focus with respect to sortem accipe in the preceding line.

Yet another passage where the verbal part of the predication is topical and the nominal part is focal can be seen in the following example from Stichus:

‘Even the tiny space between iron bars where a puppy lies will be enough space for me.’
Gelasimus tells Epignomus that he is able to sleep in the tiniest of places. The beginning of l. 619 expresses the topic *si arte poteris accubare*.

Finally, it is possible to interpret (68) from the *Aulularia* as expressing the same pragmatic setting (argument-focus).

(68) **Eunomia**

*id quod* in rem tuam optumum esse arbitror,
*ted id* monitum aduento

Plaut. *Aul.* 144–145

‘I’ve come to recommend to you what I consider to be in your best interest.’

After a lengthy introduction at the beginning of act two of *Aulularia*, Eunomia is here finally reaching the matter she wants to discuss with her brother Megadorus—that the latter should take a wife into his house. It is by now clear that there is something Eunomia wants to tell her brother and *ted ... monitum aduento* is therefore topical in Eunomia’s line. According to this line of interpretation, *id quod* can be taken as an argument-focus.

The following passage represents one instance where it is difficult to determine the distribution of pragmatic functions:

(69) **Hegio**

*quod bene fecisti referetur gratia. id quod* postulas,
*et id* et aliud quod me orabis impetrabis

Plaut. *Capt.* 941–942

‘For your kindness toward us you’ll receive thanks. What you’re requesting, this and anything else you ask me for, you’ll get it.’

Hegio here promises to fulfill Philocrates’s wish to have his loyal slave Tyndarus (938–939) back. Hegio’s words are emphatic, and *id quod ... et id et aliud* comes close to being the focus of the sentence. That Hegio will not refuse anything Philocrates asks of him has already become clear (l. 937 *quid opust uerbis? lingua nulla est qua negem quicquid roges*). The object, *id quod postulas*, is not the topic in the following context. Alternatively, one could claim that *id quod postulas* is the topic in this sentence and the verbal part of the main clause (*impetrabis*) is the focal constituent.

The informational status of the focused element is Brand New anchored in (63)–(65) and (67)–(69) and Accessible in the case of *faenus* in (66).
It should be noted here that all three instances of the pattern *id quod* … *id* express, at least potentially, a focus relation.⁴³ A comparison with *id quod* without resumption in Plautus reveals that, of the four examples in the sample (see below 3.6), two express a focus relation (and constitute 2/4 of the potential focus relations in that material). This raises the possibility that *id quod* is an expression that easily occurs in focus expressions.

### 3.4 Discussion and Conclusion

#### 3.4.1 Pragmatics and the Function of LD in Comedy

A clear majority of the dislocated elements in comedy are well-established entities in the discourse fragment where they appear. The most common informational status of the dislocated constituent is Active. This means that the entity in question has already been mentioned in the immediate context and is actively present as one of the potential topics in the conversation. Left-dislocation also has the potential to re-introduce Accessible referents across a distance. These observations are in line with the prediction of Lambrecht that LD is normally used to introduce Active or Accessible elements.

Interestingly, there has been observed a considerable number of left-dislocations establishing Brand New elements as topics. Two factors may influence this tendency in comedy. The first is that what we see in Plautus and Terence is, after all, fictional dialogue, which cannot necessarily be expected to obey the tendencies of genuine spoken dialogue in every respect. Indeed, I have suggested above that the use of LD to introduce a Brand New referent may have been a practical way for introducing referents that do not require a more thorough introduction in the dramatic situation where they occur. Another factor is the occurrence of relative clauses. These give a certain flexibility to the construction by allowing the anchoring of referents that are Accessible but mentioned several lines before, and even of identifying Brand New elements in dislocations.

As for pragmatic organization, on the basis of the above discussion, we can verify the hypothesis that, in comedy, this type of left-dislocation (thematic nominatives, anticipation and attraction) typically expresses the topic of the subsequent predication. Altogether, 70 out of the 77 examples of LD in comedy contain referents that are topics at least in their own sentences.

---

⁴³ This is the same as the three certain examples of *id quod* with resumption, as *id quod* … ⟨*ei*⟩ in (40) above is uncertain, possibly even unlikely given the uncertain text.
Beyond this, LD has shown a stronger association with topics than merely establishing topics in the sentences where they occur. It has become apparent that LD is often used in the following contexts: as a way to establish as a discourse topic an element that is already actively present and even topical in the conversation, to re-activate Accessible elements across a distance, in running slave scenes as a tool for creating a hurried comical effect, to introduce Brand New referents (in side remarks), to express the topic in generic statements, to express a contrastive topic in contrastive contexts, and to express focus relations.

Despite this tendency, there remain examples where LD introduces a constituent that is the topic only in the particular sentence where it occurs. Interestingly, it seems that, in these examples, the dislocated constituent tends to be a previously unmentioned element. In other words, there is a correlation between a sentence topic and the element’s informational status as Brand New anchored. This suggests that LD can be used in two different information structural and pragmatic constellations: ones where highly topical elements are established as (discourse) topics and ones where there is need to re-activate an Accessible referent that has not been mentioned for some time or to introduce a previously unmentioned element as the topic of merely one sentence, so that more elaborate ways to do this would not be justified, given the general irrelevance of the utterance. Nevertheless, in some cases, the function of LD is more conveniently analysed as a focus than as a topic.

There seem to be no discernible patterns between the syntactic form of a dislocation and the pragmatic function of the dislocated element in the discourse context. In other words, the pragmatic functions are scattered across the syntactic categories without any clusters like, for instance, ‘dislocations in the nominative are generic statements’. However, there does seem to be a concentration of discourse topics among anticipations (accusative and dative), accidental or not. As for instances where both the dislocated element and the resumption are in the nominative, Rosén (1992) suggests that these should be understood as rhematicizing constructions (i.e., focus on the dislocated element). It appears that, while there are such instances, this does not hold up as a rule, at least according to my analysis of the pragmatic constellation of these passages. However, there are instances where a nominative dislocation is the focus (senes qui ... i twice). Furthermore, there are several neuter dislocations with a focus function that partly represents the nominative case (id quod ... id; fel quod ... id; faenus ... id; tantillum loculi ... id).
3.4.2 Attractions

It was observed above that it would seem impossible to discern a motivation in the syntactic context of attractions that would account for the use of this construction in the specific contexts where it occurs. In this section, I will attempt to explain the construction by looking in greater detail at the discourse context and pragmatic function of these attractions.

Three attractions occur in contexts where the speaker reveals his true identity, telling his interlocutor that he is in fact the person the other one was looking for (or pretended to be himself): Plaut. Curc. 419 sed istum quem quaeris ego sum; Plaut. Epid. 448–449 sed istum quem quaeris Periphanem Plothenium ego sum; Plaut. Trin. 985–986 quia illum quem ementitus es, ego sum ipsus Charmides, quem tibi epistulas dedisse aiebas.

These three examples share the syntactic construction where the attracted element is the subject complement of the main clause ego sum. All three are emphatic in their contexts, though none is a major recognition scene relevant to the development of the plot—not, for instance, in the manner of pater tuos, is erat frater patruelis meus in Poenulus (62) above. Nevertheless, it is possible that this context of sudden and, at least from the perspective of the interlocutor, unexpected identification is one reason behind the attraction.

We may compare these attracted constructions with other instances of phrases containing quem and quaeris in Plautus: Merc. 132 ecce me, Acanthio, quem quaeris; Poen. 1045 siquidem ... quaeris adoptaticium, ego sum ipsus, quem tu quaeris. Here, Merc. 132, with the emphatic ecce me, is similar to the attractions in its pragmatic but not syntactic organization. In Poen. 1045, the main clause predicate ego sum precedes the relative clause. Hence, there appears to be no context where a sentence-initial iste quem quaeris could be compared with the attracted examples. Perhaps Plautus was simply fond of using attraction in such cases.

Three attractions have uidere as the relative clause predicate (Poen. 644–645 quem uides; Pseud. 592 quem uideo; Capt. 1–2 quos uidetis). It is reasonable to suppose that these lines were uttered while the actor made a pointing gesture. It is also possible to imagine that the context in Captiui created a need for a special emphasis, given that hos captius opens the entire play.

Again, combinations of quem and uidit/uidere are uncommon in Plautus (Cas. 213 quis est quem uides; Trin. 116 quem uides, but with uidere in a figurative sense). Most importantly, there appears to be no instance of the pattern iste/ille quem uidit/uidere, which would enable a comparison with the attracted examples.

Naucratem quem opens a scene in Amphitruo, but there seems to be no discernible motivation for this attraction.
Whatever the exact motivation (or motivations) behind the attractions, one thing can be established on the basis of the above discussion: the attraction of the antecedent (attractio inversa) in Roman comedy is not a regular construction but a minority pattern even within the restricted evidence for LD. Internal variation in the construction makes it possible for several different motivations to be behind the construction, making it likewise impossible to find one pragmatic constellation. However, in 6 out of 12 examples, the context involves a deictic element.

3.4.3 Distribution
The examples of left-dislocation are more or less evenly distributed in the different comedies of Plautus. The longest comedies, Miles gloriosus, Poenulus, Pseudolus and Rudens, contain the largest number of dislocations (6 each). Other comedies with 6 dislocations are Mostellaria, Trinummus and Captiui. Menaechmi has four examples. Amphitruo, on the other hand, has only one. At a highly speculative level, one might see a connection between this and the more serious nature of Amphitruo as a tragicomoedia (according to the generally accepted conjecture at Plaut. Amph. 59). As for register differences between Plautus’s comedies, Mercator has no examples of LD, and it is early—on the basis of cantica, as well as its apparently close proximity to the Greek original. The same holds true for Cistellaria. Epidicus has four examples of LD, even though it is one of the shortest plays. Not much can be said about chronological distribution. Trinummus and Captiui, which both have relatively many dislocations compared with their length, are late plays.

Dislocations are not restricted to the speech of any one character type. All stock characters can use them (adulescens, senex, ancilla, matrona, leno, lena, servos, parasitus, meretrix).

It may, however, be worth pointing out here the eponymous slave Pseudolus, whose lines contain altogether five dislocations. Two of these (Plaut. Pseud. 592, 526–529) belong among the twelve attractions, and the latter is notable for its complex syntax: tibicinam illam quam ... ea circumducam lenonem. In yet another dislocation (Plaut. Pseud. 716–719), I have above identified a complex referential and syntactic situation. The remaining two are the reading aloud of the letter containing a listing LD (Plaut. Pseud. 64–71) and a generic statement (Plaut. Pseud. 269). Put together, these five instances, especially the complex ones and the attraction, are, in my opinion, indicative of Pseudolus’s portrayal as a creative language-user (see below on Plaut. Pseud. 592).

In this connection, it is worth mentioning a curious parallelism in four of the LD examples from Trinummus. Both the adulescens Lysiteles and the senex Megaronides evidence two dislocations, of which one is a generic statement.
beginning with *ille qui* and another a dislocation of the anticipation type where an *adulescens* is established as a discourse topic. Another related observation is that both examples of *ego qui* (although, in one, *qui* is supplemented) come from *Rudens* (spoken by Daemones and Gripus).

The majority of dislocations are found in a dialogue. But the construction is not restricted to this obvious context. Several dislocations appear in prologues and sung or recited monodies.

### 3.4.4 Is Left-Dislocation in Roman Comedy a Colloquial Feature?

In earlier research, the prevailing view was that left-dislocation is a construction used mainly in ‘Volkssprache’. Most such earlier comments were presented in connection with *attractio inuersa*. However, as these include constructions in the nominative, they are representative of a great part of the present corpus. Löfstedt (1933: 115) mentioned the ‘volkstümliche Freiheit’ of the syntax (similarly in Hofmann-Szantyr 1965: 567; on late examples, see Norberg 1943: 79). This perceived freedom in syntax usually referred to the attration itself and less to the presence of the anaphoric element. Other scholars (Bach 1888; Kroll 1912; Lehmann 1979; Hettrich 1988) have taken *attractio inuersa* as a reflection of arhaic syntax rather than Volkssprache. The viewpoint of these early studies is limited in comparison to those I have taken in this study. I have discussed anaphoric resumption and attraction as separate features. One should remember that attractions without resumption are only a few in number.\[44\]

Havers (1926: 215–216) considered the isolated nominative to be an ancient phenomenon (‘Wir dürfen diesem vorangestellten Nominativ uralte Verbreitung zutrauen’) that is rarely found in literary texts despite being frequent in everyday conversation.\[45\] These earlier observations were not specifically aimed at examples in comedy, so they do not address this question beyond referring to ‘Volkssprache’. Havers, on the other hand, does not consider nominative + nominative combinations to be part of the isolated nominative.

I shall continue by taking a closer look at certain particularly interesting passages. The left-dislocations in *Bacch.* 935–936 and 945 come from a much-

---

44 The existence of such pure attractions (without a resumptive element) in the nominative is highly dubious.

45 Havers (1926: 216): ‘Bedenkt man aber, dass bei uns diese Redeweise trotz der grossen Verbreitung in der zwanglosen Volks- und Umgangssprache doch nur verhältnismässig selten in der geschriebenen Sprache auftaucht, weil es eben so gut wie ganz an wirklich getreuen Bildern der lebendigen Rede fehlt (Behaghel PPB. 30, 539), so wird man auch für die schriftliche Überlieferung der übrigen idg. Sprachen nicht allzuviel Belege erwarten. Es kann sich nur um ein gelegentliches Eindringen dieses Nominativs aus der lebendigen Rede des Alltags in die höhere Sphäre der Literatur handeln.’
discussed passage, the monody of Chrysalus (*Bacch.* 925–978). This is usually considered to be a mainly Plautine composition, given its exuberant expression and length (see Barsby 1986: 169–178). Chrysalus equates the protagonists of the play and his own plans of deception to the events and heroes of the Trojan war. The composition is in long verses (mainly iambic octonari), so it was a recitative rather than an actual song (Barsby 1986: 172). Fraenkel emphasized the high register and non-parodical mood of the passage, inspired by Roman tragic language (Fraenkel 1922: 68; cf. l. 933, which echoes a tragic line, probably Ennius, *Cic.* *Tusc.* 3.44; see Barsby 1986: 173). Plautus has either greatly modified the monologue that his source, Menander’s *Dis exapaton*, had here or, alternatively, composed the whole scene himself. That much or all of the monologue is genuinely Plautine (or, in any case, from some other source than Menander) is clear from the passage’s confused overall design, with a focus on vivid detail rather than a logical line of thought.46

In my view, the passage’s overall composition is connected to the use of the two left-dislocations therein. Fraenkel (1922: 63) compared the song of Chrysalus to the monody of Pseudolus (*Pseud.* 574–593) for their similar dramatic technique. In the latter passage is found one of the attractions (*Pseud.* 592). The song (in varying metre) is written in a solemn and elevated tone, seen, for example, in the archaic *perduellis* and the phrase *qui oculis meis obuiam ignobilis obicitur?* The self-praise of the eponymous slave is thought to be typically Plautine in both form and content (Willcock 1987: 118). Pseudolus is well capable of a high-register expression (cf. his parody of tragic language in *Pseud.* 702–706). The implication of all this is that we should be cautious about associating left-dislocation with spoken or colloquial registers, even in the case of a cunning slave like Pseudolus.

Another interesting context for left-dislocation is what is usually called the ‘running slave’s speech’. There are two such passages, both of which are, in fact, spoken by parasites, not by slaves: Plaut. *Curc.* 280–298 and *Plaut. Capt.* 807–822. Both passages have been identified as imitating a praetor’s edict (Manuwald 2011: 298 on *Curc.* 280–298; cf. Fraenkel 1922: 68 on *Capt.* 807–822). This is made explicit by Hegio at *Capt.* 823–824 *eugepae! edictiones aedilicias*

---

46 Scholars have debated over the constitution of the passage and presented varying views as to the authenticity and sources of the lines. It is generally agreed upon that not much of it came from Menander. Jocelyn (1969: 145), who was very sceptical of genuine Plautine elements in this passage, argued that ll. 933–936, including the attraction *has tabellas quas fero*, is an addition by an actor from some other piece of republican (possibly Plautine) comedy. Jocelyn (1969: 148) further argued that l. 945 (*seni nostro huic stolido*) is an addition by some later reader of the play. I have followed de Melo’s text and consider these lines to be Plautine enough to be included in this study.
hicquidem habet, mirumque adeo est ni hunc fecere sibi Aetoli agoranomum.\textsuperscript{47} In such instances, the register is usually elevated.\textsuperscript{48} These ‘catalogue speeches’ offer a vivid portrayal of Roman street life (see Fraenkel 1922: 130–134). The speaker of these passages is a person lower down on the social scale (a parasite), uttering insults to his fellow city-dwellers. This is framed by Plautus in the linguistic guise of a Roman edict. Once again, there seems to be no straightforward connection between this monologue and the manner of colloquial speech, in the sense of ‘genuine spoken conversation’.

In his introductory note on Plautus’s style, de Melo (2011a: lxxv) notes the following on Poen. 659 tu, si te di amant: ‘But such dangling nominatives are not necessarily always colloquial; they do at least sometimes have the function of emphasizing the agent.’ While de Melo’s example is in vocative and therefore not considered in this study, his comment appears to be used to cover other types of ‘dangling’ nominatives as well. My analysis has shown that this statement is on the right track. Such nominatives, here called thematic nominatives, are not necessarily colloquial. But before proceeding with this question, I will first define what is meant here by colloquial.\textsuperscript{49} There are (at least) two senses in which this term can be used in this particular context. The first possibility is that left-dislocation is meant to imitate, in stylized fashion, constructions that were used in genuine conversation and that this is done to express register in fictional dialogues. According to this perspective, left-dislocation would be one of the indicators of a colloquial register. The second possibility (not necessarily complementary to the first) is that Plautus used LD whenever it was linguistically motivated in a given situation, regardless of register. For a great part of the examples, the latter option appears to be preferable, because left-dislocations are found in contexts that are not especially colloquial.

Connected to this, one should note that ‘colloquial’ and ‘emphasizing the agent’ (de Melo) are not mutually exclusive.\textsuperscript{50} Left-dislocation was most prob-


\textsuperscript{48} Cf. de Melo 2011a: lxxxv: ‘The register is usually elevated when Plautus imitates formal genres. Particularly frequent is legal language, as in the “edict” in Mil. 160–165; parodies of tragedy, as in Pseud. 702–706; and “running slaves’ speeches” as in Curc. 280–298, which originate in the typical messengers’ speeches of tragedy.’ See also de Melo 2011b: 333–334.

\textsuperscript{49} A notably difficult term in the Latin tradition; see Dickey and Chahoud 2013.

\textsuperscript{50} In the same vein, Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2005: 19–20) delineate three categories of nonstandard language use: 1) colloquial or informal 2) ‘irregular’ constructions that are functional in the context and 3) ‘bad writing’, lapses, etc. To me, this classification is artificial, because the categories are on different levels of linguistic processes. The second
ably used in colloquial language to ‘emphasize the agent’, or to introduce the topic of the sentence, to employ the terminology and viewpoint of this study. There is probably a difference here among the different types of LD. Generic statements and possibly part of the *id quod ... id* or other neuter pronominals are not necessarily colloquial in any sense. But some of the dislocations are colloquial, in the sense that they were available for Plautus as patterns used in actual conversation in his day and thus useful sources of stylized expression in certain contexts of dramatic dialogue.

Sometimes, LD seems to have been used more consciously, as it were, to create an impression of a confused, comical and possibly even idiosyncratic idiom, as in the case of Pseudolus. However, the constructions used by Pseudolus, as well as several other dislocations in Plautus, betray a certain amount of length and complexity. This is not the prototypical colloquial sentence.

### 3.5 Information Structure and Pragmatic Organization of Head-Internal Relative Clauses (A1 and A2)

Here, I present a short description of the head-internal relative clause in both authors. As we can see from table 25, the head-internal relative clause occurs infrequently.

The head-internal relative clause with resumption (A1) typically expresses the topic of the sentence where it occurs. In this sense, it is similar in use to left-dislocation. The head-internal relative clause is not, however, used to introduce a discourse topic. The largest part of the examples are sentence topics and other side remarks; topic continuity beyond this is found, e.g., in Plaut. *Cist.* 675–677;

---

*a* The occurrences of type A1 have been listed in 3.2.2.2 above.
Plaut. *Most.* 416–418; Ter. *Heaut.* 654–655. It appears that, in both Plautus and Terence, half of the A1 occurrences have a generic reference (Plautus 11/22 and Terence 4/10; altogether, 15/32). This is clearly more than the share of generic statements in the corpus of LD (17/77).

It can be seen from table 25 that Terence more often leaves resumption out from a head-internal relative clause. Type A2 can also express a sentence topic and generic *sententiae*. It is noteworthy that Plautus has nine such generic statements with *qui homo* in group A2 and five examples in A1.

Another question, then, concerns the differences between types A1 and A2—that is to say, in the use of resumption with the head-internal relative clause. The answer to this question may not be easy to find, as can be seen from the following examples:

(70) *qui homini dei sunt propitii, lucrum ei profecto obiciunt*

*Plaut. Curc.* 535

(71) *qui homini di propitii sunt, aliquid obiciunt lucri*

*Plaut. Persa* 470

‘If the gods are well disposed toward someone, they throw some profit his way.’

In this pair of examples, trying to search for a syntactic, semantic or pragmatic determining factor for the use or omission of the pronoun would probably be pointless.

3.6 **Comparison of LD with Sentence-Initial Relative Clauses without Resumption in the Matrix Clause (B2 and C2)**

Constructions where a combination of an antecedent and a relative clause occur in sentence-initial position, followed by a resumptive pronoun in the matrix clause, have been described in this work as left-dislocation. The standard construction, as it were, is one where there is no such resumption. These have been labelled as types B2 and C2 in this study (see 2.2.2). Therefore, it is, in effect, the presence of the anaphoric element that differentiates

---

51 Also note Plaut. *Curc.* 557 *qui homini di sunt propitii, ei non iratos esse puto.*

52 Note, however, the difference in word order of *sunt propitii* vs. *propitii sunt*.
left-dislocation from the standard construction. Given that left-dislocation is assumed to be pragmatically motivated, the question one cannot help asking concerns the difference between LD and the standard construction without any anaphorics in the matrix clause. To say that LD has a certain pragmatic function implies that the corresponding standard construction has less, or a different type, of such a function.

Should it turn out that no difference can be observed between preposed relative clauses with resumption (B1 and C1, left-dislocation) and those without resumption (types B2 and C2), the conclusion must be that the practice of adding pronouns is accidental and that the existence of left-dislocation in the form described in this work can be challenged. If no difference can be discerned, one would also need to accept that the anaphoric pronouns are there merely as part of the relative clause formula, triggered by the presence of the sentence-initial relative clause and having little or nothing to do with pragmatic motivation.53

So far, this question has not been asked about left-dislocation in Latin. The following discussion must therefore be taken as a tentative first attempt to clarify the matter. However, it is only reasonable to expect that there will be some overlap between the examples and that a difference in the construction, context or function cannot be discerned in all instances.

I begin by taking a closer look at the alternation of left-dislocation (B1 and C1) and constructions without resumption (B2 and C2) in the prologue of Plautus's *Poenulus*. The first pair of sentences comes from the beginning of the prologue.

(72)  
\[
\text{sed illi seni qui mortuost, (ei) filius} \quad \text{‘But as for that old man who died, the only son} \\
\text{unicus qui fuerat ab diuitiis a patre} \quad \text{he has kidnapped from his wealth and from his father} \\
\text{puer septuennis surrupitur Carthagine,} \quad \text{from Carthage as a seven-year-old boy,} \\
\text{sexennio prius quidem quam moritur pater.} \quad \text{six years before his father dies;} \\
\text{quoniam periisse sibi uidet gnatum unicum,} \quad \text{when he sees that his only son was lost,}
\]

53 Cf. Pinkster (forthc. chapter 18): ‘[A] noun phrase that consists of a head noun and a restrictive relative clause can be determined by determiners like *hic* or *ille*. This combination may be referred to with a resumptive pronoun which indicates the function of the preceding noun phrase in the main clause, usually the anaphoric pronoun *is*.’
conicitur ipse in morbum ex aegritudine: he himself falls ill from grief.
facit illum heredem fratrem patruem suom, He makes that cousin of his his heir
ipse abit ad Accheruntem sine uiationo. himself goes to the Underworld
without any travel provisions.
ille qui surrupuit puerum, Calydonem uiehit, The one who kidnapped the boy
takes him to Calydon
uendit eum domino hic diui quidam seni and sells him to a certain rich old
master
here who wants to have children but
hates women.'

PLAUT. Poen. 64–74

Here, the initial sentence contains a left-dislocation. The dislocated constituent, illi seni, picks up alter est emortuos, from l. 61. It is therefore an Active element in the discourse. This old man is the topic of the LD construction and continues to be the topic for two sentences afterwards (quoniam ... uiationo). Plautus then talks about the person who kidnapped the boy and whose existence can be inferred from surrupitur on l. 66. Ille qui is the topic of the sentence here but is dropped afterwards, as the prologue moves on to tell the audience more about the old man who bought and adopted the kidnapped boy. Thus, whereas both preposed relative clauses pick up Active or Accessible entities, the one with LD enjoys longer topic-continuity.

Later on in the same prologue, another interesting pair of sentences appears:

(73)
ille qui adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio, ‘The man who adopted this chap as
his son was a
is illi Poeno huius patruo hospes fuit family friend of that Carthaginian,
the uncle of the young man.
[is hodie hoc ueniet repetietque hic filias
et hunc sui fratris filium, ut quidem didici ego. here and his nephew, as I’ve
learned. I’ll go and
ego ibo, ornabor; uos aequo animo noscite] get into my costume; you must get
to know the play with goodwill.]
hic qui hodie ueniet reperiet suas filias
et hunc sui fratris filium

PLAUT. Poen. 119–125

The man who comes today will find
his daughters
here and his nephew.'
In this case, *ille qui adoptauit* ... *is* does not exhibit topic continuity, since the following sentence (excluding the three lines removed in Lindsay) is about the Carthaginian (*illi Poeno*), not about the adoptive father. Therefore, topic continuity is not the reason behind the dislocation. Instead, the motivation for this construction can be found in the preceding context and information structure. It is clear that the adoptive father must be identifiable at this stage to the audience from the characterization *ille qui adoptauit*. However, we must look farther back in the prologue to find where this person has been mentioned last. This is, in fact, on l. 73, where he was first introduced. Accordingly, *ille qui* on l. 119 picks up the adoptive father from a rather long distance. Above, it was suggested that a long gap following the last mention is a triggering factor for the use of LD, which was seen to be an adequate tool for re-introduction back into the discourse. We may contrast this with *hic qui hodie ueniet* on l. 124, which picks up *illi Poeno* from l. 120 (the preceding line, if Lindsay’s deletion is accepted). In this case, the topic of the sentence ceases to be the topic after this sentence, so there is no motivation either for a dislocation in the subsequent context.

These observations lend additional support to the suggestion expressed earlier in this chapter, that LD can be motivated by either the preceding or the subsequent context. The motivation can be found in the preceding context if the dislocation picks up an element across some distance or even a previously unmentioned entity (Brand New anchored). Topic-continuity can be a motivating factor for LD in the subsequent context.

Further evidence for the potential of left-dislocation to introduce previously unmentioned entities can be found in the following example, the beginning of Phaniscus’s monologue (and the beginning of act four in modern editions). The monologue opens with generic observations on different types of slaves. The first group is introduced by *serui qui*, taken up by *i* on the following line. The second group is introduced by *illi qui*, without resumption, presumably because the topic of slaves has already been introduced and is therefore no longer new to the discourse.

(74)

Phaniscus

*serui qui* quom culpa carent tamen malum metuont,

*i* solent esse eris utibiles.

*nam illi qui* nil metuont, postquam sunt malum meriti,

“Those slaves who fear a thrashing even when they’re free from guilt are generally useful to their masters; those who don’t fear anything,”
even after deserving a thrashing, are seeking stupid counsel for themselves. They practice running and flee, but when they’re caught and brought back they get private funds in the shape of beatings, which they couldn’t get in the shape of tips.’

Plaut. Most. 858–863

It seems that the same strategy of introducing a pair of generic referents, the first one with resumption and the second one without, can be found in the following passage.

(75) Lysiteles [...] minus placet magis quod suadetur, quod dissuadetur placet quom inopia est, cupias, quando eius copia est, tum non uelis ille qui aspellit, is compellit; ille qui consuadet, uotat

Plaut. Trin. 670–672

‘You like less what you’re more advised to do, you like what you’re advised against; you’re keen when there’s no possibility; the man who drives you off forces you into it, the man who recommends it forbids it.’

The left-dislocation is part of a longer passage where pairs of contrastive generic statements are listed. On l. 672, the personal reference changes from a generic second person to ille. In the first reference to generic ille qui, it was picked up by is in the main clause, whereas, in the second part of the statement, ille qui is used without resumption. This can tentatively be linked to the familiarity of the construction on the basis of the previous sentence.54

In the next section, I carry out a comparison between left-dislocation as described above (B1 and C1) and preposed relative clauses where no resump-

54 Note, in this connection, without a generic reference but with an autonomous relative clause in the second part, similarly the part of the list in Plaut. Asin. 527 illos qui dant, eos derides; qui deludunt deperis.
tive element occurs in the subsequent matrix clause. Of the type *homo qui ... Ø* (type B2 in my classification), there is, e.g., *puer ille quem ego laui, ut magnust et multum ualet* (Plaut. *Amph.* 1103), and, of the type *ille qui ... Ø* (type C2 in my classification), e.g., *ille qui illas perdit saluos est* (Plaut. *Asin.* 637). The material has been assembled by collecting all preposed relative clauses introduced by *qui, quem, quo, quae, quam, qua, quod, quas, quos, quoi and quoius* in four of Plautus’s comedies (Amphitruo, Asinaria, Mostellaria and Pseudolus) using the Brepols *Library of Latin Texts* database. This search yielded the following results: 13 preposed relative clauses without resumption in *Amphitruo*, 9 in *Pseudolus*, 10 in *Asinaria* and 4 in *Mostellaria*.55 This forms a corpus of 36 examples of preposed relative clauses where the antecedent of the relative pronoun is not picked up by a resumptive element in the main clause.56

In this connection, a distinction should be made between case agreement and case disagreement in the dislocated element and its main clause reference. We may assume that the role of the resumptive element in the matrix clause is more substantial and that the resumptive element is less likely to be left out in instances where the dislocated constituent does not agree in case with the main clause resumption. We have seen that, excluding attractions, there are only two examples where resumption is left out where it would disagree in case with the dislocated element (noun or pronoun).

Accordingly, I have excluded from this comparison left-dislocations where the dislocated element and the resumptive element disagree in case. This means that only those dislocations where the dislocated constituent and the matrix clause resumption show agreement are taken into account. Instances of left-dislocation with case agreement make up slightly less than half of the examples from Plautus with relative clauses, altogether 29 examples (see above subsections 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.2 for these). Note, however, that the relative pronoun can have a different case from that of the antecedent. Constructions without a relative clause have been left out of this discussion, as the following comparison has been carried out to determine which factors are relevant to relative clause syntax.

The first observation that can be made is that, on average, the B2 and C2 types occur more frequently in Plautus than does left-dislocation. Bertelsmann

55 *Amph.* 30, 138, 179, 231, 534, 546, 553, 820, 869, 884, 1101, 1103, 1139; *Asin.* 64, 137, 199, 271, 331, 539, 637 (bis), 662, 715; *Most.* 211, 274, 409, 863; *Pseud.* 72, 281, 333, 356, 404, 427, 737, 910, 932.

56 As with left-dislocation, I have excluded addresses of the interlocutor and answers to questions that do not have a main clause.
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table 26  Pragmatic function of antecedents of relative pronouns in types B2 and C2

| B2/C2 sample (T) / T1 T2–T4 DT F Not T / F |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|---|
| 36              | 24        | 4         | 2 | 4 | 2 |   |

(1885: 45) gives the figure of approximately 200 instances of preposed relative clauses without resumption in Plautus (including both nominal and pronominal antecedents) and approximately 80 instances in Terence. For Plautus, this would mean approximately ten for each of the entire plays. This number does not stand in contradiction with the results of my check (36 from four plays).

The first thing to be looked at is the topical status and possible topic continuity of these examples (types B2 and C2). To enable a more refined comparison of topic-continuity, I have assigned a topic continuity value for each of the examples. There are three categories of topics: first, (T)–T1 denotes a sentence topic or a topic that continues one sentence after the dislocation construction; second, T2–T4 denotes a topic continued for two to four sentences after the dislocation; third, DT (discourse topic) denotes a topic that continues for more than four sentences. A fourth category (F) is formed by elements that are focused in their sentences and a fifth (Not T / F) by those that are neither topical nor focal.

The figures here are small, so no clear difference can be established (see tables 26 and 27). It should be noted, however, that the differences are consistent in that, in the left-dislocation group (B1/C1), topic continuity is higher overall. There are fewer (T) and T1 types and more T2–T4 and DT types in B1/C1 than in B2/C2. However, it is clear that no conclusions concerning the difference between these two can be made on the basis of this comparison.

Next, the information structure of the passages is outlined in tables 28 and 29. Here, although the figures are again small, a difference can be discerned in the information status of the referents. In the left-dislocation group, the share

---
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of Brand New anchored (BNA) elements as antecedents of relative pronouns is clearly higher than in the group without resumption. Generic statements occur in both groups.

None of these pieces of evidence (analysis of (72)–(75) above and the figures in tables 26–29) is decisive alone. However, by combining them, it is possible to provide further support for the suggestion that the use of left-dislocation can be triggered by either the preceding or subsequent context. BNA status in the information structure, a long gap since the previous reference, or topic continuity in following context all seem to be factors that increase the possibility for a resumptive pronoun to be added in the postponed matrix clause, when the two references agree in grammatical case.

Thus, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors can all influence the use of LD. However, it should be noted that the process of building a linguistic expression is one of overall composition and integration. It is not a matter of first choosing one part or construction then accommodating the subsequent ones to it but rather a process in which all parts are chosen at more or less the same time to produce an expression that suits the purpose and context. It is therefore possible to explain the use of left-dislocation but impossible to predict it.

### 3.7 Appendix on LD in Lucretius

In this final section of chapter 3, I analyse left-dislocation in Lucretius. There are altogether five examples. These have been described as examples of anakoluthon (Bailey 1947) and as reflections of colloquial syntax (Reinhardt 2010: 212). By comparing them with the material from comedy and setting them in
the syntactic and pragmatic framework developed earlier in this chapter, it
will be possible to describe the constructions in greater detail and offer plau-
sible explanations for their use. Examples from Lucretius are taken from Bach
(1888), Hiden (1896) and Bailey (1947). The style of De rerum natura varies con-
siderably from passage to passage, combining archaizing, poetic and colloquial
tendencies (for a general discussion, see Reinhardt 2010: 203–205; features and
examples can also be found throughout the article). Lucretius's style permits
features not accepted by the later classical poets (Reinhardt 2010: 203).

The first example is of a familiar type. There is a nominal element (offi-
cium) with an attached restrictive relative clause (quod corporis exstat) and a
resumption with the anaphoric element occuring in the main clause (id). Both
references are in the nominative. I cite here also the preceding lines to give the
necessary context for the construction.

(76) 

qua propter locus est intactus inane uacansque. 
quod si non esset, nulla ratione moueri 
res possent; namque officium quod 
corporis exstat, 
officere atque obstare, id in omni tempore adesset omnibus

LUCR. 1.334–338

‘Therefore, there is intangible space, void, emptiness. But if there were
none, things could not in any way move; for that which is the province
of body, to prevent and to obstruct, would at all times be present to all
things.’

This passage contains the first of Lucretius’s arguments, to the effect that, in
the universe, there is void and emptiness. The quality of the body (corpus) as
a solid mass that, without a void, would not allow any movement in the world
is the central idea in this part (ll. 329–345), mentioned both at the beginning
(329 nec ... corporea stipata tenentur omnia natura; 345 undique materies quon-
iam stipata fuisset). The left-dislocation construction continues the thought
of the previous sentence, quod si non esset, and is, in this sense, parallel to nulla
ratione moueri res possent. The topic of the sentence is officium corporis, which,
together with and placed in opposition to the concept of void, is also the topic
of the whole passage. This pair has been mentioned previously on ll. 329–330
(nec tamen undique corporea stipata tenentur omnia natura; namque est in rebus

57 Translations of Lucretius come from Rouse and Smith (1975).
inane). In between, on ll. 331–333, there is a short digression, and the topic of emptiness is resumed on l. 334 with *qua propter locus est intactus inane uacans-que* and the following argument: *quod si non esset*. Then, on l. 336, the idea of a corporeal body and its abilities is resumed with *officium quod corporis ex-stat*. The main clause *id in omni tempore adesset omnibus* is a predication about *officium corporis*. It continues as the topic (together with its counterpart, emptiness) until l. 345. The discussion about the nature of things that look solid (and, thus, that are close to *corpora*) continues even after this.

The next group of constructions has been analysed as nominative in anacoluthon (Bailey 1947: I 89). However, by describing them in terms of left-dislocation, a better analysis can be achieved. It appears that it is not really anacoluthon that is notable in Lucretius’s style but left-dislocation.

Bailey (1947: I 89, nominative in anacoluthon in the Prolegomena) notes the following: ‘It may be that in each of these long sentences Lucretius started his sentence in the nominative and either intended to continue so (cf. iii. 1013 qui neque sunt usquam), or liked the feeling of the nominatiuus pendens. Scansion here was probably not a deciding element, as the accusative could have been written just as well.’ What Bailey here speculates is Lucretius’s motivation—that he ‘liked the feeling of the nominatiuus pendens’—can be given a more accurate interpretation with the help of pragmatic analysis.

(77) *seruitium contra, paupertas, diuitiaeque,*

*libertas, bellum, concordia, cetera quorum aduentu manet incolumis natura abituque,*

*haec soliti sumus, ut par est, euenta uocare*

LUCR. 1.455–458

‘Slavery, on the other hand, poverty and riches, freedom, war, concord, all else which may come and go while the nature of things remains intact, these, as is right, we are accustomed to call accidents.’

Here, Lucretius continues defining the nature of things. Besides bodies and void, there is no third type of basic nature; the rest are either properties or accidents of these two. Lucretius first defines properties (451–452): *coniunctum est id quod nusquam sine permitiali discidio potis est selungi seque gregari.* Then, in (77), he turns to *horum euenta*, from l. 450. In this way, although the

---

58 See Bailey (1947: I 66 and II 654) on the suspension of thought in this passage, and defending the authenticity of l. 334.
concepts listed in the left-dislocation have not been mentioned earlier in this discussion, they are not completely unexpected either. The correct interpretation, that what is now following belongs to euenta, is made explicit by the adversative contra, which comes right after the first concept, seruitium. The actual statement to this effect comes on l. 458: haec soliti sumus, ut par est, euenta uocare. In this passage, the list making up the dislocation comes closer to being a focus constituent than a topic. It seems that the topic here is coniuncta (‘properties’) and euenta (‘accidents’), and what these are in practice is the focus. This is clearly the organization of the first part, where coniunctum est id quod is followed by the relevant examples, and, here, although the linear order is reversed, the pragmatic organization appears to be the same. Used this way, left-dislocation allows Lucretius to build a chiastic sequence in his definition of properties and accidents.

Reinhardt (2010: 212) observes that this construction (a list and a resumption) bears resemblance to patterns of spoken discourse in modern languages and can therefore be taken as a syntactic colloquialism. While it is true, as pointed out in the preceding chapters, that left-dislocation has a strong association cross-linguistically with colloquial and spoken language, it is not necessarily a sufficient explanation for its appearance in this passage in Lucretius or in other similar passages. I argue rather that left-dislocation is a practical device in certain types of communicative situations and that it depends on the author’s conception of literary style and written standard and on whether, and to what extent, such constructions are deemed acceptable in the particular context.

Example (77) has parallels in comedy (see (30) above). In my view, the difference between permissiveness and conscious selection (Reinhardt 2010: 207) of features is not the point here. I believe that, in a literary text (as opposed to a documentary one), all features are in place, because they have been consciously selected. Nothing is there simply because of a permissive accident. The notion of a permissive style relates to the line between what is accepted and what is not. In later poetry (and prose), this dividing line delineated a smaller and more tightly defined (and, in any case, different) selection of features than it did earlier. Lucretius’s permissiveness is a matter of the consciously selected group of features being larger than (or different from) that of the later era.

The following example is similar to (77) in that the dislocated constituent is a long list of entities.

(78) praeterea genus humanum mutaeque natantes
squamigerum pecudes et laeta armenta feraeque,
et uarieae uolucres, laetantia quae loca aquarum
concelebrant circum ripas fontisque lacusque
'Moreover, the race of men, and the dumb swimming tribes of scaly fish, fat cattle, and wild beasts, the different birds which throng the joyous regions of water around bank and spring and lake, and which crowd the pathless woods through and through as they flit about—of these go on to take any one in any kind, and you will find nevertheless that each differs from each in shape.'

Here, Lucretius describes the multitude and limitless variety of things. He gives an example to back up his view, presented on ll. 336–341, that no two entities in nature are similar in form. The dislocated list of elements is followed by a relative pronoun in the genitive, but we notice that the construction is not of the relative clause type seen in Plautus, as quorum here does not introduce an adnominal relative clause but is a constituent of the main clause (attribute of the object unum) and an instance of relative connection. In fact, the dislocation here is not followed by resumption at all in the traditional sense. Instead, it is followed by two paratactically adjoined main clauses. How to assign pragmatic functions here is not obvious. I prefer to interpret the list as the topic and unum quiduis as the focus. The differing nature of things is also topical here (cf. ll. 340–341 debent nimirum ... pari filo similique affecta figura), so inuenies tamen inter se differre figuris cannot be the focus.59

In (79), the organization is similar to (78) in that the dislocated constituents are followed by a sentence where no resumptive element appears to take up the dislocation in the manner we have seen in comedy. As above, the first part of the sentence can be interpreted as having a relative connection.

(79) principio caeli clarum purunque colorem,
quaque in se cohibet, palantia sidera passim,
lunamque et solis praclara luce nitorem;
omnia quae nunc si primum mortalibus essent,

59 The passage is usually thought to be corrupt, but Bailey (1947: 11861) defended this text against seeing here a lacuna. He argued that praeterea here 'connects the a priori argument of 338–341 with the a posteriori proof from experience. The MSS reading should therefore be retained and neither emendations nor a lacuna are required.' Something similar to (78) may originally have been at Lucr. 4.123.
ex improuiso si sint obiecta repente, quid magis his rebus poterat mirabili dici aut minus ante quod auderent fore credere gentes?

LUCR. 2.1030–1036

‘In the first place, consider the clear and pure colour of the sky, and all that it contains—the travelling constellations, the moon and the bright light of the dazzling sun; if all these were now revealed for the first time to mortals, if they were thrown before them suddenly without preparation, what more wonderful than these things could be named, or such as the nations would have less dared to believe beforehand?’

Thus, we see that, concerning its overall structure, this construction has several parallels in Lucretius. What remains exceptional in this example is the accusative case of the dislocation. It is difficult to see from where the accusative derives. There is no verb that could directly govern the accusative case. In the preceding context, the verb mirarier (l. 1029) can be taken to be the mentally even if not syntactically governing verb here. However, principio undoubtedly marks the beginning of a new sentence. Another option is to derive the case from the following context, where, albeit the grammatical subjects of sint obiecta, they are the psychological objects of throwing and seeing.

Bailey (1947: 11 962–963) again defends the transmitted text against corrections made by earlier editors. He does note, however, that the construction is not commonplace: ‘But there is no real difficulty in the anacoluthon though accusatives picked up by nom. are more remarkable than the reverse process in the parallel passages.’

Example (80) occurs in a list of examples of phenomena illustrating that what the eyes see cannot be trusted (although, as Lucretius reminds us, it is not a fault of the eyes but of the mind).

(80) extantisque procul medio de gurgite montis classibus inter quos liber patet exitus ingens, insula coniunctis tamens ex his una uidetur

LUCR. 4.397–399

60 On l. 1031, cohibet is a conjecture by Lachmann, accepted in Bailey 1947 (OQ have cohibent, in which case sidera would be the subject), but this does not affect the construction under discussion.
'And mountains that stand up afar off from the midst of the ocean, between which is a great channel wide enough for a fleet to pass freely through, these nevertheless seem to be joined into a single island.'

In the list where (80) originates, the first example is a ship that seems to stand still while moving (and the other way around). The second example consists of stars, the sun and the moon, which do not seem to be going anywhere, even though we know that they move across the sky. The ship is introduced with *qua uelimur nauæ* (l. 387) and the stars with *sidera cessare ... uidetur* (ll. 391–392), followed by *solque ... manere et luna uidetur* (l. 395).

The mountains are here taken to be in accusative, following Bailey (1947) and Martin (1969): *extantisque ... montis*. The accusative case is here an attraction of the antecedent, caused by *inter quos*. The mountains are taken up in the subsequent main clause by *ex his coniunctis*. Syntactically, then, this construction can be analysed as an attraction of the antecedent, the type seen in comedy (*extantis montes inter quos, ex his coniunctis uidetur insula una*), with the dislocated constituent in the accusative affected by the relative pronoun *inter quos*. The resumption in the main clause is made by *ex* + ablative. The closest syntactic parallel to this construction is Plaut. *Pseud.* 526–529 (*tibicinam illam quam ... ea [abl.]*)..

The list of which (80) is a part is opened by a restrictive relative clause with an internal head (*qua nauæ*), which is picked up as the subject of the predicate *fertur* (no overt resumption). In the second example, the topics *sidera*, *sol* and *luna* appear as subjects. The mountains in (80) are then introduced in the accusative with the participial apposition *extantisque*, followed by a relative clause with *quos* and finally picked up by *ex his*. The phrase has even been emended to do away with the hanging accusative.62 We see in this passage

61 Bailey (1947: 111 1231): *‘extantis ... montis*; Giussani, Merrill, and Ernout try to get rid of any grammatical difficulty by saying that the construction is *inter quos montis ... extantis ... liber patet exitus, ex his tamen coniunctis insula una uidetur*. But I agree with Munro that there is something of an anacoluthon, *extantis ... montis* being placed first to give it emphasis as the subject of discussion, though it should be taken as an accusative not a nominative. It is not so violent as the example which he quotes from Cic. *De Fin.* iii. 3. 11 *ceterae philosophorum disciplinae ... eas nihil adiuuare arbitror*, or as the examples in Lucr. ii. 342 ff., iv. 123 ff. It is certainly a mistake to “emend” to *exstant usque*, Lachmann, or *existuntque*, Purmann.'

62 Cf. Godwin comm. ad loc.: *‘extantisque* is grammatically difficult, and has either been emended (Lachmann’s *extant usque*) or explained away. Bailey is, however, right to see the sentence as something of an anacoluthon—the mountains float in glorious isolation in grammar as in life, only being drawn together into the structure of the sentence in 399 when we see them *coniunctis* to form an *insula*.'
nicely how left-dislocation can be used side by side with other constructions in the same function (topic-promotion): relative clauses without dislocation (as in qua … nauï) and simple explicit subjects (as in sidera … uidentur and solque … et luna uidetur).

The mountains are a topic of their predication and, in a way, can be described as contrastive topics in the list of phenomena where they appear.
Chapter 4

Left-Dislocation in the Epigraphic Material

4.1 Introduction

The material discussed in this chapter is defined according to the manner of preservation (writing incised on a durable material), which means that, unlike in chapters 3 and 5, the material is not homogeneous in text type and genre. The overwhelming majority of epigraphic material is, however, legal or official in nature. Accordingly, this chapter will mostly be about the formal Latin of administration and government (4.2–4.3). Epigraphic evidence from various types of private inscriptions will be discussed after these (4.5).

The formulation of Roman statutes and other legal texts is aimed at maximal explicitness and unambiguity, probably originally motivated by the wish to prevent intentional misinterpretations of the law. Common patterns include repetition of verbs in different tenses, repetition of nominal heads of relative pronouns in the matrix clause, accumulation of synonyms, as well as abundant use of resumptive anaphoric pronouns. This style is visible already in the earliest preserved statutes, the Lex repetundarum and the Lex agraria from the late second century BCE. Interestingly, this repetitive style exists alongside a partly opposite tendency toward simple and concise expression of leges XII tabularum (see Marouzeau 1959 and Crawford 1996: 16). These styles seem to have been used in different contexts ‘presumably by deliberate choice’ (Crawford 1996: 16).

A notable feature of the simple style is the omission and change of the subject inside the same sentence, often without any explicit notice (Pascucci 1968: 7–11; Crawford 1996: 16, with references). This has been taken as a feature resulting from a written version of what was originally transmitted orally (Pascucci 1968: 8). The simple style, though prone to constructions that would be irregular in classical Latin, did not produce constructions that lend themselves to analysis as left-dislocation.

---

2 Crawford (1996: 17) thinks that this style was a new feature in these two laws, as well as in the contemporary Sententia Minuciorum.
3 In the first paragraph of Law 25 (Lex Coloniae Genetiae), the simple style is used in a strange context (perhaps because copied from an earlier source).
An essential part of the repetitive style is the high number and unconstrained use of relative clauses to define referents (see Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 151). Especially relative clauses that precede their matrix clause are plentiful in legal Latin. Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 151) note that, although preposed relative clauses with or without resumption are an inherited feature in Indo-European languages (and, in principle, could have been used spontaneously), it is possible that the Roman officials had partly modelled their practice on Greek texts.

We saw that relative clauses were an integral part of left-dislocation in comedy, but only a small part of left-dislocation in comedy can be explained as a phenomenon of relative clause syntax. While relative clauses are indeed present in the majority of the examples, they usually cannot be explained as fronted heads of nominal restrictive relative clauses. In the official inscriptions, the situation is different. Left-dislocation exists almost exclusively as a relative clause phenomenon. In this material, the relative clause construction (type B1, left-dislocation) can always be interpreted as a word order variation of the head-internal construction (A1)—see sub-section 2.2.2.1 for different types of relative clauses. In other words, in left-dislocation constructions, the heads of relative clauses are, in all instances, potentially head-internal. In this material, the phenomenon of left-dislocation can be reduced to the question of when the head noun has been fronted out of the relative clause.

The majority of preposed relative clauses in the epigraphic data are of the head-internal type with resumption (A1, the original correlative pattern). Given its frequency and occurrence in practically all legal inscriptions, it is not unreasonable to take it as the standard construction, wherefrom the others present variations. In this chapter, I will look for patterns according to which the two types, head-internal (A1: qui homo ... is) and head-external (B1: homo qui ... is) alternate. A potential factor can, in principle, be either linguistic (syntactic, semantic or pragmatic) or non-linguistic, such as preferences in individual texts or tendencies evolving with time.

It will be investigated whether constructions identifiable as left-dislocation in inscriptions and legal Latin perform similar functions as they do in other parts of the material (introducing topics). However, as the head-internal type (A1) is used generally in legal texts and inscriptions to introduce topics, and left-dislocation presents a variation on this pattern, it may turn out to be difficult or impossible to separate the functions of left-dislocation from the general topic-
introducing function of preposed relative clauses and to discern the motivation behind fronting the head noun.\(^5\)

In addition to head-internal relative clauses (A1), variation in the presence of the resumptive pronoun in the main clause must be considered—specifically, occasional examples of sentence-initial relative clauses without resumption in the matrix clause (B2: *homo qui ... \(\emptyset\)*). It is essential to scrutinize also these different constructions in the context of legal Latin, as it is only in the larger frame of relative clause constructions that we can achieve a correct interpretation of the constructions identifiable as left-dislocation.

All examples of left-dislocation from official Latin have the head noun and the relative pronoun in the nominative case. As for the resumption, both case agreement and case disagreement are found. Those constructions that have the resumption in the matrix clause in the nominative (and, hence, three subsequent nominatives, in the head noun, relative pronoun and resumptive pronoun) have not received much attention. Such constructions do, however, satisfy my criteria for left-dislocation, even though, in terms of relative clause syntax, they can be analysed as structurally internal but fronted heads of relative clauses.

On the other hand, in another group of constructions, the matrix clause resumption disagrees in case with the initial nominative. Such constructions have usually been analysed as attractions (Bach 1888: 25–26; Tietze 1954: 154–156; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 567; more recently, Rodger 2000: 269; Penney 2011: 229).\(^6\) It was argued above (on a general level in 2.2.4 and concerning comedy in 3.2.1.3) that constructions where an initial element and the following relative pronoun are in the nominative but the main clause reference is not are best described as thematic nominatives, not attractions. We saw a small number of such constructions in chapter 3, where they were classified as thematic nominatives and analysed accordingly. The discussion in the present chapter will be pursued from this same position—namely, that what we have in these constructions is not an attraction but either a thematic nominative where the dislocated noun is modified by a relative clause (Havers 1926: 228–229) or, alternatively, a fronted head of a head-internal relative clause.

---

5 Other strategies to introduce topics besides sentence-initial relative clause include the initial *quod* clause, see Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 150) on the *Epistula ad Tiburtes*, a *senatus consultum* from 159 BC: *ILLRP* 512.3–4 *quod* *Teiburtes u(erba) f(ecistis) quibusque de rebus uos purgauistis ea senatus animum aduortit ita utei aequom fuit*. Here, *quod* begins what Clackson and Horrocks call the ‘the topic component’. In the ‘comment’ part, the resumptive demonstrative pronoun *ea* picks up both *quod* and *quibusque de rebus*.

6 *CIL I*\(^2\) grammatical index (Krummrey) lists *Vituries* in (7), *uiatores praecones* in (23) and *paries* in (9) and (10) under *nominatiuus absolutus*.  

---
Epigraphic texts differ in all respects from comedy and even literary prose. They are formal and often syntactically complex. It is therefore not evident what the constructions in these different types of texts have to do with one another or how they can meaningfully be described according to the same framework. Nevertheless, previous research has regularly cited epigraphic evidence alongside comedy and other literary texts. The implication is that left-dislocation in inscriptions is part of the same phenomenon as and similar to the literary ones. Therefore, a satisfying description of the phenomenon cannot be achieved without equally devoting attention to epigraphic Latin.

Thus far, there has been no discussion about how to explain the appearance of these constructions in these essentially different texts, or about how this distribution should be integrated into a syntactic and sociolinguistic analysis of the phenomenon. Even more importantly, however, there has been no detailed analysis of the syntax of these constructions and, hence, no way to form a definitive view on the exact relationship between the epigraphic and the literary constructions.

In chapter 3, I have argued that we should not too hastily identify left-dislocation in comedy as a marker of spontaneous dialogue. Assuming that the phenomenon of left-dislocation is the same in comedy and legal texts, the question of register becomes more complicated in this material, there being a somewhat enigmatic connection between archaism, legal language and popular usage. How should left-dislocation be viewed in these relations? Löfstedt (1911: 17–18) argued against taking popular language as being dependent on or influenced by legal language. Instead, archaisms should be seen as an essential part of conservative legal language, and popular language as often influenced by archaic language. He further drew attention to the similar psychological factors that influence both legal and popular language (simplicity, clarity and pleonastic expression). In a similar vein, Pascucci (1968: 12) argued that, instead of taking popular language as dependent on and subjected to legal language, we should understand that the same archaistic tendency which, in legal language, contributes to tradition and elevated prestige, in popular language, makes efficient use of that material which literary language has pushed to the margins of linguistic practice. De Meo (1986: 87) agrees with Pascucci’s view, adding that an influence from legal to popular language would be psychologically implausible.

While these remarks naturally concern legal language on a general level, they are pertinent to left-dislocation as well. However, we should be careful here in determining exactly the phenomena we are talking about. It may be that, at times, the similarity between popular and legal use is more apparent than actual. This concerns especially vague categories such as ‘pleonastic expres-
sion’, and such considerations are highly relevant in the case of left-dislocation. For example, resumptive pronouns are often called a ‘repetitive’, ‘abundant’ or ‘pleonastic’ feature. This formulation implies that that they could equally well be left out. However, it seems that such a use of pronouns is a standard feature of these texts and a nearly compulsory feature of relative clause syntax. Lists of synonyms, on the other hand, may not always be repetition for repetition’s sake but an essential factor in defining the referents in question (*ager locus aedificium*, with different referents). Therefore, labels such as repetition or abundance are often misleading.

In chapter 3, it was also shown that left-dislocation is typically used to express the element that is going to be the topic in the sentence and that often continues as such in the following discourse. It was suggested that the construction was used by Plautus as a device that was practical in his artistic language, having its roots in spoken conversation but not used primarily to give the impression of spoken dialogue. Therefore, even in Plautus, we should refrain from too quickly associating left-dislocation with spoken conversation. Needless to say, texts preserved in inscriptions are, in many ways, different from literary texts, in terms of their communicative function no less than in their manner of production. Consequently, even if we are to identify left-dislocation in inscriptions, the connection between these constructions and those of popular conversation is considerably more problematic in this context—even more so, as the majority of the evidence derives from statutes and other legal or otherwise formal texts.

The problem is that, in previous research, the epigraphic evidence has been studied in isolation, without any attention paid to the syntactic context of the constructions or the larger framework of variation in relative clause syntax in such texts. This is especially problematic, when constructions from the statutes are quoted alongside examples from Plautus, with the implication that they illustrate the same phenomenon. Such a practice gives the impression of an intersection point between archaic, legal and popular language use where these constructions are located. As a result, these registers appear to be interwoven, though the text types (comedy and legal Latin) do not, at first glance, have anything in common except for their relatively early date.

Is it appropriate, then, to use the term left-dislocation to describe this phenomenon in the epigraphic evidence? Can it be described in the same framework as the material from comedy and literary prose? Answers to these questions will emerge after looking at the whole corpus of epigraphic examples.

The material in this chapter will be discussed in three parts: a group of early legal/formal inscriptions (4.2), Roman statutes (4.3) and a diverse group of private inscriptions (4.5). Generous attention will be paid to the context of
all examples. The majority of the epigraphic material is either legal, formal or administrative in nature, so that the discussion on inscriptions necessarily revolves around the language of law and administration. In the final part of this chapter I have collected and discussed a small group of instances of left-dislocation that are found in private inscriptions of different types.

Despite the general frequency of relative clause constructions in this chapter, the very first text (Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus) to be discussed does not exhibit this feature. After that, two inscriptions of legal content are discussed, Sententia Minuciorum and Lex de pariete faciendo.

4.2 Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus, Sententia Minuciorum, Lex de pariete faciendo

4.2.1 ILLRP 511 (CIL I² 581) Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus

This document has a strong tendency to begin sentences with fronted initial nouns or pronouns that introduce the topic of their sentences. However, most of them do not have the form of a left-dislocation. The preserved senatus consulta appear to differ from the laws in their use of relative clauses. The laws are packed with sentence-initial relative clauses, whereas very few relative clauses occur in senatus consulta. In addition to Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus, this pattern can be seen in Epistula ad Tiburtres (ILLRP 512 = CIL I² 586). It is difficult to say whether this is due to the difference in the type of information given in each text type or a reflection of a genuine stylistic difference. Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 151) see here a parallelism between senatus consulta and the laws, but it seems that a different style is used in the two text types.

I list here the fronted topical elements in Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus:

7 Bacas uir nequis adiese velet ‘that no man should (wish to) attend the meeting of Bacchic women’
10 sacerdos nequis uir eset; magister neque vir neque mulier quisquam eset ‘that no man should be a priest; that no man or woman should be a magister’
15 sacra in [o]quoltod ne quisquam fecise velet ‘in the matter of ceremonies, that no one should (wish to) perform these in secret’

---

7 The phrase quibus de rebus in the Epistula ad Tiburtres (ILLRP 512.5–7) is a rare example and of a clearly different type from those seen in the laws.
8 Translations of this text come from Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 145–146).
In nearly all of these examples, the constructions follow standard syntax, in that the initial constituent is syntactically part of the following clause. All are topics of their sentences. The objects Bacas (l. 7) and sacra (l. 15) both set the topic by simply being placed at the beginning of the line (cf. Courtney 1999: 96: ‘The object comes before the subject in order to provide a rubric.’). Similarly, sacerdos (a subject complement) begins l. 10 and is the topic of its sentence.

The opening of the decree employs a de + abl. construction to establish the topic of the whole document: ll. 1–2 de Bacanalibus, que foideratei esent, ita exdeicendum censuere 'Concerning Bacchic festivals, with regard to those who were bound to Rome by treaty (i.e., the Italian socii), they (i.e., the senators) passed a resolution that the following proclamation should be issued.'

The only construction in which the initial constituent is not directly a member of the following sentence is l. 19 homines ... oinuorsei. This construction can be classified as left-dislocation.

(1) homines plous v oinuorsei uirei atque mulieres sacra ne quisquam fecise uellet, neue inter ibei uirei plous duobus mulieribus plous arfuise uelent

ILLRP 511.19–22

9 Cf. the reverse order without fronting of the object at ll. 25 (utei hoce), 27 (uteique eam), and 28 (utei ea Bacanalia).

10 Clackson and Horrocks’s translation of l. 15 makes this function explicit: ‘In the matter of ceremonies, that no one should (wish to) perform these in secret’.

11 Other topical beginnings in this text are those beginning with si qui sunt (3–4 sei ques esent, quei sibei deicerent necesus ese Bacanal habere, eis utei ad pr(aetorem) urbanum Romam venirent) and in the epistula at the end (24 sei ques esent quei auorsum ead fecisent quam suprad scriptum est, eis rem caputalem faciendam censuere).

'With regard to groups of people more than five in all, men and women, that no one should (wish to) hold ceremonies, and that men no more than two, (and) no more than three women, should (wish to) attend in that company.'

Translation Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 145

In this construction, homines plous v oinuorsei uirei atque mulieres precedes the main clause, sacra ne quisquam fecise uelent. The initial constituent, a nominative plural, is not a (syntactic) constituent of the main clause. Instead, the indefinite/generalizing pronoun quisquam is the main clause subject. The initial constituent consists of two parts, uirei atque mulieres being in apposition to homines plous v oinuorsei. This construction is of a type not found in comedy (see, however, some of Varro’s relative clause constructions cited in chapter 5, where an initial relative clause is not necessarily part of what follows it), classified by Rosén (1992: 251) as a nominatiuus pendens. Courtney (1999: 98), on the other hand, analyses this construction as follows: ‘Because of the drop-by-drop method of expression, this starts off as if intended to be homines plous v ... ne uelent, but then reverts to the standardized form ne quisquam uelent.’ That is, Courtney thinks that, because of the drop-by-drop style, where information is processed by small blocks and not integrated into one long period, the writer was unable to finish the sentence according to the construction with which he had begun, as he was not thinking about the end, when he set off writing the beginning. According to this interpretation, homines plous v oinuorsei was originally meant to be the subject of the sentence but was given up in favour of quisquam.

While the mechanism suggested by Courtney is valid in many examples of syntactic incoherence, it may not be the best explanation for (1). This is because homines oinuorsei plous v is not and cannot have been intended to be the subject of uele(n)t. This is made explicit in the translation provided by Clackson and Horrocks: ‘With regard to groups of people more than five in all, men and women.’ The meaning is that no one should hold a bacanal and that this restriction applies to groups of five or more people. The function of homines plous v oinuorsei is to define the context in which the following predication should be interpreted (cf. Pinkster 1990: 37). The thought that was being expressed here is complex, and I argue that the syntactic form is a reflection of this complexity. The early prose style used left-dislocation to convey a relationship that might have been expressed in a different way later on, and the expression is very concise. I argue that the underlying principle to the organization of information in (1) is the same as it is in other sentences that begin with topical constituents. In this case, however, the sentence contained more components and a more
complex thought structure, and this resulted in a construction that can best be analysed as left-dislocation. It is a thematic nominative and an unlinked topic (in the sense defined in section 2.1), given that it introduces the frame of reference where the following predication is to be interpreted but without a co-referent element in the matrix clause.

4.2.2  *ILLRP 517 (CIL I² 584 = Vii 7749)*  Sententia Minuciorum

This document is inscribed on a bronze tablet, recording the decision given by the brothers Q. and M. Minucius Rufus on a dispute between the Viturii Langenses and the Genuenses concerning the use of public land. It was composed in Rome in 117 BCE, and copies of the text incised on bronze were sent to the parties involved. One such copy was found in 1506 in the region Serra Riccò, near Genova. The text has a clearly marked thematic structure, achieved by means of sentence-initial relative clauses that introduce topics for sentences as well as larger units of text. There are autonomous relative clauses, head-internal relative clauses (type A₁), as well as instances of left-dislocation.

After the initial part, where the circumstances of the decision are briefly described (ll. 1–5), the contents of the decision commence:

(2) *qua ager priuatus casteli Vituriorum est, quem agrum eos uendere heredemque sequi licet, is ager uectigal(is) nei siet*

\[ ILLRP \text{ 517.5} \]

‘Wherever there is private land belonging to the fortress of the Veturii, land which they may sell and which can pass to an heir, the said land shall not be put under charges.’¹³

After this, there follows a section where the limits of the private land of the Viturii Langenses, which is subject to the decision given above (*is ager uectigal nei siet*), are delineated. On l. 13, the text turns to defining the limits of the public land of the Langenses. The decision concerning this public land is then given:

(3) *quem agrum poplicum iudicamus esse, eum agrum castelanos Langenses Veiturios po[si]dere fruique uidetur oportere*

\[ ILLRP \text{ 517.23–24} \]

¹³ Translations of *ILLRP 517* and 518 are from Warmington.
‘Whatever land we judge to be public state-land, that land we think the fort-holders, namely the Langensian Viturii, ought to hold and enjoy.’

The rest of this paragraph records the sum of money that the Viturii Langenses are to pay to the Genuenses, and the consequences should the money not be paid. Then come directions concerning those pieces of land that any Genuas or Viturius should happen to own within the public land:

(4) **quei intra eos fines agrum posedet Genuas aut Viturius, quei eorum posedeit K(alendis) Sextil(ibus) L. Caicilio, Q. Muucio cos, eos ita posidere colereque liceat**

ILLRP 517.28–29

‘Any Genuan or Veturian who has come into possession of land within the said boundaries, if he held possession on the first day of August in the consulship of Lucius Caecilius and Quintus Mucius, may thus remain in possession and till the land.’

Further directions on this topic continue until l. 32. Then, there follows a decision about the *ager compascuos* (graining land):

(5) **quei ager compascuous erit, in eo agro quo minus pecus [p]ascere Genuates Veituriosque liceat ita utei in cetero agro Genuati compascuo niquis prohibeto, niue quis uim facito neique prohibeto quo minus ex eo agro ligna materiamque sumant utanturque**

ILLRP 517.32–35

‘No man shall hinder the Genuans and the Veturii from pasturing cattle, on such of the said land as is associate pasture-land, in the way in which it is allowed on the remaining associate pasture-land of Genua, and no man shall use force or hinder them from taking from the said land firewood and building-timber and using the same.’

This is followed by the date when the *uectigal* must be paid for the first year (*uectigal anni primi ... dare debento*).
ative clause. We may assume that the referent of *ulectigal anni primi* in this case is clear without further definitions and that, hence, it can introduce the topic simply by its initial position. In the preceding three ‘paragraphs’, the initial and topical nouns (*ager* [twice] and *Genuas aut Viturius*) are defined further with a restrictive relative clause to give the correct referent.

Afterwards, the strategy for introducing new topics somewhat changes. First, we learn about meadows and their use:

(6) **prata quae** fuerunt proxuma faenisicei L. Caecilio Q. Muucio cos. in agro poplico, quem Vituries Langenses posident et quem Odiates et quem Dectunines et quem Cavaturineis et quem Mentouines posident, ea *prata* inuitis Langensibus et Odiatibus et Dectuninebus et Cauaturines et Menouines, quem quisque eorum agrum posidebit, inuiteis eis niquis sicet niue pascat niue fruatatur  
*ILLRP 517.37*

‘The meadows which were ready for the mower, during the consulship of Lucius Caecilius and Quintus Mucius, within the limits of the public state-land in the possession of the Langensian Veturii, and the public state-land in the possession of the Odiates and the Dectunines, and the public state-land in the possession of the Cavaturini and the Mentovini, in the case of the land which any of the said peoples shall severally possess.’

Here, the new topic, *prata*, is introduced with a relative clause after the head noun—i.e., left-dislocation. Resumption follows, as in the examples cited above, and the same construction is then found again at the beginning of the next topic:

(7) **Vituries, quei** controuorsias Genuensium ob inioarias iudicati aut dama- nati sunt, *sei quis* in uinculeis ob eas res est, *eos omneis* soluei mittei leiber(are)ique Genuenses\(^{14}\) uidetur oportere ante eidus Sextilis primas  
*ILLRP 517.43*

‘If any one of the Veturii who have been judged or found guilty in respect of quarrels with the Genuans on account of contumelious wrongs is in prison because of such matters, we think that all of them should be released, discharged and set free before the thirteenth day of August next.’

\(^{14}\) *Genuenses* = *a Genuensibus*; cf. *CIL 1^3^* index (Krummrey).
Given the similar context of these constructions, it is tempting seek out a reason for the difference in their word order. Examples (2)–(5) have the head noun incorporated into the relative clause, whereas (6) and (7) do not, resulting in a left-dislocation construction. All five instances establish a new topic in the text.

I look first at the format of the text on the tablet, as the thematic structure of the text is notably reflected in part in the physical organization of the inscription. Examples (3) and (7) are preceded by larger spaces between words (judging by the reproduction of the text in *CIL V* 7749). These have usually been interpreted as paragraph marks. On the other hand, (4) and (5) do not have such spaces before them but only standard interpuncts, which in this text regularly separate words from one another. In example (6), on the other hand, the line begins with a small indentation to the left, so that the initial *p* is, in fact, written in the left margin, and there is an empty space at the end of the preceding line, as if to indicate a new paragraph beginning on the subsequent line. We see that both instances of left-dislocation are preceded by marks (spaces or indentation), but so is one example of a head-internal relative clause. If the two matched each other, one could suggest that left-dislocation (preposing the head noun) marks a new paragraph besides marking the sentence-topic and that, together with the extra space, it helps to structure the text.

On the other hand, there does appear to be a difference in information structure. Both *prata* in (6) and *Vituries* in (7) are used to promote a new topic in their context, an entity which, although Accessible, was not the topic of the preceding textual unit. In contrast, *quem agrum* does not shift the topic but rather resumes from l. 13, where the topic of the public land was introduced (*agri poplici quod Langenses posident, hisce finis uidentur esse*). The construction *quem agrum* resumes the topic of the public land after the intervening long geographical description, where the borders of the public land have been defined.

Another way to try to account for the variation is to look at the syntactic context. The construction in (4) is shorter and simpler in organization. In (6), *prata quae ... fuerunt in agro poplico* is followed by another relative clause.

---

15 Fronda (2013: 266); Otha Wingo (1972: 72).
16 In addition to that before (3), (6) and (7), a mark indicating a new paragraph in the middle of a line is found on l. 6 where the geographical description of the borders begins (*Langgalium fines agri priuati*). There are even more instances of such spaces in the text, but they appear in contexts where they clearly do not mark new paragraphs, on ll. 14, 18, 35-37 (where the additional space at the end of the line is presumably to allow space for the letters that belong to the preceding line) and on l. 19, between *Veraglascam* and *in montem*, where there is no apparent motivation for the extra space.
defining *agro poplico*, and *prata* is taken up only after this. Thus, *prata* needs an extended definition before the actual predication about them. The same observation on syntax can be made concerning *Vituries qui* in (7). Here, the initial relative clause is followed by a conditional clause that further defines the *Vituries* signified here. While (4) also has another relative clause that further defines *qui* ... *Genuas aut Viturius*, the construction there is on the whole shorter and appears to have been added only to express the consular date.

I conclude that, although nothing can be established for certain on the basis of such few examples, they are nevertheless compatible with the interpretation that fronting the head noun (analysable as left-dislocation) was preferred in contexts where there was a topic shift within the inscription, especially if the following sentence contained another subordinate clause and was thus longer and more complex.

In addition, in this text, there is one example of a sentence-initial relative clause that has a pronominal antecedent (c2) and no resumption in the subsequent main clause:

(8) e[i]s, quei posidebunt, uectigal Langensibus pro portione dent ita uti ceteri Langenses, qui eorum in eo agro agrum posidebunt fruenturque

*ILLRP 517.29–33*

‘Those who shall possess a holding must pay to the Langenses a charge in the same proportion as the remaining Langenses such of them as shall possess and enjoy any area within the said land.’

This construction does not open a new topic but belongs to the topic and ‘paragraph’ introduced by (4), *quei intra eos fineis agrum posedet Genuas aut Viturius.*

4.2.3  *ILLRP 518 (CIL I^2^ 698 = X 1781)* Lex parieti faciendo Puteolana

This inscription records the contract made by the colony of Puteoli with a private entrepreneur for building works in front of the temple of Serapis. The text was drafted by the *duumuiri* and was later inscribed on marble in three columns, probably in the early imperial period, on the basis of the letter forms.

---

17 Case syntax is not decisive in Latin, so head-internal relative clauses may well be in a different case from the main clause reference, in inscriptions as well as in comedy.

18 In addition, there is one autonomous relative clause with a resumption in the main clause and some confusion in its syntax on ll. 31–32 *quei eorum de maiore parte Langensium Veituri(or)um sententia ita non parebit, is eum agrum nei habeto niue fruimino.*
It is usually assumed to reproduce the original text more or less faithfully, mainly because of the archaic language (Wiegand 1894: 671). The title of the text (given on ll. 1 5–6 lex parieti faciendo in area quae est ante aedem Serapi trans uiam)\(^{19}\) gives the impression that it is about building a wall (paries) and is the label usually attached to the text. However, the contract is actually about building a doorway to a wall that already exists and making certain modifications to other already existing walls (see Wiegand 1894: 693–694).

Again, as in the case of Sententia Minuciorum discussed above, the text contains different types of relative clauses that are used to introduce and define referents. The first two examples have preposed nominal heads, appearing before the relative pronoun.

Example (9) is the first sentence of the actual lex.\(^{20}\) The text here begins with a small indentation to the left.\(^{21}\) The sentence opens with in area trans uiam (mentioned already in the title), which gives the location for the paries. Afterwards comes the preposed head noun paries, followed by a relative clause (qui est propter uiam):

\[(9) \text{ in area trans uiam, paries qui est propter uiam, in eo pariete medio ostiei lumen aperito latum p(edes) VI, altum p(edes) VII facito} \]

\[ILLRP\, 518.1.9–10\]

‘In the middle of the party-wall which is near the road and which is in the vacant space across the road, he shall open a gap for a doorway. He shall make it 6 ft. wide, 7 ft. high.’

In (9), the wall (paries qui est propter uiam) is the topic, and the instructions for making the doorway constitute the focus (ostiei lumen aperito latum p(edes) VI, altum p(edes) VII).\(^{22}\) The resumption in the main clause repeats the noun paries (in eo pariete).

The instructions concerning the building of the doorway extend to l. 1 11 where another wall is mentioned:

\[(10) \text{ eisdem maceria extrema paries qui est, eum parietem cum margine altum facito p(edes) X} \]

\[ILLRP\, 518.11.11–12\]

---

19 Serapi should probably be interpreted as genitive, Wiegand (1894: 696).
20 On ll. 1 1–4 is the dating ab colonia deducta, consular and duumuiral.
21 A similar indentation is found on ll. 1 5 and 111 7.
22 On this wall, see Wiegand (1894: 702–703).
‘In regard to the wall which forms the outermost enclosure, he shall further reconstruct the said wall 10 ft. high including scoping.’

This *paries* is a different one from the one mentioned above, where the doorway was to be constructed. This wall constitutes the outer limits of the area and is farther removed from the road. Both *paries* and *maceria extrema* are in the nominative.\(^{23}\) Thus, *maceria extrema paries qui est* equals *paries qui est maceria extrema*, translating as ‘the wall that is the outermost wall’ (translation by Wiegand ‘die Mauer, welche die äusserste Einfriedigung ist’; translation by Warmington ‘In regard to the wall that forms the outermost enclosure’). *Eisdem* refers to the contractor (*eidem, idem*), who is the subject of *facito*\(^{24}\). For a reconstruction of the area before and after the description of the building work, see Wiegand (1894) and *CIL* I\(^2\) 698, with the reproduced drawing.

Both constructions seem, at any rate, to be well motivated; since there are three different walls in the area mentioned in the inscription, with different designs for each, it is vital that the walls be securely identified in each case. Preposing the head noun in both constructions signifies this explicating function. Both nouns are topics of their sentences but do not extend beyond that. In (10), it appears that the subject complement *maceria extrema* is preposed alongside the subject *paries* to mark this *paries* as a contrastive topic. This construction makes the reader aware that the following instruction concerns a wall different from that mentioned at the beginning. This second wall is the topic only of this predication.

In the next sentence, the text moves on to describe what is to be done with the door and windows.

(11) *eisdem ostium, introitu in area quod nunc est et fenestras quae in pariete propter eam aream sunt, pariete[m] opstruito*

\(^{23}\) See Wiegand (1894: 703–704).
\(^{24}\) Wiegand (1894: 672) *eisdem, eidem, idem = idem.*
given above; see Wiegand 1894: 705; \textit{CIL} I\textsuperscript{2} 698).\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{ostium} earlier furnished the entrance to the area, but it, together with the windows, are now to be closed up, as the new doorway is to be built into the wall facing the street.

The relative clauses in (11) are of the classical type, with fronted heads but without resumption in the main clause (type B\textsubscript{2}). Here, \textit{ostium} can be either the nominative or the accusative, but, in the sentence that immediately follows, (12), the initial noun is in the dative, the case required by main clause syntax. Again, there is no resumption:

\begin{quote}
\text{(12)} et pari\textit{et}, qui nunc est propter uiam, marginem perpetu\textit{om} inponito
\textit{ILLRP} 518.II.15–19
\end{quote}

‘And on the wall which is at present along the road he shall put an uninterrupted coping.’

Why do these constructions not resume the head noun in the main clause, even though both serve as topics in their sentences? Neither \textit{ostium} nor \textit{fenestras} has been mentioned in this text before, and it is impossible to discern the reason why the construction here was formulated this way rather than adopting the construction used in (9) and (10). As for (12), the relative clause does not introduce a new referent in the text, as it refers to the same wall mentioned at the beginning of the text, in (9). It is possible that it is because of this that the construction was formulated this way, rather than *\textit{paries qui est ... ei pari\textit{et}}. At any rate, nothing can be said for certain. It is noteworthy, however, that, in (12), \textit{pari\textit{et}} is in the dative and is demonstrably a member of the main clause, while the intervening relative clause is in the nominative.

In addition, there is one autonomous relative clause without a resumption (type A\textsubscript{2}):

\begin{quote}
\text{(13)} quod opus structile fiet, in te\textsuperscript{[r]}ra calcis restinct\textit{ai} partem quart\textit{am} indito
\textit{ILLRP} 518.II.19–20
\end{quote}

‘Material requiring preparation that he will use in this structure he shall make of clay mixed with one fourth part of slaked slime.’

Toward the end of the text, the final instruction for the undertaker is given.

\textsuperscript{25} The form \textit{introitu} is dative.
(14) eidem sacella, aras signaque quae in campo sunt quae demonstrata erunt, ea omnia tollito deferto composito statuitoque ubei locus demonstratus erit, duuuirum arbitratu

ILLRP 518.III.2–6

‘Likewise the chapels, altars, and statues which are on the building-ground and which shall be pointed out to him he shall remove transfer arrange and set up in a place which shall be pointed out to him, at the will and pleasure of the magisterial Board of Two.’

Here again, the preposed nouns sacella, aras and signa are taken up by the resumptive ea omnia in the main clause. This is an instance of anticipation of the main clause case (see above 3.2.1.2; table 13), as shown by the inflection of aras in the accusative case. The preposed nouns are thus in the accusative in anticipation of their role as objects of the main clause. The intervening relative clause, on the other hand, requires that quae be nominative—the relative clause predicate is esse in all examples from this inscription except fiet in (13).

In chapters 2 and 3, I have argued that constructions like paries qui est propter uiam, in eo pariete in (9) and eisdem maceria extrema paries qui est, eum parietem in (10) are best described as thematic nominatives. It is worth briefly speculating as to what would have been the alternative constructions available to the composer of this text. In (9) and (10), we are not dealing with attraction, as I have argued throughout, in the sense that there would have been a choice between two constructions, where one would have inflected the initial constituent in the correct case and the other in the attracted case (nominative, according to the relative pronoun). Instead, there is an identification of the referent with a copula construction in the relative clause (this more or less self-evidently happens in the nominative) then a predication about the entity that has just been identified. What changes in (14) is that, instead of being inflected in the nominative (along with the identifying relative clause), the dislocated constituents take the case they are going to have in the main clause. Why, then, one might ask, does this not also happen in (9) and (10)? We have seen in (12), parieti qui, and in (11), fenestras quae, that it is possible in this text for the initial noun to take the main clause case against the case of the relative pronoun and that this can happen even without resumption. In (9), it is likely that this was influenced by the form of the main clause reference, given that it is in the form of a prepositional phrase. It would have been awkward to begin the sentence with in + ablative, especially as the sentence opens with in area trans uiam. In (10), the motivation for keeping the
dislocated constituent in the nominative was the need to prepose *maceria extrema* to express a contrastive topic. Anticipation of the main clause case would not have been compatible with this expression. My intention here is not to claim that it would be possible or meaningful in each instance to find the exact reasons behind the constructions but rather to make explicit how the final syntactic form results from certain factors (both syntactic and pragmatic), between which the writer had to find a compromise. Achieving such a balance was more difficult at a time when the written style was still in its formative stage. It is this conflict, I argue, that produces the typical clumsiness found in many early prose texts (including the drop-by-drop style, for which see above 4.2.1).

One more point needs to be made concerning *ILLRP* 517 and 518. In the former, the only example of a sentence-initial relative clause without resumption is (8), where the antecedent is a pronoun (*eis*). On the other hand, *Lex Puteolana* (*ILLRP* 518) contains only one example of a head-internal relative clause, in (13). There, the variation is between left-dislocation (B1) and the sentence-initial relative clause without resumption in the main clause. The initial noun even appears in the case required by the main clause, when preceding a relative pronoun in the nominative (*fenestras quae, parieti qui*, without resumption; *sacella, aras signaque*, with the resumption). Hence, although *ILLRP* 518 does contain syntax that may be archaic, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of it was changed during transmission or re-copying.

To conclude, in section 4.2, I have shown how referents can be defined and introduced in legal inscriptions with the help of relative clause constructions. Both the head-internal relative clause (A1) and the left-dislocation (B1) are used to convey this function, but it has been possible, at least in some instances, to identify reasons favouring the choice of the B1 type of construction—i.e., the fronting of the head noun outside the relative clause. In the next section, I investigate whether similar tendencies can be observed in the statutes.

### 4.3 The Roman Statutes

Above, I showed that the types of relative constructions, including left-dislocation, alternate in *Sententia Minuciorum* and the *Lex Puteolana*. In this section, the same alternation will be seen in the corpus of Roman Statutes, by which I mean the corpus of *leges* from Rome and the Roman colonies. Most of these *leges* are inscribed on bronze or stone, the texts of which have been collected and edited in Crawford (1996), the edition that the linguistic analysis here is based on.
The statutes contain occasional examples of constructions that have been cited in earlier research as examples of syntactic irregularities (attractio inversa or nominativus pendens). The above discussion suggested that these constructions, however they are analysed, should be compared to the variety of available relative clause constructions and discussed generally in the context of relative clause syntax.

4.3.1 Lex repetundarum (Law 1) and Lex agraria (Law 2)
The earliest existing Roman statutes are *Lex repetundarum* and *Lex agraria*, preserved on both sides of a bronze slate (*tabula Bembina*), dating from the late 2nd century BCE. *Lex repetundarum* gives the right to prosecute to persons who have been subject to extortion by Roman magistrates, while *Lex agraria* concerns the status of the *ager publicus* and those parts of it converted to private land.

It is difficult to present an overview of all the different types of constructions found in these two statutes. They are, at places, very fragmentary, meaning that either the beginning or end of a relative clause construction can be missing. Hence, the attribution to one or another type is not always certain (even if some are more likely than others). Furthermore, in these two texts, the constructions, as they are reconstructed, are notably long and complicated and often not analysable in terms of a simple correlative type of construction—e.g., a preposed relative clause followed by a main clause that takes up the referent of the relative pronoun. Instead, there is often more than one relative clause at the beginning or a longer sequence of subordinate clauses—often, a *si* or *quominus* clause—that appears before the main clause. The resumptive element in the matrix clause of the relative clause may begin a chain of references finally leading to the main clause, so that the main clause does not end up referring back to the relative clause. There are also occasional examples of additional subordinate clauses between the initial relative clause and the main clause in comedy, but the constructions are, on the whole, more complex in the statutes. Finally, in the statutes, there are only constructions where the head noun is potentially internal to the relative clause. Nevertheless, the statutes cannot be completely dismissed as evidence, because they do contain constructions that are formally similar to constructions discussed in this study as left-dislocation.

I start with the construction most commonly cited as an example from the statutes, (15), which comes from *Lex agraria* (Law 2 Crawford):

(15) *ager publicus* populi Romanei, *quei* in Italia P. Mucio L. Calpurnio co(n)s(ulibus) fuit, *eius agri* Iiluir a(gris) d(andis) a(dsignandis) ex lege plebeieue scito sortito quoi celiui Roma[no quod dedit designauit, quod
eius agri neque is ... abalie]naut abalienaueritue neque heres eius aba-
lienauit abalienau[eritue]

Law 2.15

‘The public land of the Roman people, whatever there was in the land of
Italy in the consulship of P. Mucius and L. Calpurnius, [whatever] of that
land a IIIvir for the granting and assigning of land [granted or assigned]
by lot to any Roman citizen according to statute or plebiscite, [whatever
of that land neither he ... ] has or shall have alienated, nor his heir has or
shall have alienated.’

At first glance, this construction does indeed show features that would justify
its classification as an attraction (ignoring here the general implausibility of
nominatives as attractions, see 2.2.4 and 3.2.1.3). There is an initial noun in the
nominative (ager publicus populi Romanei), defined by the relative clause quei
in Italia ... fuit, followed by a resumption in genitive, eius agri. However, the
construction is somewhat more complicated. The neuter pronoun quod is assumed
in the restoration to go with the genitive eius agri (‘this land that ... whatever
of this land’), and the resumption happens in what is, in fact, another relative
clause, IIIvir agris d(andis) a(dsignandis) ... quoi ceiui Roma[no quod dedit
adsignauit]. The actual main clause does not appear until l. 16 [...] is de ea re
ius deicito d(cec)e(nte) utei possessionem, where is presumably takes up quie
eorum in the reconstruction. This construction seems clearly to be quite unlike
the other passages in the inscriptions or elsewhere that have been identified as
attractions.

Other relative clause constructions in this text must also be considered to
describe the construction adequately. In Lex agraria, there is a large number of
relative clause constructions whereby the land in question in each part of the
law is defined. This definition takes the form of an initial quei ager construc-
tion, whereby the relevant part of the ager publicus is defined. For example, at
the very beginning of the law, the phrase defining ager publicus is followed by
another relative clause that specifies one of the different ways in which parts
of this land have been assigned to citizens for private use (see Crawford 1996:
153).

(16) quei ager poplicus populi Romanei in terram Italiam P. M(u)cio L. Cal-
pur[nio co(n)s(ulibus) fuit, extra eum agrum, quei ager ex lege plebeiue
scito, quod C. Sempronius Ti.f. tr(ibunus) pl(ebis) rogauit, exceptum caui-
tumue est nei divideretur, ... quem quisque de eo agro loco ex lege ple-
beiue scito sibei agrum locum sumpsit reliquitue, quod non modus
maior siet, quam quantum unum hominem ex lege plebeiue sc(ito) sibei sumer[e relinquereue licuit ...]²⁶

Law 2.1–2

‘Whatever public land of the Roman people [there was] in the land of Italy [in the consulship of] P. Mucius and L. Calpur[ni]us, apart from that land, whose division was excluded or forbidden according to the statute or plebiscite which C. Sempronius, son of Tiberius, tribune of the plebs, proposed ... whatever] land or piece of land [of that land or piece of land anyone, according to statute or plebiscite,] took or kept [for himself], provided that its size be not greater than what [it was lawful] for one man to take [or keep] for himself, according to statute or plebiscite.’

The various groups of public land that have been taken or assigned for private use are defined on lines 1–7 then collectively taken up on l. 7 (17). At this point, finally, it is declared that this land, consisting of the categories listed above, is to be private. The construction, in contrast to the preserved parts of the preceding lines, as in (16), begins with ager locus aedifium ... quei. This is apparently followed by a main clause, reconstructed without a resumption (priuatus esto) in Crawford (1996). It is uncertain whether or not there was a resumption, but it would be the only example where ager is not taken up by a resumptive pronoun in the matrix clause in this statute.

(17) ager locus a//edicium omnis quei supra scriptu[s est, extra eum agrum, quei aker ex lege plebeiue sc(ito), quod C. Sempronius Ti.f. tr(ibunus) pl(ebis) rog(auit), except]um cauitu[m quo c[oguiet, priuatus esto ...]

Law 2.7

‘all land, pieces of land or buildings, which [are] written down above, [apart from that land, whose division was excluded or] forbidden [according to the statute or plebiscite which C. Sempronius, son of Tiberius, tribune of the plebs, proposed, is to be private ...]’

It is tempting to think that ager quei in (17) appears in this order because it takes up all the different types listed above and finally proceeds toward the prescription of what is to happen to this land—namely, that it is to be private.

²⁶ The latter part of the phrase is preserved on l. 6.
This sense, even if not the exact form of the expression, is certain; see Crawford (1996: 158).

Elsewhere in this law, a construction beginning with quei ager can be found several times (Law 2.12–13, 13–14, 27, 48, 51, 75, 82, 89). In many of these, the pattern is an initial relative clause followed first by a subordinate clause and, only after that, the main clause (pattern quei ager + si/quominus is ager/eum agrum + main clause). There are two examples of the reverse pattern, ager quei, (15) and (17) above.

There is now enough context and other comparative relative clause constructions from this law to achieve a correct analysis of (15). It appears that attractio inuersa cannot, in any way, be the proper label for this construction. First, as I have argued in chapters 2 and 3, constructions that would have the nominative case as a result of attraction are better analysed as thematic nominatives than attractions. The concept of attraction necessarily implies that the original case form from which the attraction happens is a possible one for the construction. In other words, to say that ager publicus populi Romanei quei in (15) is an attraction would mean that it is an attraction from the genitive to the nominative case, implying that it could, in principle, have been in the genitive. However, this is not the case possible here. There are no examples of an initial relative clause where the head + relative pronoun combination (in this order) is in a case other than the nominative, whether in this Law or Law 1, Lex repetundarum. The second point concerns the status of the head noun. Heads that are internal to the relative clause are the most common form in the statutes, and even heads that appear to be external can be taken as internal to the relative clause: e.g., quei ager poplicus populi Romanei, as in (16) above. In this case, then, it seems clear that ager publicus in (15) is internal to the relative clause but fronted to appear before it. Therefore, even if the nominative resulted from attraction, this construction would not be a good example. Moreover, it may be added that, in the statutes, the head noun and the relative pronoun always agree in case. This means that a construction where the initial noun in an oblique case (here, the genitive) would be followed by a relative pronoun in the nominative appears to be highly unlikely, if not impossible.

On the other hand, it might be asked is whether there is a reason for this word order, ager quei for quei ager. Another instance of such a fronted head was seen above in (17), where it was cautiously suggested that the fronting may have been motivated by the role of ager quei in resuming all the different types of ager publicus in private use delineated before it. Ager quei thus marks a break in the flow of the text, signalled also by an empty space immediately preceding it—but such spaces appear elsewhere as well, before other types of relative constructions. It may be possible to discern the motivation for the
fronting of *ager* in (15). The sentence before this has been about pasture-land, and, in (15), the text returns to the different categories of *ager publicus* in private use defined earlier on ll. 1–7 of the statute. However, here, these categories need not be defined again; instead, they are cited to give further regulations about the availability of jurisdiction. Indeed, *ager publicus populi Romanei* is introduced here so that it can be broken down to different categories, on ll. 15–18. These references take the form of *quod eius agri*, as on l. 16: *quodque eius agri*. The relative construction in (15) serves to re-establish *ager publicus* generally as the point of reference (after the mention of pasture-land) and, more importantly, to enable the subsequent reference to the different categories by way of the *quod eius agri* construction. Afterwards, the sentence builds up into a long chain of references, shifting from *ager* to the magistrate, who is to have jurisdiction over the matter: *ager quei ... [quod] eius agri III vir ... quoi ceiui [adsignauit—quod eius agri neque is abalienauit—quei eorum ... in ious adierit ad eum quem ... oportet, is deicito] decernitoque* (reconstructed according to ll. 16–18). The subject of the main clause is the magistrate.

The other internal head nouns are found at Law 2.34 *quod iudicium*, 36 *quoi publicano*, 38 *quaes res*, 67 *quoi colono*, 86 *quaue uectigalia*. Most probably, these were followed by a resumption, though that cannot be established for certain. There is one more *ager [quei]* construction that begins on l. 20, but the sentence is extremely long and badly preserved (Law 2.20 *ager locus publicus populi Romanei quei ...*], etc.).

Other examples of fronted heads in Law 2 have magistrates as head nouns (*IIuir, praetor, magistratus*). At places, enough of the sentence survives, and the resumption can be seen as well, as at Law 2.77 (*IIuir, quei ex h l factus creatueur erit, is in diebus (centum quinquaginta) proxsumeis, quibus factus creatueur erit, facito ... eis hominibus agrum in Africa dederunt*) and Law 2.78 (*IIuir quei ex h l factus creatueur erit, is facito ...*). We may note also Law 2.28 (*censoribus quei quomque posthac facteis erunt, ei faciunto [ut]ei ...*), with a fronted head (erroneously in the dative) and a resumption, even if this construction does not open its sentence but appears to come in the middle of a longer construction. By comparing these head nouns with those attested in the internal position in

---

27 Crawford’s reconstruction of the text is based on the assumption that all the categories mentioned on ll. 1–7 should be mentioned again here; see Crawford (1996: 162).

28 On these two occasions, the resumption comes directly after the relative clause and at the beginning of the matrix clause. This means that a resumption may have appeared in those passages as well where the juncture between the relative clause and the matrix clause is not preserved. However, these are very lacunose, so nothing much can be said about them for certain, except that the heads precede their relative pronouns.
the relative clause, it becomes apparent that, in Law 2, there is a strong tendency for animate heads to precede the relative pronoun and for inanimate heads to be in internal position. Exceptions are Law 2.36 *quoi publicano* and the two examples of *ager quei* in (15) and (17).

Next, I examine briefly the corresponding constructions in Law 1 (*Lex repetundarum*). This text has four certain examples of the head-internal type (A1).

I cite (18) as an example (the remaining three occur in Law 1.27, 39 *quam rem … sei eam rem*, 54 *ex qua sorti … eam sortem … [reddito]*, 65 *[queiquomq]ue praetor … is … facito*):

(18) *quei ioudices e[x h(ace) l(ege) lectei erunt], quam in rem eis ioudices lectei erunt, e[ius rei iudices in perpetuom sunto …]*

Law 1.27

‘Whoever [shall have been chosen] as jurors [according to this statute], for whatever matter they shall have been chosen as jurors, [they are to be jurors of that matter to the end]’

On the other hand, there are three examples of type B1 (fronted heads with resumption). All three have *pr(aetor)* as their head noun.

(19) *pr(aetor), quei inter peregrinos ious deicet, is in diebus (decem) pro-\(\text{xum(eis)}, quibus h(ance) l(egem) populus plebesue iouserit, facito utei (quadringentos quinquaginta) uiros legat, quei in hac ceiuit[ate …]*

Law 1.12

‘The praetor, who shall have jurisdiction in relation to foreigners, within the ten days next after the people or plebs shall have passed this statute, is to see that he choose 450 men, who in this state […]’

In (19), the construction is simple and short in the initial part, and it is difficult to imagine any other reason for the use of the resumption than the requirements of relative clause syntax.
In (20), on the other hand, the initial *praetor* is resumed in the relative clause *qua de re ei praetori*. This relative clause introduces another entity, according to the supplement *eisque ioudicibus*, further defined by *eorum maiorei partis*. These datives go together with the main clause predicate *satis factum erit*.

(20) *praetor, quei* ex hace lege quaeret, *qua de re ei praetori eisque ioudicibus*, *quei* ex hace lege ad eam rem iocos adfuerint, *quei uiuent, eorum maiorei partis* *satis factum erit*, nomen, quod ex [hace lege quis detulerit, prauearicationis causa eum detulisse ...]

Law 1.75

‘The praetor, who shall investigate according to this statute concerning whatever matter that praetor [and] the majority of those [jurors, who] shall have been present [according to this statute for] judging [that matter,] those of them who shall be alive, shall be satisfied [that anyone who shall have] prosecuted anyone according to [this statute prosecuted him by way of collusion ...]’

The initial *praetor quei* is used as a way of introducing both the *praetor* and the *ioudices*. The third instance of a fronted head (B1) construction occurs in Law 1.18 *pr(aetor) quei legerit, is eos, quos ex h(ace) l(ege) C[DL u]iros legerint, facito in conj[unctione recitentur].* Here, the motivation for the use of the resumptive pronoun *is* may spring from the nature of the subsequent complement clause of *facito*, which includes a proleptic accusative (*is eos ... facito ... recitentur*, where *eos* is the subject of *recitentur* but appears in the accusative, as if an object of *facito*), making the construction even more complex.

In Law 1, there is, furthermore, at least one example of a fronted head without resumption (B2), Law 1.26 *pr(aetor) quei ex h(ace) l(ege) quaeret facito.* This marks a new beginning after a *vacat* and a rubric, *[nomin]a utei scripta in taboleis habeantur* (the same pattern is reconstructed on ll. 30, 32, 44). As for the fronted head, it appears that there are no examples of *quei praetor* in this Law (but *queiquomque praetor* is found on l. 65). It is impossible to say what has motivated the choice of one or the other construction on these occasions. There is no difference in the types of matrix clauses governing one or the other type (both main clauses and subordinate clauses are found, as with the A1 type). Another magistrate appears at Law 1.68 *quaestor, quiquomque [que erit, utei*
quod recte factum esse uolit, facito in diebus (...). The distribution of different types of heads in fronted or internal position seems to be the same as in Law 2: of the four internal heads, two are inanimate (Law 1.39 quam rem, 54 ex qua sorti), whereas none of the fronted heads is.

4.3.2 Other Statutes (Law 14, Law 15, Law 24, Law 25)
The first text examined in this section is Lex Cornelia de xx Quaestoribus (Law 14). This statute concerns the appointing of additional scribes (scribae), messengers (uiatores) and criers (praecones) for magistrates in the Sullan period. It is well preserved and very clear in its contents. The text offers some good examples for comparing different types of preposed relative clauses. The lost portion at the beginning dealt with scribes. On l. 7, the text starts with a new topic: appointing messengers and criers. This is introduced by a reference to the present consuls, in (21), where the resumption in the main clause is in the same case (nominative):

\begin{align}
(21) & \text{co(n)s(ules) quei nunc sunt, iei ante k(alendas) Decembreis primas de} \\
& \text{eis, quei ciues Romanei sunt, uiatorem unum legunto, quei in ea decu-} \\
& \text{ria uiator appareat, quam decuriam uiatorum ex noneis Decembribus} \\
& \text{primeis quaestoribus ad aerarium apparere oportet opotebit} \\
\end{align}

\text{Law 14.1.7}

‘The consuls who are now in office, they before the Kalends of December next following are to choose, from those who are Roman citizens, one messenger who may attend as messenger in that group, which group of messengers it is or shall be appropriate that it attend on the quaestors at the treasury from the Nones of December next following.’

This passage begins with an indentation on the left, which, together with the construction (b1) co(n)s(ules) quei ... iei, signifies the beginning of a new section. As for analysis as left-dislocation, it should be noted that the consuls are not actually the topic of this predication. Therefore, the construction seems to indicate that a new section begins on a more general level, not introducing the consuls as topics.

The following two examples offer the possibility to compare constructions with fronted heads, one with resumption and one without, in very similar contexts. Both passages have uiatores praecones as the head noun of the relative pronoun. Furthermore, in both passages, this head noun is in the dative in the main clause, in (22) as a complement of ius esto licetoque and in (23) as the indirect object of dato.
itemque eis uiatoribus praecoonibus, quei ex hac lege lectei erunt, uicarium dare subdere ius esto licetique, utei cetereis uiatoribus praecoonibus, qua in quisque decuria est uicarium dare subdere iuus erit licebitque

Law 14.11.24

‘And it is to be right and lawful for those messengers and criers, who shall have been chosen according to this statute, to appoint or substitute a deputy, just as it shall be right and lawful for the other messengers and criers, in whichever group anyone is, to appoint or substitute a deputy.’

In (22), the sentence is connected to the previous context by way of itemque, showing that the previous topic is at least partly continued in this sentence (concerning the appointment of deputies). In addition, in (22), the dative complement is, in fact, the psychological subject (i.e., the person who can do something). Between (22) and (23) is a sentence where the subject is quaestores (col. 11.28–30 itemque quaestor(es) ab eis uicarios accipiunto, utei aa cetereis uiatoribus praecoonibus uicarios accipei oportebit). The relative clauses in (22) and (23) are practically identical.

uiatores praecoones quei in hac lege lectei sublectei erunt, eis uiatoribus praecoonibus magistratus proue mag(istratu) mercedis item tantundem dato, quantum ei uiator(ei) praconei darei oporteret, sei is uiator de tribus uiatoribus isque praeco de tribus praecoonibus esset, quei ante hanc legem rogatam utei legerentur institutei sunt

Law 14.11.31

‘Whoever shall have been chosen or chosen in replacement as messengers and criers according to this statute, to those messengers and criers a magistrate or promagistrate is to issue similarly as much in fee as it would be appropriate to be issued to that messenger or crier if he were a messenger from the three messengers or a crier from the three criers who were established so as to be chosen before the proposal of this statute.’

The construction in (23) re-establishes uiatores praecoones as the topic after the intervening sentence on quaestores, and the resumption eis uiatoribus praecoonibus is a reflection of this.

The text has internal heads at 11.7 quosquomque quaestores ex lege plebeiene scito uiatores legere sublegere oportebit, ei quaestores ... legunto sublegunto and at 11.11 quosquomque praecoones ... legunto sublegunto. In addition, a construction without resumption is found in 11.18 (itaque de eis quattuor uiatoribus
quaestor queiquomque erit uiatores sumito habeto), repeated at II.21 (with praecoonibus); in 1.2 (quaestorque quei ... soluito, in the nominative), in 1.32 (eosque uiatores eosque praecones omneis, quos ... legunto, in the accusative).

Finally, I will briefly discuss Lex coloniae Genetiuae (Law 25). This statute, of Caesarian date, survives as a Flavian copy. It is generally thought to be an ill-drafted document, possibly showing later interpolations between its original composition and the date of the text as we have it. A great number of paragraphs in this statute begin with some type of relative construction (A1, B1, B2). Of these, the head-internal type with resumption (A1) is the most frequent (16 examples), while there are eight examples of fronted heads with resumption (B1) and three of fronted heads without resumption (B2). It seems to be very difficult, if not impossible, to discern any difference between these constructions or their contexts that would account for this variation in syntax. Finally, it may be noted that there is no difference in the behaviour of the relative pronouns. Both qui and its frequent variant quicumque precede as well as follow their heads.

However, all eight occurrences of left-dislocation (B1) in Law 25 do have IIuir or IIuiri as the head noun of the relative pronoun (twice together with aediles) against three instances of IIuir or IIuiri in a head-internal construction (A1). This observation agrees with the situation in Laws 1 and 2 (where it is principally animate nouns—i.e., magistrates—that are fronted) and is therefore interesting.

Furthermore, the two remaining instances of fronted heads with resumption (B1) in the statutes both concern animate nouns. The first instance is Law 15.1.7 (IIIuir(ei) aedilesque quei h(ac) l(ege) primei erunt, quei eorum Tarentum uenerit, is facito), where the construction marks the beginning of the paragraph, as well as a syntactic transfer from plural to singular: IIIuir(ei) ... quei eorum ... is. The other instance is Law 24.24 (aed(iles) cur(ules) aed(iles) pl(ebei) quei ... queiquomque ... iei). It seems that, in the statutes, mainly animate nouns (often magistrates) get fronted out of their relative clauses.

Other sentence-initial relative clause constructions in the statutes are mainly of the head-internal type with resumption (A1), with occasional examples of the external head without resumption (the ‘classical’ type, B2).

31 Against large-scale interpolations, see Crawford (1996: 395–397). The text undoubtedly nevertheless draws on earlier statutes and has more than one source (Crawford 1996: 397–399).
4.4 Discussion on the Statutes and Other Legal Inscriptions

In this group of texts, the resumptive pronoun is exclusively *is*. In all groups, the pattern where all three references (head, relative pronoun, resumption in the matrix clause) are in the nominative is the most common throughout the material. Virtually all instances of left-dislocation (*B1*) have both the head noun and the relative pronoun in the nominative. The only exception is (14), in *Lex Puteolana*. In the statutes, the resumption in the matrix clause is in the nominative in nearly all instances, meaning that the head of the relative pronoun is usually the subject. In one or two places, the resumption in the main clause is in some other case, but even those that are not in the nominative are usually partitive genitives that go with the subject, as in Law 1.75 (20); Law 2.15 (15); Law 15.7 (*III-Iuiri(ei) aedilesque ... quei eorum, is facito*); Law 25.C.II.23 (*Iuiri qui h(ac) l(lege) quaeret iud exercet, quod iudicium ... non est, ne quis eorum*). In addition, there is one dative that functions as a psychological subject, in the conjecture in Law 25.LXII.11 (*Iuiri quicumque erunt, iis(s) Iuiri(s) ... ius potestasque esto*) and one indirect object *eis uiatoribus praeconibus* in (23) (Law 14.II.31). This latter one is the sole example in the statutes of a resumption not used to express the subject. In *Sententia Minuciorum* (*ILLRP* 517) and *Lex Puteolana* (*ILLRP* 518), on the other hand, the resumptions are in the accusative (three times) or in the form of a prepositional phrase (once).

In the head-internal constructions, on the other hand, there is more variation in case syntax. We find, for example, nominative in the head with *pro* + ablative in the resumption (Law 2.82 *quei ager ... erit ... pro eo agro loco*), accusative in the head with nominative in the resumption (Law 14.II.7 *quos-quamque quaestores ... ei quaestores*), *ex* + ablative in the head with accusative in the resumption (Law 1, 54 *ex qua sorti ... eam sortem*). The resumption in the main clause is usually in the nominative, but other cases are occasionally attested, too. The predicate of the relative clause is, in most instances (both for internal and external heads), the copula or the passive perfect.

Both types of sentences (the head-internal relative clause, *A1*, and left-dislocation, *B1*) are used to begin new paragraphs. The only single text that offers enough examples for internal comparison is Law 25, *Lex coloniae Gene-tiuae*. Even there, however, no difference can be discerned between the use of different types of constructions: all five are used to introduce referents at the beginning of a new paragraph (after a *vacat*).

Looking only at the head nouns of relative clauses in the statutes, it is interesting to note that the preposed heads are almost always animate entities—in most cases, magistrates. In the statutes, the fronted head nouns are *praetor* (Law 1), *ager* (Law 2), *censor* (Law 2), *consules* (Law 14), *uiatores praecones* (Law
IIuir (Law 2, Law 25), aediles (Law 15, Law 24) and IIIuir (Law 15). Of these, only ager is an inanimate noun, fronted twice in Lex agraria (Law 2). In this law, all other examples of ager as the head of a relative clause have ager following qui. In the nearly contemporaneous Lex repetundarum (Law 1), there are several examples of fronted heads, all of which are animate nouns (see above for examples). Thus, it is notable that, with the exception of two examples of ager qui in Law 2, all fronted heads in the statutes are animate entities. Naturally, animate nouns may also occur in a clause-internal position (for example, they do so twice in Law 1: e.g., Law 1.65 queiquomque praetor ex hace lege tribuendei caussa prodeixerit, is ...).

What, then, might be the reasons why an animate head was fronted?

One simple explanation for this would be that animate entities are more prone to be topics and, therefore, get fronted out of their relative clauses. This explanation is not entirely plausible, however, as animate entities in the statutes cannot often be analysed as topics of their predications. There is a discernible difference here when compared to the inanimate entities. The latter type can readily be claimed to represent the topic of the predication (e.g., ager in (15) and prata in (6)). If ager occurs in the main clause, it is natural to express what must be done with it. However, when the head is a person (usually a magistrate) its identification as a topic is less straightforward. Naturally, a word of caution is in order here: it is obvious that there are limits in the extent to which ancient legal texts can be subjected to analysis on the basis of their pragmatic organization. Such concepts as topic and focus should not be pushed too far in the analysis of these texts.

In the other legal inscriptions (Sententia Minuciorum and Lex Puteolana), there is no such correlation between the animacy of head noun and its fronted placement, but such instances are also fewer in number.

One might expect to find more constructions of type B2 (fronted heads without resumption) toward the later laws, given that correlative structures are traditionally considered to become less frequent with the advance of time and the development of the literary language. However, there seems to be no support for such a conclusion. There is one certain example of a B2 construction already in Law 1.26 (praetor) quei ex h(ace) quaeret facito). This construction forms the basis for the supplements without resumption on ll. 30, 32

32 Head nouns that are magistrates in the statutes and legal inscriptions: praetor, IIuir, censor, consul,aedilis,quaestor; nouns that are animate but not magistrates: viatores praecones, scribae librarei, iudices, Vituries, pontif(ices); inanimate nouns: ager, uia, prata, res, pequenia, loca, fluui riui fontes, paries, lex, munitio.
and 44. In addition, there is one B2 construction in Law 7 \(\text{Lex Latina tabulae Bantinae}\), two in Law 14 \(\text{Lex de xx quaestoribus}\), one in Law 15 and four in Law 25. The later laws are, however, better preserved and consequently have more examples of other relative constructions as well. Any counting or comparison of the occurrences of different types of constructions across time in the various statutes is thus rendered difficult, if not impossible, by the fragmentary nature of many texts, especially in the case of the important early witnesses \text{Lex repetundarum} (Law 1) and \text{Lex agraria} (Law 2).

### 4.5 Relevant Constructions from Other (Private) Inscriptions

In the final section of this chapter, I begin by looking at an early inscription, the famous dedication of the cooks’ \textit{collegium}. The inscription is dated to 150–130 BCE (see Wachter 1987: 446–447; \textit{CIL I^2 suppl.} 364).

\begin{quote}(24) \textit{gonlegium quod est aciptum aetatei age(n)d[ai] opiparum a[di] ueitam quolundam festosque dies}, quei soueis aastutieis opidque Volgani gon-decorant sai[pi]sume comuiua loidosque, quqiem huc dederu[nt i]nperia-toribus summeis, ueti sesed lubent[es be]ne iouent optantis

\textit{ILLRP 192 b = CIL I^2 364 b}

‘Cooks—a guild that is acceptable for making a pleasant pastime, and is richly endowed for pursuit of good living and for making holiday—who time and again garnish banquets and games with their own clever tricks by the aid of the Fire-God, bestowed this on their All-Highest Commanders, desiring that they may be pleased to help them nobly.’

\textit{Translation Warmington}

---

33 Another (uncertain) one is found at Law 2.52 \(\text{IIuir qui \ldots eri\[t\]}, \text{in bid\(\ldots\) proxsumo, quo factus creatusue erit, e\(d\)ici\(t\)}\).

34 I follow Degrassi’s interpretation of this document (Degrassi in \textit{ILLRP 192}), according to which the inscriptions on the two sides of the bronze plate (a and b) do not refer to same persons, so the cooks are not Falerian cooks in Sardinia. Degrassi points out that it is highly unlikely that there would have been enough cooks from Falerii in Sardinia to constitute a \textit{collegium}. Degrassi suggests that side b (the cooks’ dedication) was written first, but, due to the resulting mistakes and eventual lack of space, the writer reused the plate to write text a. This explanation also accounts for the fact that the same handwriting is found on both sides.
The text begins with the relative clause *gonlegium quod est aciptum*. This relative clause precedes the rest of the sentence independently, setting the framework for interpretation of what is to follow. There is no resumption of *gonlegium quod*, but this is loosely co-referent with *quqei* (‘The collegium that is put up for ... those who ... decorate ... the cooks dedicated this’). The syntactic organization of the inscription is reminiscent of the drop-by-drop style (Fraenkel 1922; see 4.2.1). Information is given in small units, unconnected by explicit syntactic means. This early method of syntactic organization produces in (24) an expression that can be interpreted as a left-dislocation. As the left-dislocated constituent is not a member of the subsequent predication (*collegium quod* is not resumed afterwards), it can be classified as an unlinked topic (for which definition, see 2.1).

On the other hand, this construction also closely resembles the various relative clause constructions in the statutes and other legal inscriptions. In (24), too, the initial relative clause is followed by another relative clause (an autonomous relative clause, *quei*). After this is the main clause, where *quqei* is co-referent with *quei* in the preceding relative clause and may even be taken as a nominal resumption of the autonomous relative pronoun. The inscription has been written in Saturnian verse, with aberrations on the two first lines, according to Mercado’s pattern for this metre (Mercado 2012: 196–199).

There is another Saturnian inscription that contains a construction of some interest for a study on left-dislocation. This is the *elogium* of Scipio Barbatus’s son (*CIL* I² 9, after 230 BCE). I quote here the entire poem:

(25) honc oino ploirume consentiont R[omai] duonoroptumo fuise uiro Luciom Scipione *filios Barbati* consol censor aidilis hic fueat a[pud uos] hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe dedet Tempestatebus aide mereto[d]

\[cili² 9 = illrp 310 b\]

‘This man alone was the best of good men, most in Rome agree, namely Lucius Scipio. Son of Barbatus, he was consul, censor and aedile among you. He took Corsica and the city of Aleria (its capital); he gave to the Weather Goddesses a temple in return for benefits received.’

Translation adapted from Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 138

---

The point I wish to make concerns the interpretation of l. 3 and the nominative *filios Barbati*. This form is that inscribed on the stone and is the one usually accepted in editions and commentaries as well. However, several scholars have argued that *filios* here is an error for *filiom* (Ernout (1966: 16); Van Sickle (1988: 146 fn. 25); Goldberg (1995: 62–63); Courtney (1995: 221)). This would have been produced by the model text, which supposedly had only *filiio*, erroneously expanded as *filios* by the engraver. In Courtney’s view, the nominative would break up the flow of the verse, and the patronymic epithet goes much better with what precedes, as an appositive. Mercado (2012: 189) notes that *filios Barbati* in the nominative anticipates *hic* on l. 3, and there is no need to imagine an original accusative. This, I believe, is the correct interpretation. The nominative *filios Barbati* establishes the person as the subject of the final part of the inscription, and it is taken up by *hic* in the following line. This function of an initial independent nominative is recorded in the present study in a variety of contexts, and I suggest that left-dislocation offers a context that helps to make sense of the syntactic and pragmatic status of *filios Barbati*.37

Next, I discuss a small group of curse tablets. Curse tablets offer much interesting material for the study of syntactic irregularity, but most of them come from a later time period and, hence, are not included in this study. As I have limited the time period of this study to achieve a description of Latin left-dislocation before the emergence of tendencies that were to influence especially the role of the nominative and accusative cases, I will equally discuss only the curse tablets that, in all likelihood, date from the republican period. Similar constructions naturally occur in curse tablets generally, but, in these early examples it can be seen that this type of syntax is typical not only of later substandard language but is an expression that is necessary in this text type already in the early period.

The first tablet comes from Rome, probably from the Augustan period.

(26) *Danae ancilla* noicia Capitonis *hanc ostiam acceptam* habeas et consumas Danaene, ne habes Eutychiam Soterichi uxorom

*ILLRP* 1145 = *CIL* I² 819 = *AUDOLLENT* 138 = *KROPP* L.4.4/2

‘Danae, new slave of Capito, her you should accept as sacrifice, and destroy Danae; you should not take Eutychia, wife of Soterichus.’38

---

36 Wachter saw an anacoluthon in the father’s *elogium* on lines 1–2 (see Courtney 1995: 218).
37 Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 140) observe that both this text and the *elogium* of the father show a literary character, noting, for example, the lack of correlative clauses.
38 Translations of curse tablets are mine.
The name of the object of the curse is in the nominative (*Danae ancilla*) and is taken up in the accusative in the subsequent clause (*hanc (h)ostiam accep-tam habeas*).

The following text, (27), belongs to a group of three curse tablets found in Nomentana (Audollent 133–135). They were originally thought to have come from the 2nd or even the 3rd century C.E. Solin (1998 [1989]: 315–319), however, has argued, on the basis of the writing and onomastics, that the tablets are, in fact, considerably earlier, coming from the late republican or early imperial period.

(27) **A Malcio Nicones** oculos manus dicitos bracias uncis capilo caput pedes femus venter (...) crus quastu lucru ualetudines defico in as tabelas

**AUDOLLENT 135 = KROP 1.4.2/3**

‘Malcio, son of Nico—the eyes, hands, fingers, arms, nails, hair, head, feet, thigh, stomach (...) leg, income, profit, health, I curse in these tablets’

**B Rufa publica** manus detes oclos bracia (...) umlicus cunus ụḷuas ilae Rufas publica deioo [= defigo] in as tabelas

**AUDOLLENT 135 = KROP 1.4.2/3**

‘Rufa, public slave—the hands, teeth, eyes, arms (...) and vulva of this Rufa, public slave, I curse in these tablets.’

Both sides of this tablet (A and B) begin with a name in the nominative. Malcio was identified as ‘ein ausserhalb der Syntax stehender erstarrter Nominativ’ by Solin (1998: 318), undoubtedly the correct interpretation. A long list of body parts in the accusative follows, and the text finishes with the predicate *defico*. There is no resumption of Malcio. A similar pattern is found on side B of the text Audollent 135, with Rufa Publica in the nominative followed by body parts in the accusative as objects of *defigo*. Here, however, there is a resumption in the genitive *ilae Rufas Publica*.

We may compare two further curse tablets with similar constructions. The first comes probably from the 1st century BCE (Brigantium, Raetia).

---

39 The text Audollent 134 appears to have a similar structure, with personal names in the nominative followed by nouns, including body parts, in the accusative. That text, however, is poorly preserved and presents problems for interpretation; for improvements on the reading, see Solin (1998: 318–319). Of the third text, Audollent 133, even less survives.

(28) **Domitius Niger et [L]ollius et Iulius Seuerus et Seuerus Nigri serus adue[rs)a(rii) Bruttae et quisquis aduersus ilam loqut(us est) omnes perdes**

_Audollent 93 = CIL III 11882_

‘Domitius Niger and Lollius and Iulius Seuerus and Seuerus, slave of Niger, opponents of Brutta, and whoever spoke against her, destroy all of them.’

According to Audollent (citing Zangemeister), the missing cognomen of Lollius suggests a date in the 1st century CE. However, the letter forms and orthographical variants _serus_ and _loqutus_ point to an earlier date, in the 1st century BCE. The missing cognomen cannot be used as a criterion for a later date (Heikki Solin, p. c.). The names of the persons are in the nominative, followed by the resumption _omnes_ (here, clearly a resumption, because the names are in the nominative). Brutta curses those who have spoken against her in court.

The final text is a curse tablet from Cumae:


_Audollent 199 = CIL I ² suppl. 3129 p. 1012_

‘M. Heius Caledus, son of Marcus, Blossia, daughter of Gaius, P. Heius Caledus, son of Marcus, Chilo, slave of Marcus Heius, M. Heius Blossius, [son or freedman of] C. Blossius, Bithus, freedman of (a woman), Atto, slave of Marcus Heius, Blossia, daughter of Lucius, all of these people I pick up (?) for the gods of the underworld, so that not one of them ...’

Audollent dated this inscription to the 1st century BCE, on the basis of the letter forms and servile nomenclature in the form _Hei Marci seruus_ (confirmed as republican by Heikki Solin, p. c.). The names of the persons are in the accusative, anticipating their role in the main clause and followed by the resumption _[hos] homines omnes_.

4.6 Discussion and Conclusions

The syntactic shape of epigraphic left-dislocation varies greatly. However, nearly all examples in this chapter can be classified as thematic nominatives, with occasional examples of anticipation of the main clause case, in the curse tablets and (14) above.

Certain constructions in the famous early inscriptions can plausibly be explained as instances of left-dislocation: *homines oinuorsei in the senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, (1) above, and the combination *filios ... hic in the Scipio elogium*, (25) above. Such dislocated nominal constituents are, however, not the usual type of left-dislocation in the inscriptions. Instead, the usual type is a sentence-initial relative clause, where the head noun has been fronted to initial (and, possibly, clause-external) position. It has been possible to establish a pattern where an element is first defined with a restrictive relative clause (where it is often the subject of *esse*) then appears in the subsequent main clause in another form (accusative, dative, prepositional phrase). Constructions of this type are, (7), (9), (10) and (23), as well as (6) in the neuter. These constructions were analysed as attractions in earlier research, but I have argued for a different interpretation. According to my view, the initial constituent is in the nominative not by virtue of being attracted by the case of the main clause reference but by virtue of being the subject of the relative clause, regardless of whether it is understood as internal or external to the relative clause (at least for certain constructions, placement inside the relative clause seems improbable). Even if not internal to the relative clause (and sharing the case of the relative pronoun because of this), the nominative in these constructions is practically the only option for the nominal element, because inflecting it in the case form of the main clause would have required a completely different syntactic arrangement, one that was not possible or, in any case, not preferable at the time the texts were written.

Therefore, these constructions have more to do with archaic than with spoken syntax, in the sense that they are sensitive to information-structural and pragmatic considerations and are motivated by them in contexts where there was no standard preventing this usage. Here, we see that (the historical state of) syntax also plays a role in determining the use of left-dislocation.

In the statutes, on the other hand, any motivation of an information-structuring or pragmatic nature seems hard to detect. This is probably connected with the fact that, even syntactically, it is difficult for the most part

---

41 See chapter 5.5 for more parallels and discussion.
to say whether the constructions actually can or should be classified as left-dislocation. Nevertheless, there is a clear tendency for head nouns, when they are fronted, to be animate entities.

We can conclude that it was useful to examine epigraphic evidence of left-dislocation alongside the evidence in comedy. Although the typical constructions in each part of the corpus differ from each other considerably, there is a continuum from the most idiosyncratic Plautine examples, via standard left-dislocation and potentially head-internal relative clauses to similar pragmatically motivated constructions in the laws and, finally, constructions that, in all probability, are mere word order variations of established patterns, without any discernible pragmatic or other motivation (i.e., the fronted head nouns in the statutes). By comparing the epigraphic examples with those of comedy, it has been possible to describe them more accurately and to draw attention to the features specific to their text types.

Finally, I have argued that the curse tablets have in common the underlying principle of identifying the referent (i.e., the object of the curse) first then making a predication about this referent. In this, they reflect the same linguistic principle, though in a rather simple form, as the rest of the epigraphic and literary examples of left-dislocation.
5.1 Introduction

The two previous chapters have explored left-dislocation and related constructions in two genres that are both products of special circumstances. Chapter 3 is predominantly about the language of one individual, who, for all we know, may have been an idiosyncratic language user. Because of this, there will always remain some uncertainty concerning the degree to which observations on Plautus can be held representative for the Latin of that period. The form of Latin preserved in the statutes and other legal inscriptions, on the other hand, is somewhat removed from common language usage due to their specialized content and tradition.

The texts discussed in this chapter naturally have their own special character as well, but it is possible that, at least occasionally, the language of early republican prose allows for a more direct observation of the types of constructions that may have enjoyed currency outside of this particular text type. Equally, however, the questions of register and stylistic connotations are not simple in this part of the material. Both Cato and Varro wrote instructions on agriculture in a technical register. In Cato, this is combined with features of archaic syntax. In Varro, on the other hand, his agricultural treatise shows the same characteristics of his idiosyncratic style as *De lingua Latina*. The historical and oratorical works, on the other hand, may be the closest to a ‘neutral register’ in the present corpus.

The prose texts discussed in this chapter are divided into three parts. I begin with an analysis of M. Porcius Cato and his *De agricultura* (5.2). I then look at (the fragments of) Roman orators and historians (5.3), finishing with a discussion of Varro’s *De re rustica* and *De lingua latina* (5.4).

5.2 M. Porcius Cato: *De agricultura*

The information structure of *De agricultura* differs substantially from that seen in the dramatic dialogue and other parts in comedy. Over the course of his work, Cato needed continuously to refer to previously unmentioned elements. It is thus typical for a topical element to be brought to the beginning of the clause (e.g., 1.1 *praedium quom parare cogitabis, sic in animo habeto*). Such ele-
ments are often new to the discourse. However, we may say that they are not unexpected in this genre. Cato could trust that, in a work on farming, names of, for example, different plants could appear and that these plants could, for the most part, be identifiable by sole references to their names. This means that plants together with other groups of objects such as animals, types of land, parts of the farm and utensils, can be expected to be accessible to the reader by the sole mention of their names. Defining relative clauses or other subordinate clauses (ubi, si) are used when further information about the element in question is needed. The pragmatic organization in the work is typically one where the initial part of the sentence expresses the topic, and the latter part contains the comment or the focus. Sentences are typically short. In addition, elements that can be supplied from the context are often left out, be they verbs, pronouns or adverbial expressions. Indeed, left-dislocation and other special phenomena seem to occur wherever Cato felt the need to express something more complicated.

5.2.1 Constructions without Relative Clauses
The first example from Cato is a prototypical instance of left-dislocation. The dislocated element is a noun, resumed by a pronoun in the main clause that immediately follows. This example has served as an example of left-dislocation (nominativus pendens) in numerous treatments. However, this is the only example of such a construction type in Cato, and, even if not completely without parallels—see, in particular, (62) in chapter 3 and (35) below from Sallust—the construction is not the usual type of left-dislocation in Latin.

(1) **cancer ater**, is olet et saniem spurcam mittit, albus purulentus est, sed fistulosus et sub tus suppurat sub carne

*CATO Agr. 157.3*

‘The black ulcer has a foul odour and exudes putrid pus, the white is purulent but fistulous, and suppurates under the surface.’

This sentence appears in the final part of the work, in the so-called ‘praise of cabbage’. In this paragraph, we are told, first, that cabbage cleanses suppurating wounds and tumours, then instructions on how to use cabbage are given. In (1), Cato makes a side remark about two different types of ulcers. The cancer

---

1 This point is made in Pinkster (forthc. chapter 22) concerning technical texts generally.
2 Translations of Cato’s *De agricultura* come from Hooper and Ash.
is thus an Active element in the context as well as the topic in this sentence. In the latter part, a contrast is created with (cancer) albus. After this, ulcers are mentioned in one further sentence (157.4 in ea uulnra huiusce modi teras brassicam, sanum faciet; optima est ad huiusce modi uulnus), after which the topic shifts to other uses of cabbage.

I now move on to patterns used more frequently in Cato’s prose: anticipation of the main clause case, in the accusative. In (2), Cato describes the optimal overseer (starting at Agr. 5.1 haec erunt uilici officia) and his duties.

(2) **amicos domini, eos** habeat sibi amicos

*Cato Agr. 5.3*

‘He must consider the master’s friends his own friends.’

The passage where the overseer’s duties are enumerated is extensive, but (2) is the only example of a left-dislocation. The master (*dominus*) is an Active element, but the master’s friends have not been mentioned previously. I interpret *amicos domini* as the topic and *sibi amicos* as the focus, with a contrast between *domini* and *sibi*. Generally, in Cato, we find the standard pattern, meaning that even initial topical objects that are Brand New elements and not necessarily anchored with, for example, a relative clause are not resumed in the main clause (as if *aminos domini habeat sibi amicos*). This is because the technical style allows for reference to previously unmentioned elements, if they are identifiable in the context by that sole reference. To explain this particular instance, we must assume that there was something in this particular sentence that triggered left-dislocation. One possibility is that, because humans in this work are not among the typical objects, a semantic explanation would be fitting here—namely, that the resumption was prompted by the need to mark humans as the object.

The same syntactic pattern, anticipation of the main clause case, in the accusative, is found in the following passage (instructions concerning the land type appropriate to certain plants). The instruction preceding (3) does not have resumption (*Agr. 8.1 ficos mariscas in loco cretoso et aperto serito*). Then follows (3), with a contrast drawn with the type of land where this particular group of plants are to be planted.

(3) **africanas et herculaneas, sacontinas, hibernas, tellanas atras pediculo longo, eas** in loco crassiore aut stercorato serito

*Cato Agr. 8.1*
‘The African, Herculanean, Saguntine, the winter variety, the black Tel-lanian with long pedicles, plant these in soil which is rather rich or manured’

Translation adapted from Hooper and Ash

The focus here is on *in loco crassiore aut stercorato*, and the initial list of plants (*africanas* ... *tellanas atras*) may be taken as contrastive topic (‘These plants, on the other hand, you should plant in rather rich or manured land’). Further examples of such listing LD are cited below in sub-section 5.2.3.

Similarly, in (4), *oleas tempestiuas* constitutes a contrastive topic after *oleae caducae quam plurimum* in the preceding clause. Storing (*condito*) is present already in the preceding context and is topical, and, in the verbal part, *parcito uti quam diutissime durent* is focal.

(4)  
oleae caducae quam plurimum condito; postea *oleas tempestiuas* unde minimum olei fieri poterit, *eas* condito, parcito, uti quam diutissime durent  

_Cato Agr. 58_

‘Store all the windfall olives you can and later the mature olives which will yield very little oil. Issue them sparingly, and make them last as long as possible.’

The next example has a very long dislocated constituent, and the resumption in the main clause can be explained as being caused at least partly by this. The long description of the land to be chosen is necessary in this context. Example (5) is the first sentence after the rubric of the paragraph (*seminarium ad hunc modum facito*).

(5)  
locum quam optimum et apertissimum et stercorosissimum poteris et quam simillimum genus terrae eae, ubi semina positurus eris, et uti ne nimis longe semina ex seminario ferantur, _eum locum_ bipalio uertito, delapidato circumque saepito bene et in ordine serito  

_Cato Agr. 46.1_

‘Choose the best, the most open, and the most highly fertilized land you have, with soil as nearly as possible like that into which you intend to transplant, and so situated that the slips will not have to be carried too far from the nursery. Turn this with a trench spade, clear of stones, build a stout enclosure, and plant in rows.’
In (5), *locum quam optimum* is clearly the topic, and the predicates (*uertito*, etc.) in the main clause carry the focus.

Yet another example of main clause case anticipation is found in (6), which, however, is an exceptional construction, in that the initial element is a (nominalized) adjective, referring to *cupam* in the preceding sentence (*cupam facito p x, tam crassam quam modioli postulabunt, media inter orbis quae conueniat*):

(6) **crassam** quam columnella ferrea erit, **eam medium** pertundito

*CATO Agr. 21.1*

‘Drill a hole in the middle as large as the iron pivot, so that the latter may be inserted in it.’

In (6), *crassam* (with *cupam* understood) is the topic and *medium* the focus.

In the next two passages, the dislocated elements are neuters, and, as such, can be either nominative or accusative. However, the accusative is the more probable interpretation, because it is the case of the co-referent element in the main clause.

The sentence that precedes, (7), is about the same topic, the storing of leaves for the winter (*Agr. 5.8 frondem populneam, ulmeam, querneam caedito per tempus, eam condito non peraridam, pabulum ouibus*).

(7) **item faenum cordum, sicilimenta de prato**, **ea arida condito**

*CATO Agr. 5.8*

‘Second-crop hay and the aftermath should also be stored dry.’

There is a contrast here between the way the *frondem populneam*, etc., should be stored (*non peraridam* ‘before they are entirely dry’) in the previous sentence and the way the *faenum cordum* and *sicilimenta* in (7) are to be stored (*arida*, ‘dry’). The pragmatic organization of (7) is similar to that of (3) and (4).

In all three sentences, the initial element—a list in (3) and (7)—expresses a contrastive topic, and the focus is on the object or another verbal complement.

In (8), the object pronoun *id* in the main clause is not formally the resumption of the initial noun *prata irrigiua*, despite being loosely co-referent with it:

(8) **prata irrigiua**, si aquam habebis, **id** potissimum facito

*CATO Agr. 9*

‘If you have a water supply, pay particular attention to water meadows.’
In this and the preceding paragraphs (Agr. 8 and 9), Cato gives instructions on what to do with different types of land. *Prata irrigiua* can be taken as the topic, if we accept that focus falls on *potissimum*. Water as an element is present in the preceding sentence, where Cato mentions plants that will fare well in damp ground. Hence *prata irrigiua* is to some extent Accessible in the context.

The next example features an apparently unmotivated accusative at the head of the sentence. However, as I have argued earlier (Halla-aho 2009: 117–118), a verb must be understood to go with *terram*, as this type of unmotivated accusatives are a demonstrably much later phenomenon in Latin:

(9) terram quam maxime cretosam uel rubricosam, eo amurcam infundito, paleas indito

*CATO Agr. 128*

‘Take very chalky or red earth, pour amurca over it and add chopped straw.’

Here, the specific type of earth to be used may be analysed as the topic of the predication. Another example of a seemingly unmotivated accusative is Cato Agr. 7.4 *oleas orchites, posias, eae optime conduntur uel uirides in muria uel in lentisco contusae*. There, the initial accusative is caused by the predicates of the preceding sentence *serito aut inserito* (Agr. 7.4), which we must understand here, too, to explain the case form (Svennung 1935: 186 fn. 1). Because of the need to supply a verb form to explain the case, these two constructions cannot be classified as left-dislocation.

### 5.2.2 Constructions with Relative Clauses

The constructions quoted from Cato so far have not included relative clauses, examples of which are now discussed in this section. It seems reasonable to separate these two groups, since relative clause syntax interferes with left-dislocation in several ways in the republican Latin corpus. In most of the examples in Cato, the head noun is potentially internal to the relative clause.

The first of these examples, (10), shows the same syntactic pattern as (2)–(5) above, without relative clauses—namely, anticipation of the main clause case, in the accusative. The intervening restrictive relative clause is in the nominative.

(10) *columellam ferream, quae in miliario stat, eam rectam stare oportet in medio ad perpendiculum, cuneis salignis circumfigi oportet bene, eo plumbum effundere, caueat ni labet columella*

*CATO Agr. 20.1*
'The iron pivot which stands on the post must stand straight upright in the centre; it should be fastened firmly on all sides with willow wedges, and lead should be poured over it to prevent it from shaking.'

The iron pivot is a Brand New element at this point of discourse, and it needed to be defined with the relative clause before it could serve as the topic of the expression. This construction is the only one in Cato where the dislocated element is in the accusative, preceding a relative clause in the nominative. It shows how the main clause case can affect the dislocated constituent across the relative clause, supporting the analysis that the main clause case is decisive. On the other hand, it is difficult to say what made *columellam ferream* be inflected in the accusative, when other head nouns in similar contexts, as in (11)–(13) below, occur in the nominative together with the relative pronoun (and are, hence, potentially head-internal). One difference is the presence of other fronted elements, of which there are none in (10); see below (11)–(13). Another difference is the predicate of the relative clause, which is *stare* in (10) and *esse* in (11)–(13).

Furthermore, there are examples in Cato, where the pattern we see in (10) (head noun in the accusative, relative pronoun in the nominative) appears without resumption in the main clause: *Agr. 38.4* (*uirgas et sarmenta, quae tibi usioni supererunt, in segete comburito*); *Agr. 89* (*gallinas teneras, quae primum parierint, concludat*). Both of these examples have the initial noun in the accusative, as required by the main clause predicate, but the relative pronoun is in the nominative.\(^3\) In the context of the present work, the obvious question is whether it is possible to find a reason that would account for the presence of resumption in (10) against the absence of such resumption in the two sentences just quoted. There is at least one such potential reason. In (10), *columellam ferream* is a Brand New element, whereas, in the constructions without resumption, the initial objects *uirgas et sarmenta* and *gallinas teneras* are Active in the context.

It may be noted at this point that there are no examples in Cato of a relative clause with a fronted head and case disagreement between the head and the main clause reference but no resumption. This would be the relative clause

\(^3\) Other sentence-initial relative clauses with external heads show case agreement between the relative clause and the main clause (14 instances, mainly in the accusative; e.g., *Agr. 37.3 ridicas et palos, quos pridie in tecto posueris, siccus dolato, faculas facito, stercus egerito*). Case disagreement with neuters or other formally ambiguous forms is found in three places (*Agr. 2.7; 18.6; 109*, assuming that the initial noun represents the case required by the main clause).
equivalent of the type seen in (18) below (olea ubi nigra erit, stringito), where the fronted noun is not resumed in the main clause, even though the case form required in the main clause is not that of the fronted constituent.

Other left-dislocation constructions with relative clauses in Cato have the fronted constituent in the nominative, preceding a relative pronoun in the nominative (i.e., thematic nominatives). The next two examples are practically the same predication and come from identical contexts (duplicate passages on the layering of trees). In both (11) and (12), the head noun pulli and the relative pronoun are in the nominative, and the resumption is in the accusative, as it is the object of the main clause predicate.

(11) ab arbore abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos in terram deprimito extollitoque primorem partem, uti radicem capiat

\textit{Cato Agr. 51}

‘Press into the earth the scions which spring from the ground around the trees, elevating the tip so that it will take root.’

(12) arboribus ab terra pulli qui nati erunt, eos in terram deprimito, extollito, uti radicem capere possint

\textit{Cato Agr. 133.1}

The head noun is fronted along with other material from the relative clause (\textit{ab arbore abs terra/arboribus ab terra}). The difference between (10) above and these examples is that, here, the fronted constituent remains in the nominative and does not anticipate the case of its main clause reference. One possible reason for this different treatment of grammatical case is that, in (11) and (12), additional elements have been fronted from the relative clause along with the head noun.

There is yet another example of the same pattern in (13). Here, too, the fronted head is accompanied by further attributes, and the resumption is in the accusative (note, however, that the head noun \textit{arbores crassiores} can be either the nominative or the accusative):

(13) arbores crassiores digitis quinque quae erunt, eas praecisas serito oblititoque fimo summas et foliis alligato

\textit{Cato Agr. 28.2}

‘Before transplanting, cut off the tops of trees which are more than five fingers in diameter and smear the scars with dung and wrap them in leaves.’
On all three occasions, (11)–(13), the head nouns are topics of their sentences. They are not Brand New elements but are rather expected in their contexts. However, it is noteworthy that, in all three constructions, additional elements of the relative clause are fronted alongside the head noun.

We have seen above that it is possible for a head noun to take the case required by the main clause, overriding the case of the relative pronoun—both with the resumption, as in (10), and without the resumption, as in Agr. 38.4 and Agr. 89, cited above. Therefore, because there demonstrably exist constructions without such attraction, the implication is that (11)–(13) could, in principle at least, be analysed as attractions from the accusative (*pullos qui nati erunt, eos) to the nominative (note, however, my reservations about this possibility). Indeed, all three constructions have usually been analysed as attractions. The source construction of such attractions would be either that in (10) or similar constructions without resumption. However, I argue that this is not the case.

First of all, we notice that, in (11)–(13), there are other elements besides the head noun that precede the relative pronoun and which are needed to define the head noun. In fact, all elements excluding the predicate of the relative clause precede the relative pronoun. In the two constructions where there is no resumption and the head noun takes the case required by the main clause predicate, there are no such additional elements in the relative clauses. On the contrary, these constructions are short and simple (Agr. 38.4 quae tibi usioni supererunt; Agr. 89 quae primum parierint). My interpretation is that, in (11)–(13), there are pragmatic needs that cause the fronting of other elements besides the head noun out of the relative clause (ab arbore abs terra/arboribus ab terra, crassiores digitis quinque). These are used to define the topic in each instance, and their fronted placement highlights the fact that the head noun, too, has been fronted out of the relative clause. Its inflection in the nominative is therefore to be expected. A resumptive pronoun in the main clause is then used to express the required syntactical relation. In other words, this is a typical example of left-dislocation. The fact that, in these particular constructions, the head could not, in practical terms, have been inflected in the accusative case means that attraction is not the correct interpretation, even in theory. We have to remember that, in De agricultura, there are no examples of case disagreement with head-external relative clauses without resumption (and even generally, besides accusative attractions, there are only two instances in Plautus, for which see 3.2.1).

The pattern we see in (11)–(13) is the same as that in (32) and (33) below and in (9) and (10) of chapter 4, from Lex Puteolana. All of the constructions in (11)–(13) have a head noun that is defined by attributes and a restrictive rel-
ative clause. The relative clause usually has esse as the predicate. This entity is the object of the main clause and is resumed by a pronominal expression in the accusative. This pattern is attested for prose texts across several genres (historical narrative in Ennius, semi-legal recording of a building process in Lex Puteolana and the technical-instructive prose of Cato). On the basis of the reasons given above, I argue that this construction is not one of attraction from the accusative to the nominative but rather a pattern of first identifying the referent with attributes and a restrictive relative clause then making a predication about this referent. The identification of the referent happens in the nominative, the neutral naming case in Latin of this period. Moreover, it is only to be expected that the identification be made by means of a relative clause where the relative pronoun is in the nominative and is the subject of esse.

Alternatively, it is possible to say that the head noun was fronted out of its relative clause and that this fronting was caused by the same pragmatic factors that give rise to left-dislocation.

The next example opens the paragraph on the duties of the overseer. The uilici officia are a Brand New element and the topic of the predication. This and the following examples continue the pattern seen above in (11)–(13), where the initial constituent is the subject of a relative clause (usually with esse):

(14) **uilici officia quae sunt, quae dominus praecepit, ea omnia, quae in fundo fieri oportet quaeque emi pararique oportet, quo modoque cibaria, uestimenta, familiae dari oportet, eadem uti curet faciatque moneo dominoque dicto audiens sit**

*Cato Agr. 142*

‘Those things which are the duty of the overseer, the instructions which the master has given, all those things which should be done the farm and what should be bought or brought in, and how food and raiment should be issued to the servants—the same I warn that he do and perform, and that he hearken to the master’s instructions.’

This construction apparently has a double resumption, first *ea omnia* and later *eadem*. However, the first of these, *ea omnia*, is perhaps more of a parenthetical expression meant to define *uilici officia* in greater detail and is itself followed by further relative clauses and an indirect question. I suggest that the final

---

4 If *omnis* is classified as constituting a resumption, another similar example can be found in *Agr. 145.22* (*factores qui oleum fecerint omnes iuranto aut ad dominum aut ad custodem sese de*
resumption *eadem* is needed here because of the long and bipartite description of *uilici officia*, and it is thus partly motivated by syntactic considerations (the need to retain coherence in a long sentence).

In two places, an initial constituent in the nominative occurs together with an adverbial resumption in the main clause.

(15) *olea, quae diu fuerit* in terra aut in tabulato, *inde* olei minus fiet et deterius

Cato Agr. 64.2

‘Olives which have been long on the ground or the floor will yield less oil and of poorer quality.’

(16) *ager rubricosus et terra pulla*, materina, rudecta, harenosa, item *quae aquosa non erit*, *ibi* lupinum bonum erit

Cato Agr. 34.2

‘Lupine will do well in soil that is reddish, and also in ground that is dark, or hard, or poor, or sandy, or not wet.’

In (15), *olea* is an Active constituent in the context, and, in (16), the passage is about what to plant in different types of land.

I do not analyse these as attractions because of the reasons given above for (11)–(13).⁵ The initial clauses serve to identify the referent, after which a predication about them can then be made. However, we cannot dismiss an explanation as attraction merely on the supposed basis of the use of the prepositional phrase as the initial constituent. The initial constituent in Cato does sometimes take the form required by the main clause in contexts similar to (16),⁶ i.e., a phrase like *in agro* can begin a sentence. For example, immediately after (16), we find *in creta et uligine et rubrica et ager qui aquosus erit*, *semen adorem potissimum serito*, which has a prepositional phrase at the start of the sentence (e.g., 33.3 *in uinea utere serito ocinum*; 6.1 *in agro crasso et caldo oleam fundo L. Manli neque alium quemquam suo dolo malo oleum neque oleam subripuisse*). Plautus has one listing left-dislocation resumed by *omnia*.

---


⁶ Bach (1888: 34) thought that, unlike Plautus, Cato does not normally allow attraction to take place. If the two clauses demand a different case, Cato uses a head-internal relative clause, and attraction does not happen. This is not, however, quite accurate. The number of both types of constructions is small.
conditiam, with ager but without a relative clause and with a predicate (serito) to be supplied from the context). Such constructions would seem to suggest that (16) should be understood as an attraction from *in agro rubricoso et terra pulla ... quae to ager rubricosus et terra pulla ... quae.

However, there is evidence that points to another direction, against taking (16) as an attraction. In De agricultura, it happens more than once that ager or locus is left without a locatival prepositional expression, if the relationship is clear from the context: Agr. 35.2 hordeum, qui locus nouus erit, aut qui restibilis fieri poterit, serito (ellipsis of in loco), which is both preceded and followed by complete constructions (in loco aperto celso ubi ... seri oportet and trimestre[m] quo in loco ... facere non potueris et qui locus ... fieri poterit, seri oportet). In fact, it seems that a prepositional locative in the relative (or other initial) construction and ibi in the subsequent clause seem to be mutually exclusive; the style is very elliptical. Importantly, there is an expression where ager is in the nominative without a relative clause (and without ibi in the main clause): Agr. 6.1 idem ager, si nebulosus est, rapa, raphanos, milium panicum, id maxime seri oportet. Here, we see that ager can appear in the nominative at the start of the sentence to express a location even without a relative pronoun influencing the case form.

At this point, it is worth considering the variation in relative clause syntax in De agricultura (namely, placement of the head noun and the presence of resumption in the main clause). Cato's work does not contain many head-internal relative clauses.7 Head-internal relative clauses with resumption are mainly used in defining land types suitable to particular plants, where resumption in the main clause is often performed by ibi: 6.2 qui ager frigidior et macrior erit, ibi; 6.4 qui locus crassus ... ibi; 7.2 quas ... duracinas ... ea (with the head noun uuas to be supplied from the preceding sentence); 34.2 quae loca sicca ... ibi; 44.1 qua locus ... erit, quae arida erunt ... ea omnia eximito; 135 qui ager longe a mari aberit, ibi; further examples in 42.1 quod genus ... inde; 136.1 qua ex parte ... eam partem.8 In addition, there are at least four instances of the head-internal type without resumption (A2) (6.4 qui locus; 17.1 quae materies; 31.2 quae materies; 40.1 quem ramum; ellipsis of ibi at 6.4, others with case agreement). It seems that no difference in information structure or pragmatics can be discerned between head-internal relative clauses and left-dislocation.9

---

7 On correlative constructions (type A1, together with preposed autonomous relative clauses) in Cato, see Probert and Dickey (2016: 405–408).
8 This example is written in a legal style, coming from a context where Cato gives instructions on letting the tending of the land to a share tenant (Agr. 136 si communiter pisunt, qua ex parte politor pars est, eam partem in pistrinum politor).
9 Probert and Dickey (2016: 403) give a total of 25 correlative sentences with explicit resump-
In addition to relative clauses, other types of subordinate clauses in Cato may also present a pattern where the subordinate clause precedes its main clause, and the subject of this subordinate clause is fronted, appearing before the subordinating conjunction. There is variation as to whether or not the main clause has a resumptive element. In (17), the initial noun *bos* is taken up in the main clause in the dative.

(17) *bos, si aegrotare coeperit*, dato continuo *ei unum ouum gallinaceum crudum*  
*Cato Agr. 71*

‘If an ox begins to sicken, administer at once one hen’s egg raw.’

The noun *bos* is Active in the context and is the topic of this passage. Oxen and remedies for their ills have been discussed even in the preceding paragraph. There, however, the topic was the actions to be taken in advance, for efficient prevention of sickness (*Agr. 70 si morbum metues*). In (17), the topic shifts to instructions for the situation when the ox already shows signs of being unwell. In other words, *si aegrotare coeperit* marks a constrastive topic.

The following examples, (18)–(19), come close to being left-dislocation because of case disagreement left without overt expression. A fronted subject of the subordinate clause occurs without any resumptive element in the main clause, when the expected case form is the accusative (in other words, ellipsis of the object pronoun).

(18) *olea ubi nigra erit*, stringito  
*Cato Agr. 65.1*

‘Pick olives after they have turned black.’

(19) *olea si fructum non feret*, ablaqueato  
*Cato Agr. 93*

‘If an olive tree is sterile, trench it.’

Latin allows unconstrained use of ellipsis (non-instantiation of arguments), and, with a subject placed clause-internally, these constructions would be
nothing out of the ordinary (*Agr. 33.4 ubi uinea frondere coeperit, pampinato*). However, the subject in fronted position produces a certain discontinuity in these constructions, because the constituent that is the object of the main clause predicate appears in the nominative and, because it is fronted out of its clause, stands alone, as if governed by no predicate. In the absence of a relative clause, the case of the fronted subject cannot have been caused by the case form of the relative pronoun.

The common feature in (18)–(19) that sets them apart from (17) above is the case form of the fronted constituent in the main clause, the accusative when it is left out in (18)–(19) and the dative in (17). The simplest explanation is that case syntax is decisive for the use of resumption in (17). Just like an element in the nominative, an element in the accusative could be left out for the reader to supply, whereas an element in the dative could not be. There are four further instances in the *De agricultura* of the pattern seen in (18)–(19), where an initial subject of the subordinate clause introduced by *ubi, sī* or *cum* is the object of the main clause, but there is no resumption in the main clause (*Agr. 17.2 eae, ubi primum incipiunt hiascere, tum legi oportet; Agr. 64 olea ubi matura erit, quam primum cogī oportet, quam minimum in terra et in tabulato esse oportet; Agr. 99 fici aridae sī voles ut integrae sint, in uas fictile condito; Agr. 115 uites, cum ablaqueabuntur, signato rubrica, ne admisceas cum cetero uino*).

It seems that Cato did not have the option in these constructions of inflecting the initial noun as accusative and, by so doing, making it part of the main clause. In subordinate clauses with *ubi, sī* and *cum*, the pattern *oleam ubi nigra erit stringito* is not found in Cato. If an element that is the subject or object of one of these clauses is fronted to appear before the subordinating conjunction, it takes the case of the subordinate clause and not the case of the main clause.10 Moreover, it is never resumed in the main clause with an anaphoric pronoun in the case required by the main clause.11 This can be taken to mean that the subject is in fact internal to the subordinate clause, and the fronting is simply a matter of surface word order, so these examples should not be classified as left-dislocation (for additional examples, see chapter 1.5).12

We may further note an example of this pattern with *ita* in 144.2 (*scalae ita uti datae erunt, ita reddito, nisi quae uetustate fractae erunt*). Havers (1926: 228)

10 The opposite pattern (initial object + ellipsis of main clause subject) is found in *Agr. 98 and 157* (with *sī* clauses).

11 Note, however, *Agr. 6.1 ubi ager crassus et laetus est sine arboribus, eum agrum frumentari-ium esse oportet* (with an internal subject and a resumption including the noun).

12 It is difficult to say whether there was a pragmatic reason for preposing the subject. For example, in (18), *olea* is an Active element, and occurs as the subject even in the preceding context, whereas, in (19), *olea* marks a topic change.
compared this with Agr. 146.3 (\textit{uasa torcula, funes, scalas, trapetos, siquid et aliiut datum erit, salua recte reddito, nisi quae uetustate fracta erunt}), where a similar phrase occurs with the initial object in the accusative, as required by the syntax. He concluded that the first example (144.2), with its initial nominative and a subsequent break in the syntax, conveys a special emphasis that is lacking in the second example. However, I fail to see here any special emphasis, preferring instead a syntactic motivation. The reason for the different cases in which the initial element is inflected must lie in the subordinate clause, of which \textit{scalae} in the first example is a member. This cannot be in the accusative case, as it is the subject of the \textit{ita uti} clause. What is expressed with a subordinate clause in the first example is expressed by the sole adjective \textit{salua} in the latter one (\textit{salua} = \textit{ita uti datae erunt}).

5.2.3 \textbf{Lists and Resumption with haec omnia}

Finally, there is a group of constructions where dislocated elements are followed by a pronominal resumption but that otherwise do not share the pattern of the examples of left-dislocation discussed above. These are long lists of sentence-initial objects (in the accusative) taken up by \textit{haec} (\textit{omnia}).

Example (20) continues the same topic shortly after (3), with a long list and a subsequent resumption.

(20) sub urbe \textit{hortum omne genus, coronamenta omne genus, bulbos mag-}
\textit{aricos, murtum coniugulum et album et nigrum, loream delphicam et}
\textit{cypream et siluaticam, nuces caluas, abellanas, praenestinas, graecas,}
\textit{haec facito uti serantur}^{13}

\textit{Cato Agr. 8.2}

‘Near a town it is well to have a garden planted with all manner of vegetables and all manner of flowers for garlands—Megarian bulbs, conjugulan myrtle ... and Greek filberts.’

Here, the plants are focal and the verb \textit{serito} is topical.

The following two examples, (21) and (22), come from two passages in different parts of the work, where the same topic is handled with closely matching phraseology. These examples are preceded by (11) and (12), respectively, cited above. Here, Cato gives instructions on how to layer trees.

---

^{13} This example most probably has a proleptic accusative in the main clause, as the neuter \textit{haec omnia} is expected to be in the accusative after the list in the accusative.
(21) *ficum, oleam, malum punicum, cotoneum, aliaque mala omnia, laurum, myrtum, nuces praenestinas, platanum, haec omnia a capite propagari eximique serique eodem modo oportet*

*Cato Agr. 51*

‘Fig, olive, pomegranate ... Praenestine nuts, and planes, should all be layered, dug and transplanted in the same way.’

Here, the verb is topical, as it picks up the instructions from the preceding sentence (*propagari eximique serique eodem modo oportet*). Similarly, in (22), the verbal part is topical (*ad hunc modum*, referring backwards), because the layering of trees has been instructed on in the preceding context:

(22) *ficum, oleam, malum punicum, mala strutea, cotonia aliaque mala omnia, laurum cypriam, delphicam, prunum, myrtum coniuolum et myrtum album et nigrum, nuces abellanas, praenestinas, platanum, haec omnia genera a capitibus propagari eximique ad hunc modum oportebit*

*Cato Agr. 133.2*

‘In this way you should propagate from the crown and transplant fig, olive, pomegranate ... and plane trees.’

In the next example, Cato is concerned with the welfare of the cattle. The three ingredients are taken up by *haec omnia* in the main clause. Of these three, the skin (*eam pellem*) has already been mentioned (*pellem anguinam*, earlier in *Agr. 73*).

(23) *eam pellem et far et salem et serpullum, haec omnia una conterito cum uino, dato bubus bibant*

*Cato Agr. 73*

‘Macerate this skin, spelt, salt and thyme with wine, and give it to all the cattle to drink.’

In these four examples, the initial lists of elements are in the accusative, anticipating their role in the main clause. Syntactically, these constructions satisfy the criteria of left-dislocation, but, in their information structure, they do not align with the majority pattern, where the dislocated constituent is the topic of the predication. Instead, they are closer in their function to being focus
constituents. At least in some of the contexts of (20)–(23), it appears that the verbal part is topical, if it has been present in preceding context, and the LD construction mentions further elements for which the same action is to be performed. The same was seen above in (4)—cf. also the argument-focus structure attested in comedy; see 3.3.6. In contexts where the verb is presupposed, it may be left completely unexpressed, resulting in lists in the accusative with a verb understood but left unexpressed (for example, Agr. 14.1–2 and 135; close to the so-called recipe accusative).

It is clear from (22)–(23) above that Cato often employs a resuming element after a long list of items that serve as objects (or other complements). This is not, however, a rule. Even long initial lists of objects may not have a resumptive pronoun, such as the list of utensils in Agr. 26 uindemia facta uasa torcula, corbulae, fiscinas, funis, patibula, fibulas iubeto suo quidquid loco condi. Elsewhere, there may be an expression appended to the end of list that, in a way, sums up what precedes without being an actual resumption: Agr. 68 funes torculos, melipontos, subductarios in carnario aut in prelo suspendito; orbes, fibulas, uectes, scutulas, fiscinas, corbulae, quala, scalas, patibula, omnia quis usus erit, in suo quidque loco reponito (equipment to be put back to their proper places after harvesting); Agr. 7.3–7.4. poma mala strutea, Cotonea, Scantiana, Quirinia, item alia conditius, mala mustea et Punica (eo lotium suillum aut stercus ad radicem addere oportet, uti pabulum malorum fiant), pira uolaema, anicieta, euniciita, haec conditius in sapa bona erunt, tarentina, mustea, cucurbitiuta, item alia genera quam pluri(s) serito aut inserito (a long list of fruit to be planted). The expressions omnia quis usus erit and item alia genera quam pluri(s) may have contributed to the absence of a resumption.

We saw above, in (3), a pattern where a sentence without resumption in the main clause is followed by one with resumption. In (24), there is another example of such an organization, in the context of a list of the housekeeper’s duties.

(24) mala scantiniana in dolis et alia quae condi solent et silucarta, haec omnia quotannis uti condita habeat

CATO Agr. 143.3

‘Scantian quinces in jars, and other fruits that are usually preserved, as well as wild fruits, all these she must store away diligently every year.’

Translation adapted from HOOPER and ASH

Here, as in (3), the preceding sentence does not have a resumptive pronoun (Agr. 143.3 pira arida, sorba, ficos, uuas passas, sorba in sapa et pira et uuas in dolis et mala strutea, uuas in uinaciis et in urceis in terra obrutas et nucus Praen-
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estinas recentes in urceo in terra obrutas habeat. However, unlike in (3), where the resumption in the latter part was caused by contrast, it is difficult to see any pragmatic difference here. One can, of course, say that the resumption haec omnia in (24) helps to highlight quotannis and make it a focus, but this may be reading too much into the sentence, as quotannis does not otherwise appear to be important in the context, and it does not stand in contrast with anything else.14

It seems that haec (omnia) is used in longer lists to resume the contents of the list mainly as a syntactic device and without any (or, in any case, much) information structuring or pragmatic information. There is only one instance of a list where the resumption happens with is, (3) above, where a different situation is at work—there, the initial list of plants marks a contrastive topic and, by doing so, helps to centre the focus on the type of land where these plants are to be planted. This corresponds nicely with the fact that the pronoun used in resuming the lists above is haec and that, in them, no such motivation can be found.

5.2.4 Discussion
Left-dislocation in Cato’s De agricultura is less tightly connected with information structure than the phenomenon is in Plautus. This is due to the nature of the work and its instructive genre. Brand New elements, even without anchoring devices or prior introduction, regularly come up in the work, and such elements frequently have topic status. This is allowed in the context of this work, where elements from certain semantic fields are assumed to be known for the reader, even without any previous mention. Nevertheless, a combination of information structure and pragmatic organization can be identified in the majority of constructions discussed in this chapter.

First of all, a contrastive context appears to be a factor motivating more than one left-dislocation. Such a context is found in (1), (3), (4), (7) and (17). Of these, (1) is somewhat exceptional, in that cancer ater is the first element in the contrasting pair. The other four are the second elements in the pair, which is perhaps the normal case. Such second elements in contrasting pairs are neces-

14 Note that, here, it is possible to put the sentence-end in a different place and take the initial elements as dependent of the verb habeat, as a kind of afterthought. Then, haec omnia could begin a new clause. In fact, the translation in Hooper and Ash follows this interpretation (‘… and Scantian quinces in jars … as well as wild fruits. All these she must store away diligently every year’). Another possible occurrence of this pattern is Agr. 58 postea oleas tempestiuas.
narily Active, given that it stands in contrast with another element of the same kind just mentioned. Left-dislocation in Cato is found also in contexts where the element occurs for the first time or is in need of a more elaborate definition than solely the mention of its name, or both. An example is (10), an element that is Brand New at this point of the discourse and one that is not identifiable solely by the mention of its name (a pivot). The reader needs to know what the pivot is that Cato is talking about. Another example is (5), where the dislocated element is followed by a long definition. In this construction, the definition is, in fact, so long that the resumption is needed for syntactical reasons, as well as to make the sentence coherent. Shorter definitions are found in (11)–(13), constructions for which parallels can be found in the legal inscriptions and in Plautus. The part of the clause preceding the relative pronoun includes both Active and New elements—Active: *arboribus/ab arbore, arbores, paries* twice; New: *pulli, in area trans uiam, maceria extrema, crassiores digitis quinque*.

In (14) is a nice example of how left-dislocation works, when we compare it with the beginning of the following paragraph (*Agr. 143*). In (14), the construction opens the paragraph and is the first mention of the topic of the overseer’s duties. It is because of this, I argue, that *uilici officia* is preposed, appearing before the relative pronoun. The *officia* are given a long description and a resumption with *eadem* follows in the main clause. Again, a syntactic motivation may play a part in the use of resumption here, given that the predicate would be at some remove from the object without it. In the next paragraph, however, a simpler construction is used to introduce the housekeeper’s duties (*Agr. 143 uilicae quae sunt officia curato faciat*). We notice that, here, only *uilicae* is fronted from the relative clause, with *officia*, now a topical element, appearing inside the relative clause. Moreover, all of *uilicae quae sunt officia* serve as the object of *curato faciat*, without any further description or resumption.

I mentioned above the syntactic motivation, which I define as the need to add a resumptive element in the same grammatical case, if the initial definition is so long as to threaten the cohesion of the sentence. However, even this type of motivation may have and often has had pragmatic roots. If the element is Brand New and not expected, it can easily be in need of an elaborate definition (which, in turn, results in a long sentence).

There is an interesting correlation between the presence of relative clauses and case syntax. With one exception, all examples without relative clauses are instances of anticipation of the main clause case, in accusative, whereas, again with one exception, the constructions with relative clauses are thematic nominatives. This is in agreement with the view that the head nouns of the relative
clauses are, in reality, internal to the relative clause and are in the nominative because of this.

Listing LDs introduce a new element into the discourse, but it is not clear whether or not these are the topics of their predications. If, for example, a paragraph is about sewing or planting, it would appear that, within the topic ‘what to plant when/where’, the names of the plants should be closer to being foci than topics, if the question they answer is, ‘What should I plant in this type of land?’ However, in these constructions, it is also possible to take the specific type of land as the focus, which would result in the entire sentence carrying the focus in that particular context (broad-scope focus), as if answering the question, ‘How should I proceed with planting?’—‘This and this type you should plant there, while these will do better in such and such land.’

5.3 Roman Historians and Orators

In this chapter, I discuss examples of left-dislocation in the fragments of Roman historians and orators. There are five examples from Cato (two from Origines and three from his orations) and one each from Claudius Quadrigarius, T. Annius Luscus, Ennius, C. Trebatius Testa and C. Sempronius Gracchus.

5.3.1 M. Porcius Cato

I begin with two attractions in the accusative from Cato. In chapter 3, accusative attractions in comedy were described. The results showed that they can be divided into roughly three categories: 1) an internal head (eunuchum quem), 2) attractions of pronouns (iste, ille) and personal names without resumption and 3) complex constructions mostly with resumption. In chapter 2, two explanations for attractio inuersa were mentioned. The traditional explanation is that what we see in these constructions is, indeed, an attraction. The head noun is not in the case it would be in as a constituent of the main clause. Instead, it is attracted from this expected case form to that of the relative pronoun next to which it stands. The other explanation for this phenomenon is based on the Indo-European history of the Latin relative pronoun and the possibility for head nouns to be, in fact, internal to the relative clause, occurring in a fronted position before the relative pronoun. This presumably reflects the origin of the Latin relative pronoun as an indefinite pronoun. According to this view, there is no attraction, but the head noun is simply in the case form it would have been in anyway, because it remains internal to the relative clause (see the references given in chapter 2.2). We have seen that the same problem concerns heads and relative pronouns in the nominative as well. However, I have argued that, for
antecedents in the nominative, an explanation as attraction is ill suited, regardless of what one thinks about the status of the head noun (internal / external to the relative clause).

Supporting evidence for the traditional explanation as attractions can be drawn from the fact that attraction in Latin can also happen occasionally with adverbs and that attractions in similar contexts can be found in other languages besides Latin (and Greek), where an explanation drawing on relative clause syntax is not possible. Indeed, in chapter 3, it was pointed out that attractions found in comedy in most occasions cannot be explained as fronted heads of relative clauses and that this is because the head of the relative pronoun is modified by a demonstrative pronoun or is a pronoun itself (on pronouns as antecedents, see 2.2.2.2).

Outside comedy, there are four attractions in the accusative. These are example (80) from Lucretius in 3.7., example (46) from Varro below and two attractions from Cato’s fragmentary works. The first example, (25), comes from the historical work *Origines* and the second, (26), from one of Cato’s speeches.

(25) agrum quem Volsci habuerunt, campestris plerus Aboriginum fuit

\[ \text{Cato Orig. FRHist 24 [Prisc. GL 11, book V p. 182]} \]

‘The land that the Volscians held, the greater part of it flat, belonged to the Aborigines.’\(^{15}\)

This fragment from the first book is cited by Priscian for the ancient use of *plerus* without the enclitic *–que*: ‘Cato ... in I Originum: agrum quem ... fuit’. Unfortunately there is no context here. Briscoe (2010: 155–156) draws attention to the colloquial register of the fragment. However, as I have pointed out above, in this particular type of attraction, with an unmodified nominal head noun that is potentially head-internal, it is best to accept the explanation that this is a fronted head of a head-internal relative clause (*quem agrum*). If this is indeed the case, then the reason for fronting must be explained.

Exactly the same questions of origin and register concern (26), which even happens to have the same head noun.

(26) agrum quem uir habet tollitur

\[ \text{Cato Orat. Jordan 32.2 (p. 54, 9) = Malcovati 159 (Oratio 40) [Servius ad Verg. Aen. 1.573]} \]
‘The field that the husband owns is being confiscated.’

This sentence is cited by Servius as a parallel to *urbem quam statuo uestra est* in Verg. *Aen.* 1.573. Servius comments on the Virgil passage thus: *hoc schema de antiquioribus sumptum possimus accipere. ait enim Cato in legem Voconiam ‘agrum ... tollitur’.* This citation comes from Cato’s speech in support of *lex Voconia* (*suasio legis Voconiae*), but we do not have the linguistic context for this fragment. Such quotations of early authors often survive because of their linguistic oddities, which, nevertheless, are usually of a lexicological or morphological nature. The quotation in (26), exceptionally, was quoted by Servius as a syntactic parallel to the construction found in Virgil.

As we have no context for either (25) or (26), it is next to impossible to say anything about why the head may have been fronted out of the relative clause or why the attraction, if that is the case, happened. The important point, however, is that there exist two such constructions in Cato, one in *Origines* and the other in one of his speeches, and that they are syntactically paralleled only in Terence (*Eun.* 653) and Virgil. The constructions in Virgil and Cato may be connected by a degree of archaism and solemnity. In Cato, the source construction of (25) and (26) would be *quem agrum ... fuit/tollitur*. However, Cato does not (at least in *De agricultura*) have examples of such constructions, where a head-internal relative clause shows case disagreement but has no resumption.

Looking now at the (accusative) attractions, the following observations can be made. Cato’s attractions (*agrum quem*) share the pattern of the Terentian example *eunuchum quem* (and Virgil’s *urbem quam*). Nearly all examples of attractions that are not explainable as internal heads come from Plautus. This distribution points to the direction that the constructions in Plautus are largely due to his own invention rather than due to any established pattern of the Latin language. They may be based on phenomena that were current in spoken language and that were thus taken over by Plautus, used (as well as probably extended) for artistic or comical purposes. The *agrum quem* type, on the other, appears to be a reflection of archaic syntax. The Virgilian example has been plausibly interpreted as a solemn archaism (Fraenkel 1954), and the two examples of *agrum quem* in Cato, even with no context, are possibly explainable in the same way. But what about the Terentian example? There is nothing in the

16 Translations of orators are my own.
17 Terence, on the other hand, does have such a construction (*Andr.* 26 *quas comoedias*), but, there, the whole relative clause construction is embedded in the matrix clause.
context that would point to the likelihood of an arhaic or solemn expression.\textsuperscript{18} Whether there is a connection between Plautus and the others, in the sense that the archaic type is the source of the Plautine innovations, remains as yet unclear.

The next example has often been cited as an example of attraction with an adverb, but it can also be analysed as an anticipation, given that the reference in the main clause is in the dative. Syntactically, however, this construction does not qualify as a left-dislocation \textit{stricto sensu}, because it is not sentence-initial but rather preceded by multiple subordinate clauses and is governed by the initial main clause \textit{atque ego a maioribus memoria sic accepi}.

\textbf{(27) illi unde petitur, ei potius credendum esse}
\begin{flushright}
\textit{Cato Orat. Jordan 51 = Malcovati 206 (Oratio 58) [Gell 14.2.21]}
\end{flushright}

‘The person who is being sued, he should be believed in the first instance.’

This is from Cato’s speech \textit{Pro L. Turio contra Cn. Gellium}. At the beginning, \textit{illi} is an anticipation of the main clause case, possibly strengthened by the adverb \textit{unde}. Cato’s formulation leaves open the possibility that the phrasing here follows the original \textit{(a maioribus memoria)}. Here, \textit{illi unde petitur} picks up the words \textit{siquis quid alter ab altero peterent} from two lines earlier. It is thus an Active element in the passage and can be said to be the topic of the predication.

The next example from Cato, which comes from \textit{Origines}, is a thematic nominative.

\textbf{(28) Leonides Laco, qui simile apud Thermopylas fecit, propter eius uirtutes omnis Graecia gloriam atque gratiam praecipuam claritudinis inclitisissimae decorauere monumentis}
\begin{flushright}
\textit{Cato Orig. FRHist 76.19 [Gell 3.7]}
\end{flushright}

‘In the case of the Laconian Leonides, who did something similar at Thermopylae, because of his valour all Greece has adorned his glory and exceptional esteem with memorials of the highest distinctions.’

Here, the personal name \textit{Leonides Laco} in the nominative is picked up by \textit{eius} in the main clause. This is at least the text of Cornell (2013), who aban-

\textsuperscript{18} One possible explanation for the Terence example is the accusative of exclamation.
dons Peter’s conjecture *qui(dem)*, on the grounds that, in early Latin there exist several parallels with such hanging elements followed by non-defining (non-restrictive) relative clauses. The passage is quoted verbatim by Gellius and concerns the Roman military tribune Q. Caedicius, who showed exceptional valour in battle against the Carthaginians by volunteering to lead a group of four hundred soldiers to distract the enemy, thus saving the main part of the army while at the same time commissioning himself and his soldiers to a seemingly inevitable death. Cato compares the tribune’s action to that of the famous Spartan, Leonides. Courtney (1999: 77) points out that ‘We must certainly recognize the wish to give prominence to the name.’ While this is surely the case, it is necessary to recognize that the initial nominative, instead of giving prominence, is essentially introducing (or re-introducing) Leonides into the narrative. Courtney argues, correctly, that the parallels for the construction are strong, and there is no need to alter the text (Courtney: ‘possibly a reverse attraction if not an anacoluthon’). However, the closest parallel to (28) is (30) below (not cited by Courtney), another construction with a proper name as the dislocated constituent (even if, there, the resumption is in the nominative). It is clear that (28) is not an example of attraction. It is inconceivable that Cato could have begun the sentence by putting *Leonides Laco* in the genitive to go with *propter*. Had he wished not to use a left-dislocation, he would have had to arrange the syntax in a completely different way. Of course, we do not know whether Leonides had been mentioned earlier in the episode in Cato. In Gellius’s quotation at least, the nominative dislocation is the first mention that is made of him. The translation of Cornell makes explicit the new topic here: ‘In the case of the Laconian Leonides’. The preceding sentence prepares for the change of topic: *sed idem benefactum quo in loco ponas nimium interest* ‘But the theater in which you perform the same service makes a huge difference’ (translation Cornell), turning from Caecidius to Leonides.

A thematic nominative is found even in (29), where the matrix construction of the dislocation is a *si* clause.

(29) *serui, ancillae, si quis eorum sub centone crepuit, quod ego non sensi, nullum mihi uitium facit.*

*CATO ORAT. JORDAN 18 FRG. 1 = MALCOVATI 73 (ORATIO 12) [FEST. LINDSAY P. 268, 18 = Gloss. Lat. IV P. 342]*

‘The slaves and servants, if one of them made noises under the blanket, what I did not hear, it does not hurt me.’
The subjects *serui* and *ancillae* are topical, and reference to them is made in the following predication as well (*si cui ibidem seruo aut ancillae*). They have not been mentioned before in the fragment, but the sentence that precedes (29) does refer to *domi*, which makes *serui* and *ancillae* Accessible in the context.

5.3.2 **Other Fragmentary Historians and Orators**

A construction that matches the construction of (28) closely is found in a quotation from Claudius Quadrigarius.

(30) *nam Marcus, inquit Manlius, quem Capitolium seruasse a Gallis supra ostendi, cuiusque operam cum M. Furio dictatore apud Gallos cumprime fortém atque exsuperabilem res publica sensit, is et genere et ui et uirtute bellica nemini concedebat*

 Q. CLAUDIUS QUADRIGARIUS *FRHist 3 [GELL. 17.2.14]*

‘“For,” he says, “Marcus Manlius, whom I showed earlier saved the Capitol from the Gauls and whose efforts, together with the dictator Marcus Furius, the Gauls—so the state realized—found eminently mighty and all-conquering, yielded to no one in birth and strength and courage in war.”’

Here, as in (28) above, the dislocated element is a personal name in the nominative. It is followed by a relative pronoun in the accusative. The resumption then follows in the nominative. The passage makes explicit that Marcus Manlius has been mentioned earlier and is thus an Active element as well as the topic. A connection with other constructions discussed in this chapter was recognized already by Wölflin (1908: 15): ‘Das Subjekt des Hauptsatzes wird nach Einschiebung längerer Satzteile durch *is* wieder aufgenommen. Frg. 7 M. Manlius, quem ... ostendi cuiusque operam ... sensit, *is nemini concedebat*. Vgl. Cato *agr.* 157.3 cancer ater, *is olet*, Sall. Cat. 37.4 *sed urbana plebes, ea uero praeceps erat de multis causis.*’ One further example comes from *Bellum Africum*—see (39) below.

However, we must leave room for the possibility that the dislocation has its origin in Gellius rather than in Quadrigarius. Gellius himself used similar constructions, either as archaisms or as genuine features of his colloquial style.

The following is the only verbatim citation from T. Annius Luscus, an adversary of T. Sempronius Gracchus (Cic. *Brut.* 79 *T. Annium Luscum huius Q. Fului collegam non indisertum dicunt fuisse*). It was cited by Festus for the meaning of
**satura**, here allegedly in the meaning of a law put together from several earlier laws.

(31) **imperium** quod plebes per saturam dederat, *id* abrogatum est


‘The power that the people had collectively given, it was cancelled.’

What the fragment refers to remains unclear (Malcovati 1953: 106 ad loc.), since the power that had been taken away from the tribune M. Octavius by his colleague T. Gracchus was not **imperium** but **potestas**. Without any context, not much can be said about the informational status of **imperium**. Syntactically, though, the construction is of a familiar type.

Fragments of Ennius’s prose work *Euhemerus siue sacra historia* have been preserved by Lactantius in *Diuinae institutiones*. Example (32) derives from a fragment where Ennius tells about the beginnings of the disagreement between Saturn and Titan as to who should rule over the world. Titan agrees to give the throne to Saturn on the condition that the latter not raise any possible male offspring born to him, thus passing the throne eventually to the sons of Titan.

(32) tum Saturno filius qui primus natus est, *eum* necaverunt

ENN. Euhemerus VAHLEN frg. 3, p. 224 [LACT. DIU. INST. 1.14.4]

‘Next they slew the first son born to Saturn.’

Translation WARMINGTON

In (32) is recorded what happened to the first son of Saturn: he was killed. The male offspring have been mentioned in the preceding context (*si quid liberum uirile secus ei natum esset*), so that *filius qui* here is an Active element as well as a topic. The construction fosters dramatic emphasis on *eum necaverunt* in the main clause. Courtney (1999: 31) refers to the explanation given for (28), which he calls an anacoluthon or possibly a reverse attraction (*attractio inversa*). We have seen by now that this construction is indeed an established one in early Latin. Even closer syntactical parallels of (32) than (28) or the others given in Courtney (1999: 77) are, in fact, (11)–(13) above, (33) below, as well as (9) and (10) in chapter 4. These parallel constructions have common nouns as heads, whereas Leonides in (28) is a proper name. Moreover, with the exception of (33), in these constructions, other constituents of the relative clause
are fronted together with the head noun, causing a postponing of the relative pronoun (similar to what is often seen in Varro). The construction is thus not an attraction but a thematic nominative followed by a defining relative clause.

In the following example, the head noun is again potentially internal, this time without any additional elements preceding it.

(33) *luci qui sunt in agris, qui concilio capti sunt, hos lucos eadem caerimonia moreque conquiri haberique oportet, ut ceteros lucos qui in antiquo agro sunt*

*C. Trebatius Testa* *Libri VII de religionibus* *(F. P. Bremer Iurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt 1 (1896) Liberae rei publicae iuris consulti, p. 405)*

*Servius ad Verg. Aen. 11.316*

‘The groves that are in fields that have been obtained through the assembly, these groves should be taken care of with the same rites and manner as the rest of the fields in old territory.’

The writer of this fragment is C. Trebatius Testa, a protegé and friend of Cicero, who was also a jurist. The construction in (33) has close parallels in the statutes and other legal inscriptions: a potentially internal head, repetition of the head noun in the main clause, the addition of a relative clause between the initial one and the main clause and the referent *luci* as the object of regulations. Clearly, *luci* is the topic of the predication.

The final example from fragmentary sources comes from C. Sempronius Gracchus. Here again, the clause with the dislocated element is preceded by other elements (a vocative and a subordinate clause introduced by *cum*).

(34) *itaque Quirites, cum Romam profectus sum, zonas, quas plenas argenti extuli, eas ex prouincia inanes retuli; alii uini amphoras quas plenas tulerunt, eas argento repletas domum reportauerunt*

*C. Sempronius Gracchus, Malcovati frg. 28, p. 182 [Gell. 15.12.2]*

‘So, Roman citizens, when I returned to Rome, the pouches that I had taken with me, full of silver, them I brought back from the province empty; while others, the wine jars that they had brought with them full, them they carried back home filled with silver.’

According to Gellius, these words were spoken by C. Sempronius Gracchus in a speech he gave to the people after his return from Sardinia, where he had been
a quaestor (Ad populum cum ex Sardinia rediit). C. Gracchus was a famous orator. In this speech, he forcibly praises his own actions in Sardinia, where he led a modest and decent life and did not return to Rome with riches gained in the province. The words *zonas* and *amphoras* are best taken as anticipations of the main clause case, in *eas*, though they agree with the case of the relative pronoun *quas* as well. We do not have the immediate context of this statement, but *itaque*, together with the vocative *Quirites* at the beginning, suggests that this is a recapitulation of something said earlier, which makes *zonas* and *amphoras* active elements and the topics. The two sentences, with the dislocated constituents *zonas* and *amphoras*, form a contrast, which the syntax helps to underline. Two longer fragments of this same speech have been preserved by Gellius in the same chapter, in which C. Gracchus tells about his moderate conduct in Sardinia. Malcovati places (34) after these two, and, although nothing can be said for certain, *itaque Quirites* would follow well after them.

5.3.3 *Sallust and Bellum Africum*

The final examples come from Sallust and *Bellum Africum*. Left-dislocation in Sallust is not particularly frequent, but there are certain very nice examples in *Bellum Catilinae*. McGushin (1977: 14–15 and his comments ad loc. 8.1 and 37.4) considered these to be part of Sallust’s avoidance of a periodic structure, favouring parataxis. In Sallust, all examples of left-dislocation (as well as those which come close to being such) do indeed concern the resuming of the subject. McGushin (1977: 15) lists examples of repetition of subject by means of the pronoun *is*. He observes that such pronouns are generally accompanied by *demum* or *uero*. In fact, only those four of his examples that count as left-dislocation, (35)–(38) below, are followed by *demum* or *uero*.¹⁹

(35) *sed urbana plebes, ea vero praeceps erat de multis causis*

*SALL. CAT. 37.4*

‘But the city commons in particular was reckless for many reasons.’²⁰

---

¹⁹ McGushin (1977: 15) mentions Sall. Cat. 8.1 but there the syntax is different, as the resumption *ea res* begins a new main clause (*fortuna ... dominatur; ea res ... celebrat obscuratque*), and the construction is thus not a left-dislocation but a genuine paratactic sequence.

²⁰ Translations of Sallust are from Rolfe and Ramsay (2013).
This is one of the most often quoted examples of this phenomenon in Latin. Earlier, in *Cat.* 37.1, *cuncta plebes* has been mentioned, and a general characterization of the *plebs* follows. In (35), Sallust then turns to the city people in particular, which remains the topic for all of paragraph 37.

Nevertheless, (35) appears to be the only one of its kind in Sallust, left-dislocation with a nominal dislocated constituent. Interestingly, Sallust has three examples of a construction where the dislocated element is a verbal form, in infinitive.

(36) *nam idem uelle atque idem nolle*, *ea* *demum firma amicitia est*  
*SALL. Cat.* 20.4

‘For to have the same desires and aversions, precisely that constitutes solid friendship.’

(37) *nam in fuga salutem sperare*, *quom arma quibus corpus tegitur ab hostibus auorteris*, *ea uero dementia est*  
*SALL. Cat.* 58.16

‘For to hope for safety in flight when you have turned away from the enemy the arms which protect your body, such conduct is surely madness.’

(38) *proinde quasi inriam facere*, *id* *demum esset imperio uti*  
*SALL. Cat.* 12.5

‘As though to do a wrong were precisely what it means to exercise power.’

All three examples, (36)–(38), are generic statements summing up and concluding a description of events. Left-dislocation of non-finite verbal phrases is attested also in other languages (see Lambrecht 2001: 1062–1063).

In addition, there are constructions that come close to left-dislocation in *Sall.* *Cat.* 14.2–3 and 37.7, where however the construction begins with an autonomous relative clause and is therefore not actually left-dislocation. There appear to be no examples of left-dislocation with relative clauses in Sallust, though he does make use of the head-internal type with resumption (*A1*) in familiar patterns—e.g., *Iug.* 76.6 (*quas ... poenas ... eas*); *Iug.* 17.2 (*sed quae loca et nationes ... sunt, de iis*).

Finally, there is the often quoted example from *Bellum Africum*:
(39) dum haec ita fierent, rex Iuba, cognitis Caesaris difficultatibus copiarum-que paucitate, non est uisum dari spatium conualescendi augendarum-que eius opum

Bell. Afr. 25.1

‘While these events were taking place, king Iuba, who was aware of Caesar’s difficulties and the small numbers of his forces, thought it advisable not to give him any respite for recruiting his strength or increasing his resources.’

Translation way

This is a left-dislocation in the sense that the predicate non est uisum should require a dative to go with it. However, the left-dislocation is not made explicit, as there is no resumptive element in the remaining predication. In other words, this is a case of an ellipsis of the dative complement. A construction with a similar mismatch between the subject (Labienus in the nominative) and the predicate in passive voice (his copiis … est decertatum) can be found in Bell. Afr. 19.4, but, due to an initial subordinate clause and a more complicated structure, it is best analysed as an anacoluthon, which I do not discuss here. 21

5.3.4 Discussion

It is possible to identify certain new types of LD in the prose of historians and orators discussed in this section. One type of left-dislocation not encountered thus far is one where a personal name in the nominative is introduced as the topic of the predication. In (28) and (30), a relative clause is followed by a resumptive pronoun in the main clause, but, in the Bellum Africum example, (39), there is no relative clause, and the resumption (dative complement with uisum est) is left unexpressed after rex Iuba. Another type of nominative is that used by Sallust in (35), which has parallels in (1) above as well as in (62) in chapter 3. Sallust also has the only examples in the present corpus of left-dislocation where the dislocated element is a non-finite verbal phrase. These are all generalizing statements, and this is clearly a pattern favoured by Sallust. I suggest that left-dislocation in Sallust is part of his characteristic style, avoiding balanced periods. The remaining types of left-dislocation in the historians and orators have parallels in other parts of the prose corpus (see below 5.5) or in comedy.

21 Adams, Lapidge and Reinhardt (2003: 20–21) discuss both passages.
Evaluating the style of the fragmentary texts is difficult. Both colloquialism and archaism may be imagined as stylistic traits of early prose that could easily accommodate left-dislocation. Wölfflin (1908: 22) commented thus on Quadrigarius’s style: ‘Sollen wir daher die Sprache des Quadr. kurz charakterisieren, so werden wir sagen, dass sie nicht viel archaischer ist, als sie in der sullanischen Zeit sein muss, und dass jedenfalls Quadr. das archaische Gepräge nicht so absichtlich gesucht hat, wie etwa Sallust.’ We know, for example, that Gellius thought of Claudius Quadrigarius as *uir modesti atque puri et prope cotidiani sermonis* (on Quadrigarius’s style, see Briscoe 2005: 66–69).

We should not think of left-dislocation in pre-classical Latin prose as an instance of colloquialism in the sense that it was a construction taken over from contemporary spoken language as a stylistic embellishment of historical writing. Rather, it is a more general linguistic strategy to (re)introduce referents before making a predication about them, one that was judged differently in different stages of Latin. Towards the classical Latin style, the drive towards concinnity and logical balance of syntax, where no part is left without government, grew stronger. However, one should not think merely of a shift from the ‘colloquial’ to the ‘literary’; writers created their own means to express things in writing, means best suited to their literary taste and stylistic ideals. In the early days of Latin, literary syntax may have been closer to spoken discourse or narrative, but this does not mean that it was colloquial. This is shown already by the use of literary embellishments in the passage from which many of the examples from historiography and oratory come.\(^{22}\) It is in this context which we must understand the characterization of Badian (1966: 10, on Cato), that the ‘sentence structure [is] rudimentary and monotonous, subordination light’ (cited in Briscoe 2005: 58). Left-dislocation may, in my view, be called rudimentary in the sense that it belongs in Latin to the early days of prose writing, perhaps even with an implication that it was used before the emergence of more refined syntactic and stylistic devices. However, we should abandon the view that left-dislocation was something the writers could not avoid if they wanted. It was rather an effective and practical strategy, well in place in certain contexts for certain pragmatic needs. It should be noted, however, that while Cicero himself occasionally used left-dislocation (see Halla-aho 2016), Caesar did not. It seems then that the use of left-dislocation in prose texts is a matter of degree of acceptability both in different time periods and by different authors.

\(^{22}\) See Courtney (1999: 77) on the passage from which (28) comes.
5.4 M. Terentius Varro

Varro is well known for his idiosyncratic style. The constructions studied here are one (relatively small) part of the often astonishing paths taken by Varrollian diction, but they are closely connected to his general habits of expression. Integral to Varro’s style are 1) preposing of elements of the subordinate (especially relative) clause and the resulting late appearance of the subordinating conjunction or relative pronoun, 2) a strong tendency to add examples and explanations in the middle of the period (often before the main clause), which sometimes leads to the period not being brought to a proper end and 3) frequent ellipses of subjects, objects and verbs, even when the subject changes. For these and others, see most importantly Krumbiegel (1892) and Laughton (1960). These features will be discussed below in connection with the relevant examples. One can further recognize a preference to start the sentence with topical information, which is a part of point 1) above. I do not deal with all examples of anacolutha in Varro. For these, see Laughton (1960: 20–22). Here, I discuss merely the subgroup of Varronian anacolutha that can be explained in terms of left-dislocation. There is a continuity between constructions that can be classified as left-dislocation and those that are better described as something else.

*De lingua Latina* is cited from and translated according to the forthcoming edition of Wolfgang de Melo. Translations of *De re rustica* come from Hooper and Ash.

5.4.1 Constructions with Relative Clauses

Nearly all constructions in Varro have to do with relative clauses, a fact that once again points to the intimate bond between left-dislocation and relative clause syntax in Latin. This fact is also related to the exceptional relative clause syntax in Varro.

---

23 I have been unable to get a hold of G. Heidrich, *Der Stil des Varro*, Melk 1892.
24 See Havers (1926: 224) on *de*, added in editions of Varro at *Rust*. 2.3.2 *forma uidendum ut sint firmae*; and 2.7.4 *forma (equum) esse oportet magnitudine modica*, following the usual practice of Varro to use expressions introduced by *de*.
25 I wish to thank Wolfgang de Melo for giving me access to his edition and translation before its publication.
26 See Laughton (1960: 6–9) for examples and analysis of Varro’s relative clauses. On correlative constructions in Varro, see Probert and Dickey (2016: 405–408).
In (40), the dislocated element *Thebae* marks a clear topic change. The city of Rome has been the topic of the previous sentence. *Thebae* is an Active element in the context, having been mentioned as the oldest of all cities in 3.1.2. It has no continuity as topic, until it is mentioned again in 3.1.6. In (40), the relative clause is non-restrictive.

In the next example, two types of seeds are introduced:

(41) *primum semen quod* est principium genendi, *id* duplex; unum quod latet nostrum sensum, alterum quod apertum. (latet, si sunt semina in aere ... ut scribit Theophrastus) *illud quod* appareat ad agricolas, *id uidendum diligenter*

VARRO Rust. 1.40.1

‘In the first place, the seed, which is the origin of growth, is of two kinds, one being invisible, the other visible. (There are invisible seeds if ... as Theophrastus writes.) The seed which can be seen should be carefully watched by the farmer.’

This continues from *Rust. 1.39.3*, where four types of seeds have been mentioned. It breaks the first category of these into two subtypes (*unum* and *alterum*). The construction reflects the need to be explicit about different types of seed and to define the one that is meant in each case before a predication is made about it. Another left-dislocation (*illud quod*) is used to set the second type of seed as the topic in contrast to the first type. The seeds enjoy topic continuity in this paragraph (1.40).

The following examples are relative clause constructions from *De lingua Latina*. In (40) and (41) above, both the dislocated element and the resumption were in the nominative. Here, both are (most probably) in the accusative:

(42) *nam uocabula ac uerba quae* declinamus similiter, *ea* in consuetudine esse uidemus et ad ea(m) conferimus et, si quid est erratum, non sine ea corrigimus

VARRO Ling. 9.9
'For we can see that those nouns and verbs which we inflect in similar way are in common usage, and we compare them to this usage, and if any mistake is made, we do not correct it without this usage.'

Here, uocabula and uerba are Brand New elements in the discourse at this point, continuing afterwards as the topic.

In the next construction the resumption is in the genitive.

(43) hi ea quae natura declinari non possunt, eorum declinatus requirunt, proinde ut non eo(rum) dicatur esse analogia quae ab similibus uerbis similiter esse(nt) declinata

Varro Ling. 9.51

‘These people are seeking inflections of those words which cannot be inflected by nature, just as if analogy were said not to belong to those which, starting from similar words, had been inflected in a similar way.’

In (43), the referents of the relative construction have not been mentioned previously. In the preceding paragraphs, there is no mention of ea quae natura declinari non possunt, but once introduced, they remain the topic for this paragraph. Example (43) is preceded by dicunt quod uocabula litterarum Latinarum non declinentur in casus, non esse analogias ‘They say that analogies do not exist, because the terms for Latin letters are not inflected into cases.’

Example (44), where the word analogia is picked up from Ling. 10.39, is formally similar to (43), but in fact it is not an instance of left-dislocation:

(44) analogia quae dicitur, eius genera sunt duo

Varro Ling. 10.45

‘What is called analogy has two kinds’

Havers (1926: 228–229) cited (44) as an emphatic nominative. However, (44) must be interpreted as an autonomous relative clause with a fronted subject complement (as if *quae dicitur analogia) in the same way as patronus qui in Plaut. Asin. 621 (see chapter 2.2.3). As such, it does not count as left-dislocation.

In the next passage, Varro discusses three types of actions: cogitare, dicere and facere.
(45) de his tribus minime putat uolgus esse actionem cogitationem. tertium, in quo quid facimus, id maximum

VARRO Ling. 6.42

‘Of these three the common people do not believe at all that thinking is an action; the third, in which we do something, this is thought to be the most important.’

In the construction of (45), Varro picks up the third type of action, doing, for further comment. This stands in contrast with the first action, thinking, which is not understood as an action by the uulgus: minime esse actionem cogitationem.

There is also one instance of attraction in Varro, different from those seen so far in that it is not at the beginning of the sentence:

(46) sin illud quod significatur debet esse simile, Dionæ et Theona quos dicunt esse p(a)ene ipsi geminos, inueniuntur esse dissimiles, si alter erit puer, alter senex, aut unus albus et alter (A)ethiops, item aliqua re alia dissimile(s)

VARRO Ling. 8.41

‘But if that which is indicated must be similar, Dion and Theon, who they themselves say are almost identical, are found to be dissimilar, if one is a boy and the other an old man, or one is white and the other an Ethiopian, and likewise if they are different in some other matter.’

Varro’s point here concerns the relationship between linguistic form and its real-life referent (illud quod significatur). Does the similarity of linguistic form necessitate the similarity of the referents? The proper names Dion and Theon have not been previously mentioned. However, because they are proper names, they are identifiable without further definition, and the following relative clause is non-restrictive (see Tietze 1954: 61 fn. 42; Krumbiegel 1892: 40–41 considered (46) to be an example of attraction, along with (47)).

The names do not continue as topics afterwards.

---

27 In discussing these examples, Krumbiegel (1892: 40) mentions also Rust. 1.31.2 (pampinare est e sarmento coles qui nati sunt, de iis, qui plurimum ualent, primum ac secundum, non numquam etiam tertium, reliquere, reliquos decerpere, ne relictis colibus sarmentum nequeat ministrare sucum), not included here because of the verb (est) that precedes the relative construction.
In (46), the main clause does not have a resumptive pronoun, as the subject can, in such attractions, remain unexpressed. In the following examples, we encounter more initial relative constructions that lack any kind of resumption in or even a connection with the main clause. In these examples, the relative clause is, to varying degrees, independent from the subsequent main clause or subordinate clause. The status of these as left-dislocation can be disputed, especially in the case of (47), which can be explained as an ellipsis of a pronominal expression in the genitive. For the rest, the alternative explanation could be that, instead of being related to left-dislocation, they belong together with other anacoluthic expressions in Varro.

(47) **faui qui eximuntur**, *siqua* pars nihil habet aut habet incunatum, cultello praesicatur

*VARRO Rust. 3.16.34*

‘If some of the comb removed contains no honey or honey that is dirty, it should be cut off with a knife.’

The bee hives that are being emptied, *faui qui eximuntur*, constitute an Active and topical element in this passage (3.16.34 *eximendorum fauorum primum putant esse tempus*). However, after their previous mention, the topic was the amount of honey that can be taken out rather than the hives. Here, the topic is again the hive itself and, more precisely, possible parts of it that have no honey or that are dirty. The relative construction is needed to shift the point of reference back to the hive. The relative construction has no resumption in the subsequent two clauses, but *pars* is implicitly connected with what precedes it (i.e., part of the hive). There is no topic continuity.

The next example is, in many respects, similar to (47) above. It, too, has an initial relative construction. Here, however, the independence of the relative clause is taken even further than in (47), as there is no way in which *sationes quae fiunt* can be a syntactical part of what follows.

(48) **uere sationes quae fiunt**, terram rudem proscindere oportet, quae sunt ex ea enata, priusquam ex iis quid seminis cadat, ut sint exradicata

*VARRO Rust. 1.27.2*

‘For the spring plantings the untilled ground should be broken up so that the weeds which have sprung from it may be rooted up before any seed falls from them.’
The initial relative clause sets the frame in which the following predication is to be interpreted but is not itself part of the predication. This is somewhat striking even in Varro and has caused (48) to be evaluated as bordering on being an anacoluthon (Krumbiegel 1892: 43–44 ‘enuntiatum relativum ex ceterorum verborum structura quasi excidere videtur’). But the construction can now be identified as a thematic nominative and an unlinked topic (see chapter 2.1). In this sense, with a relative clause not in any expected way connected with what follows, the construction is similar to the autonomous relative clauses in Varro Ling. 7.93 quibus res erat in controversia, ea uocabatur lis; Rust. 1.63 sub terra qui habent frumentum (both cited as parallels of (48) by Krumbiegel).

In the relative clause, uer is Active, having just been mentioned, whereas sationes is a Brand New element in this context. The same topic continues for one sentence after this one.

The same pattern can be found in yet another instance, this time with a relative clause that is not potentially head-internal, like (47)–(48), as it has a demonstrative pronoun as the antecedent:

(49) contra illae in saltibus quae pascuntur et a tectis absunt longe, portant secum crates aut retia, quibus cohortes in solitudine faciant, ceteraque utensilia

VARRO Rust. 2.2.9

‘On the other hand, in the case of those that feed on the ranges and are far from cover, hurdles or nets are carried with which to make enclosures in a desolate district, as well as other necessary things.’

The initial relative construction sets the frame for the predication that follows. There, the subject is an anonymous group of people who carry hurdles or nets to faraway pasture lands. As far as pragmatics, illae in saltibus quae pascuntur is clearly a contrastive topic (after the preceding ad uillaticos greges animaduer-
tenda), as signalled by the initial contra. It continues as the topic for this para-
graph. This construction is mentioned as an isolated-emphatic nominative by Havers (1926: 232). Krumbiegel (1892: 41) hesitated between identifying it as attraction or anacoluthon (‘An rectius hoc loco propria anacoluthia statuitur? ita scilicet ut Varro post enuntiatum relativum ad structuram plane aliam transierit’). Constructions (47)–(48) can be compared with (11)–(13) in Cato and the epigraphic (9) and (10) of chapter 4. The parallels between Cato and the inscriptions were also alluded to earlier in this chapter. In Varro, the relative clauses with fronted constituents show a similar pattern with these, the difference being that the main clause does not contain a reference to the head (or
left-dislocation in republican prose

antecedent), which cannot even be reconstructed as a member of the main clause in (48) and (49) (in (47) as a pronominal genitive). I argue that Varro here used a pattern that was an established part of (technical) Latin writing but adapted it and used it in contexts where the end result may come closer to an anacoluthon than a left-dislocation involving a relative clause.28

The next example opens with the particle *ut*, which marks the beginning of a simile (*ut—sic*).

(50) nam *ut* signa quae non habent caput [et] aut aliquam aliam partem, nihil[h]o minus in reliquis membris *eorum* esse possunt analogiae, sic in vocabulis casuum possunt item fieri (*iacturae*)

VARRO Ling. 9.78

‘For just as in the remaining limbs of those statues which do not have a head or some other part there can nonetheless be analogies, so likewise in words losses of cases can happen.’

The statues are brought up here for the sake of the simile and have not been mentioned previously before this passage, nor are they mentioned after this. The relative clause is restrictive. Havers (1928: 112) classified (50) as an ‘unkonstruierter Nominativ infolge von Anakoluth’.29

The next passage is one of Varro’s more idiosyncratic constructions.

(51) et *hi qui* pueros in ludum mittunt, ut discant quae nesciunt uerba que-

madmodum scribant—idem *barbatos* qui ignorabunt uerba quemad-

modum oporteat dici non docebimus, ut sciant qua ratione conueniat
dici?

VARRO Ling. 9.15

‘And those who send their boys to school in order that they may learn how to write the words which they do not know—will we not also teach bearded men who are ignorant as to how words ought to be said, so that they may know by what theory they are uttered correctly?’

28 Note already in Cato the following: *Agr. 16* calcem partiaro coquendam qui dant, *ita datur*.

29 The Menippean satires contain similes where a constituent of the initial *ut* clause is not mentioned again—e.g., frags. 25 and 3238; see Woytek (1970: 105).
This passage was discussed by Laughton (1960: 23) who saw in it an attraction into the relative clause, with the relative clause (*hi qui*) preceding its antecedent (*barbatos*). An alternative explanation is anacoluthon—cf. Laughton (1960: 23): ‘Here anastrophe of *quemadmodum* occurs twice. *hi qui* ... *mittunt*, with its apparently hanging nominative, looks like an example of anacoluthon, and is so taken, for instance, by Kent. But it is preferable, perhaps, to regard it as an instance of the relative clause preceding its antecedent (*barbatos*), the demonstrative pronoun, which properly belongs to *barbatos*, being attracted into the relative clause. It would thus be analogous to the attraction noted in *Ling.* 7.44 above.’

In my view, this construction is formally rather close to a type of left-dislocation that has been encountered several times in this book. There is first an antecedent of a relative clause in the nominative (*hi qui*), followed by a main clause where the co-referent element serves as the object and is in the accusative (*barbatos*). We may compare (51) with what precedes. Varro here lists different types of people who are instructed to adopt a new way of doing things. This list starts in *Ling.* 9.13 (*quod si uiri sapientissimi*), continuing in *Ling.* 9.14 (*an cum quis perperam consuerit qui facere in ciuitate ... sed etiam p(o)ena[m] afficiemus*). Then comes (51) and, after that, *Ling.* 9.16 *sed ut nutrix pueros a lacte non subito auellit*. Thus, *hi qui* is defined here as one group of people who do things in a certain way and are used for the argument. They are not mentioned before or after this. In fact, (50) above also is part of the argument. I conclude that such argumentative contexts in the *De lingua latina* were places where Varro used left-dislocation to introduce entities.

### 5.4.2 Related Constructions

Varro has a listing LD similar to those found in Cato. Example (52) comes from a context where Cato has been mentioned as a source, so it is probable that the syntactic form has been taken over from Cato as well.

---

30 The construction mentioned as parallel is worth quoting here in full: *Ling.* 7.44 *id tutulus appellatus ab eo quod matres familias crines conuolutos ad ertzicem capitis quos habent uitta velatos dicebantur tutuli*, *siue ab eo quod id tuendi causa capilli fiebat*, *siue ab eo quod altissimum in urbe quod est, arcs*, *tutissimum*. In this very Varronian construction, several elements are fronted, appearing before the relative pronoun *quos*, which must be taken as governing a head-internal relative clause (*quos crines* in the accusative and understood as the subject of *dicebantur*), the whole thing then being dependent on *ab eo quod* (*ab eo quod quos crines conuolutos matres familias habent dicebantur tutuli*); on this, see Laughton (1960: 23).
(52) **de pomis conditiua, mala struthea, cotonea, Scantiana, Scaudiana, orbiculata et quae** antea mustea uocabant, nunc melimela appellant, **haec omnia** in loco arido et frigido supra paleas posita servari recte putant.

*Varro Rust. 1.59.1*

‘The varieties of apples for preserving are the smaller and larger quinces ... and those formerly called must-apples but now called honey-apples. It is thought that all these keep well in a dry and cool place, laid on straw.’

In (53), the syntactic relationship between *proauuos ac superiores de Tremeliis* and *nemo* is left unexpressed, as both stand in the nominative (*Scrofa* is topical, *nemo* focal).

(53) **itaque proauuos ac superiores de Tremeliis nemo** appellatus *Scrofa*

*Varro Rust. 2.4.2*

‘Hence, neither my great grand-grandfather nor any of the Tremelii who preceded him was called by this surname.’

The initial constituents set the framework in which *nemo* is to be interpreted, but the relationship between the two parts is left without explicit syntactic expression. This is the only left-dislocation construction in Varro that does not involve a relative clause.

I mention here also (54), where resumption in the main clause happens with *pleraque*. This is of the same status as constructions that have *omnia* in the main clause (see Laughton 1960: 22). These are not unambiguous examples of left-dislocation, as it is debatable whether *omnia* and *pleraque* constitute a genuine resumptive expression or not.

(54) **nec non ea, quae** faciunt cultura honestiorem agrum, **pleraque** non solum fructuosiorum eadem faciunt, ut cum inordinem sunt consita arbusta atque oliueta, sed etiam vendibiliorem atque adiciunt ad fundi pretium

*Varro Rust. 1.4.2*

‘And yet for the most part the methods of cultivation which improve the aspect of the land, such as the planting of fruit and olive trees in rows, make it not only more profitable but also more saleable, and add to the value of the estate.’
I mention finally (55). Although this is not formally an example of left-dislocation, the anacoluthon there may also be analysed in terms of pragmatic organization.

(55) quare de canibus quoniam genera duo, unum uenaticum et pertinet ad feras bestias siluestres, alterum quod custodiae causa paratur et pertinet ad pastorem, dicam de eo ad formam artis expositam in nouem partes

VARRO Rust. 2.9.2

‘As there are, then, two sorts of dogs—the hunting-dog suited to chase the beasts of the forest and the other which is procured as a watch-dog and is of importance to the shepherd—I shall speak of the latter under nine divisions, according to the scientific division which has been set forth.’

The topics are given at the beginning (de canibus and genera duo), but the syntax of the sentence breaks apart after the parenthetical remark unum uenaticum ... pertinet ad pastorem, where the two types of dogs are described. In the subsequent clause, we find the anaphoric de eo, but this expression refers only to the latter type of dog (alterum quod custodiae causa paratur).

5.4.3 Discussion

Left-dislocation in Varro is not particularly common, and the relatively small number of examples there contain much internal variation. However, looking at the possible motivations for the construction, similar contexts can be identified in Varro that have been identified in other parts of the material (comedy, inscriptions, prose). The contexts where left-dislocation is used typically contain at least one of the following: topic continuity, a Brand New element promoted to the topic of one sentence and contrast. In the case of Varro, there is one further type that must be added to these. This is the larger frame of reference, the context in which the subsequent predication is to be interpreted. These are called unlinked topics—see (47)–(49) above—and further parallels (1) and (24) in chapter 4. This type is intimately connected with Varro’s style of writing and his idiosyncratic syntax showing much disintegration. In these examples, the initial relative clause is not connected with the clauses that come after it—i.e., the referent of the relative pronoun is not a constituent in the rest of the sentence.

As for relative clause syntax, a few examples of left-dislocation potentially have internal head nouns—three in Res rusticae (41), (47) and (48), perhaps two, (50) and (42), in De lingua Latina. Head-internal relative clauses with resumption (type A1) are occasionally used by Varro (in both Res rusticae and
De lingua Latina, there are c. ten examples: e.g. Rust. 1.7.4, 1.25, 1.54.2, 2.11.7 (embedded), 3.11.3, 3.2.15, Ling. 5.5 (generic), 5.23, 6.51, 9.17, 10.21 (embedded), 10.36, 10.37).31 The referents of the relative pronoun usually pick up Active or Accessible elements, promoting them to topics in their sentences, but generally do not introduce new referents into the discourse. However, due to the small number of interchangeable examples, a systematic comparison of these with left-dislocation is impossible. In Varro, the head-internal type often appears without the resumption (A2), but this variation is outside the scope of the present study.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have been able to observe the occurrence of certain types of left-dislocation across the prose corpus. Syntactically, these can be analysed in terms of the threefold grouping suggested in chapter 3. Most of the examples are thematic nominatives and anticipations, with two attractions in Cato and one in Varro. The thematic nominatives are followed by resumption in either the nominative or a disagreeing case (usually the accusative). The prose corpus also contains two thematic nominatives without a relative clause, (1) and (35).

A noteworthy pattern is a thematic nominative where the dislocated element consists of an antecedent together with a relative pronoun in the nominative; this is followed by a main clause where the co-referent pronoun is (often) in the accusative or in a prepositional phrase. Such constructions are found in the De agricultura, (11)–(16), in the fragments of Ennius, (32), and Trebatius Testa (33), and in a slightly different form in Varro, (47) and (48). Such constructions are not, however, restricted to the prose corpus. They are found, likewise in Plautus (Plaut. Asin. 237 domi serui qui … uiros; Most. 250–251 mulier quae … ei) as well as in the inscriptions—see examples (6), (7), (9), (10), (23) in chapter 4. I conclude that we can establish this pattern as part of pre-classical Latin syntax, regardless of genre and context. This construction type promotes to topic status a referent that may be New or Accessible in the discourse. The occurrence of this referent as the head of the relative pronoun in the ‘correct’ case (i.e., that of the main clause) would probably not have been possible. This, I assume, is due to both syntactic and pragmatic factors. The syntactic factor

31 Probert and Dickey (2016: 400) give a total of 38 correlative sentences in Varro. This means all preposed relative clauses with explicit resumption, including autonomous relative clauses without nominal heads. Their figures include, furthermore, only two potentially fronted head nouns (ambiguous between correlative sentence and left-dislocation).
means that putting the head noun in the case required by the main clause would have produced a heavy and impractical construction, one that may not have been possible at this state of the language. The pragmatic factor, on the other hand, means that the referent needs to be mentioned before it can serve as a topic of predication (Lambrecht’s Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role; see chapter 2).

Yet another construction type attested in the prose corpus is found in comedy. This is the anticipation of main clause accusative seen in (34) above. This type is paralleled in a number of constructions in Plautus and Terence (see the examples in sub-section 3.2.1.2) and in the inscriptions (ex. (14) in chapter 4, albeit with the relative pronoun in the nominative).

A fairly straightforward type of left-dislocation is that seen in (31), from T. Annius Luscus, and (41), from Varro, both potentially with an internal neuter head noun. They differ, however, in that (41) has both references in the nominative, while (31) has the head noun and the relative pronoun in the accusative, followed by resumption in the nominative. Similar constructions can be found also in comedy (see section 3.2.1).

The prose corpus yields three further attractions. Those from Cato are different from the Varronian one in that they may present internal heads of relative clauses. The one attraction from Varro (46), on the other hand, is a genuine attraction in the sense that there is no other imaginable motivation for the accusative than attraction into the following relative pronoun.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to identify, first, the syntactic forms of left-dislocation in republican pre-classical Latin and, second, the function or functions of the construction. By doing this, the study has established a systematic way of analysing one form of syntactic irregularity in early Latin.

The following results have been obtained.

Left-dislocation exists as an identifiable construction in republican Latin. It takes a variety of syntactic forms, and these forms are dependent to a considerable degree on the type of text where they occur. Relative clauses occur in the great majority of left-dislocation constructions in this corpus, so relative clause syntax can serve as an alternate explanation for some examples of left-dislocation—only a few in comedy but much of the examples of left-dislocation in the epigraphic sources and legal Latin. The alternative explanation is that the initial element (the head noun of the relative pronoun) is internal to the relative clause but fronted to appear before it. This makes the construction a correlative sentence, where there is no clause-external noun in a dislocated position. Nevertheless, it was assumed at the beginning that such fronting would be indicative of conditioning similar to left-dislocation. This assumption was shown to be true for much of the evidence.

For the rest of the examples of left-dislocation, including relative clauses, the relative clause is contingent, and the left-dislocation construction can be described without reference to relative clause syntax. This, together with the fact that left-dislocation without a relative clause occurs in every part of the corpus, shows that left-dislocation in republican Latin exists as a phenomenon independent from relative clause syntax.

It was, furthermore, argued from a theoretical viewpoint that the grammatical cases of the Latin case system are not of equal standing as far as the case form of the dislocated constituent is concerned. A framework was drafted with three categories of cases and their relations: thematic nominatives, anticipation of the main clause case and attraction to the case of the relative pronoun. This tripartite division turned out to be an adequate tool for the syntactic description of grammatical cases and their combinations in left-dislocation across the corpus. It was possible to describe the syntax of all examples in the corpus within this framework. To achieve this and to accommodate the variety of dislocated elements, a broad definition of the thematic nominative had to be accepted, including elements that are not constituents of the matrix clause.
(and hence have no possible role in the predication) but rather set the frame in which the following predication is to be interpreted (unlinked topics) and, furthermore, being a broad enough definition to cover infinitives. The great variety in possible case combinations resulted from the fact that, when external to the relative clause, the initial element is, in theory, sensitive to two government relations, one from the relative clause and the other from the main clause. The initial element (the dislocated constituent) may take the case of one of these or, as the third option, remain in the unmarked case (nominative).

In comedy, left-dislocation was found to be strongly connected with topic function. It is used several times to introduce discourse topics. Another function identified for left-dislocation in comedy was the promotion of Brand New elements to topic status. However, topic function is not unexpected in other types of sentence-initial constructions with relative clauses. These functions were checked in a corpus of alternative constructions to investigate whether the connection between left-dislocation and topic function was stronger than the corresponding connection in alternative constructions. Left-dislocation was compared with a corpus of head-internal relative clauses with resumption and another with sentence-initial relative clauses without resumption. The combined results of these investigations, together with analyses of passages where the different types are attested, allow for the cautious conclusion that the Brand New status of the topical element and topic continuity are both factors that trigger the use of left-dislocation (fronting of the head noun and the addition of the resumptive pronoun in the matrix clause). Finally, in rare instances, the thematic nominative introduces a referent that must be analysed as the focus rather than the topic.

The connection of topic function, topic promotion and left-dislocation was found to exist in prose as well. In the inscriptions, the situation was observed to be less clear. While there were constructions where a clear topic-introducing function could be observed, there remained several constructions where it was not possible to identify any difference in context when compared with the alternative constructions. Nevertheless, certain important observations were made in the epigraphic material.

One of these was that animate head nouns seem to be fronted out of their relative clauses more often than inanimate ones. Another important observation was the identification of a particular type of left-dislocation that shows up in other parts of the corpus as well, where the dislocated element and the relative pronoun are both in the nominative (and often the subject of esse), but the resumption is in some other form (usually the accusative). The relative clause is used to define the initial element, so that a predication about it can be expressed.
If, for some reason, it is not possible in such expressions to put the initial element in the case required by the main clause, left-dislocation serves as a practical alternative. In addition to pragmatic factors, the reasons why it may be impossible or difficult to put the initial element in the required case may be linked with such factors as the main clause case form (especially if it is a prepositional phrase), the length of the construction or because the governing force of the main clause predicate was felt to be insufficient in the early phases of written Latin.

I have argued that attraction of the antecedent \textit{(attractio inuersa)} is much more restricted in Latin than traditionally thought. However, this means that constructions traditionally defined as attractions in the nominative are here defined as thematic nominatives. Attractions in the accusative appear in certain patterns. Partly, they are to be explained as internal heads and, therefore, agreeing in case with the relative pronoun. Partly, they are genuine attractions, found mainly in Plautus, but most probably reflecting a potential, though restricted, of the relative pronoun to induce an attraction in its antecedent.

In the chapter on comedy, the creativity of Plautus was clearly observed. However, parallels between Plautus and other parts of the corpus strongly suggest that left-dislocation in this form is a genuine feature of republican Latin, not merely an idiosyncratic innovation of Plautus, even if put to artistic literary use by him and hence occurring in a great variety of constructions.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Audollent 134</td>
<td>186n39</td>
</tr>
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<td>Audollent 135</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audollent 138</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 511, 158–161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audollent 199</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² 9</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 310 b, 23–24, 28–29, 29–30, 31–32, 32–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² 581 (Senatus consultum de Bacchanalesibus)</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 511, 5–7, 161, 161–162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² 584 (Sententia Minuciorum)</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 517, 5, 161, 162, 165, 165n18, 162, 163, 163–164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² 586 (Epistula ad Tiburtes)</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 512, 1.9–10, 11.11–12, 11.13–15, 11.15–19, 161–167, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² 698 (Lex Puteolana)</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 518, 11.19–20, 168, 111.2–6, 169</td>
</tr>
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<td><em>CIL I</em>² suppl. 364 b</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 1145, 185</td>
</tr>
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<td><em>CIL I</em>² 819</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 1145, 170–178, 181–183, 176n30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL I</em>² suppl. 3129 p. 1012</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 192 b, 11, 26, 27, 39, 54, 65, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CIL III</em> 11882</td>
<td><em>ILLRP</em> 310 b, 183, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 1 (Crawford)</td>
<td>170–178, 181–183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Literary Texts

Bellum Africum (Bell. Afr.)
19.4 219
25.1 219

Cato
De agricultura (Agr.)
1.1 190
2.7 196n3
5.1 192
5.3 192
5.8 194
6.1 17, 201, 203n11 196n3
6.2 201
6.4 201
7.2 201
7.3–7.4 206
7.4 195
8.1 192
8.2 204
9 194

Bellum Africum (Bell. Afr.)
14.1–2 206
16 19, 227n28
17.1 201
17.2 203
18.6 196n3
20.1 195
21.1 194
26 206
28.2 197
31.2 201
33.3 200
33.4 203
34.2 200, 201
35.2 201
37.3 196n3
38.4 196, 198
40.1 201
42.1 201
44.1 201
46.1 193
De agricultura (Agr.) (cont.)

51  197, 205
58  193, 207n14
61.1  39
64  203
64.2  200
65.1  202
68  206
71  202
73  205
89  196, 198
93  202
98  203n10
99  17, 201
105  201
109  24, 196n3
115  203
128  195
133.1  44, 27, 197
133.2  205
135  206
136.1  201
142  199
143  208
143.3  206
144.2  203
145.22  190n4
146.3  204
157.1  20, 203n10
157.3  191
157.13  18
157.4  192
157.10  17

Orationes (Orat.)

Jordan 18 frg. 1 = Malcovati 73 (Oratio 12)

18  213

Jordan 32.2 = Malcovati 159 (Oratio 40)

210

Jordan 51 = Malcovati 206 (Oratio 58)

212

Origines (Orig.)

FRHist. 24  24, 45, 53, 210
FRHist. 76.19  212

Demetrius

De elocutione

199–201  30

Fragmentary historians and orators

T. Annius Luscus (Malcovati frg. 5, p. 106)

215

Q. Claudia Quadrigarius (FRHist 3)

214

Q. Ennius Euhemerus (Vahlen frg. 3, p. 224)

215

c. Sempronius Gracchus (Malcovati frg. 28, p. 182)

216

c. Trebatius Testa

216

Lucretius

De rerum natura (Lucr.)

1.334–338  146
1.455–458  147
2.342–347  149
2.1030–1030  150
4.123  149n59
4.397–399  150

Petronius

Satyricon (Petr.)

134–7  84n14

Plautus

Amphitruo (Amph.)

30  143n55
138  143n55
179  143n55
231  143n55
402  91
479  19
532  91
534  143n55
546  143n55
553  143n55
702–703  17
820  143n55
869  143n55
884  143n55
947–948  91
1009  77, 78, 83, 86, 93, 118
1101  143n55
1103  45, 143
1139  143n55

Asinaria (Asin.)

8  20
64  143n55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>工商银行</th>
<th>4922</th>
<th>143n55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619–621</td>
<td>235</td>
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<td>39, 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
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<td>91, 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
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