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Abstract
This study examines the claim that demonstratives are used more frequently in Latin comedies than in other genres (Karakasis, 2014; Palmer, 1975), as well as additional hypotheses regarding the use of demonstratives within this language. To examine these claims, I created a corpus composed of fragments of Early Latin authors of comedic, tragic, and non-dramatic works. I examined demonstratives within this corpus for frequency, form, syntactic role, affective force, co-occurrence with personal pronouns, and use in multimembral demonstrative sets. This study provides the first quantitative evaluation of demonstrative use for often neglected authors of Early Latin. It also identifies those theories regarding demonstrative use that have more support within this time and suggests why these theories might hold true and how they might impact the overall demonstrative count for comedy, tragedy, non-dramatic works, or Latin as a whole.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Demonstratives are a complex linguistic phenomenon. Though rarely receiving the same level of attention as nouns or verbs, and virtually never a focal point in language pedagogy, these words are unique in their universal usage and widespread functionality. This thesis examines the use of demonstratives in Early Latin, focusing especially on the claim that demonstratives are notably frequent in Latin comedy relative to other genres (Karakasis, 2014). The data are drawn from Early Latin writing, including both comic and tragic drama as well as non-dramatic texts. This work also attempts to examine why comedy might have especially high rates of demonstratives by examining claims that pertain to demonstrative use. In addition to providing information on the characteristics of the Latin language, an analysis of demonstratives in Latin helps us tease out the characteristics of demonstratives as a word class, increasing our linguistic understanding.

1.1 Purpose of this Study

Existing research on demonstratives in Latin (e.g., Meader, 1901; Keller, 1946) has identified numerous aspects of form, function, and force that impact how and why demonstratives are used. However, despite these existing studies, little scholastic attention has been given to the role that demonstrative use plays in defining genre-specific language in Latin literature. Authors like Wayenberg (2011) and Karakasis (2014) have discussed various positions in which adnominal demonstratives may occur within a sentence, focusing on Latin prose. Additionally, classicists have claimed that a characteristic of the language of Roman comedic plays is the freer use of the demonstrative (Karakasis, 2014; Palmer, 1975). Palmer (1975) attributed language to Roman comic authors that is characterized by “deictic elements” (p. 74) and which “makes much freer use of the personal and demonstrative pronouns” (p. 75). Do these
claims hold true? Do the roles and functions of demonstratives contribute to variation across the
genres?

This study seeks to thoroughly examine demonstrative use across numerous genres of a
singular time period in Latin. As with English demonstratives, Latin demonstratives assume
three different syntactic roles, namely pronominal, adnominal, and adverbia1. Latin, however,
makes use of three contrasting demonstrative forms, compared to the two found in English. By
examining the statistical distribution of the use of these three forms and three syntactic roles
across comedy, tragedy, and non-dramatic writing, I will bring evidence to the claim that Latin
comedy makes more frequent use of the demonstrative and provide the beginnings of a detailed
treatment of demonstratives in Early Latin. Because authors of Latin dramas were active in
Rome from roughly 240 to 86 B.C.E (Duckworth, 2015), this study focuses on this pre-classical
period of Latin history where most extant Latin comedies and tragedies can be found. The
language spoken during this period of Roman history is referred to as Early Latin, Archaic Latin,
or Old Latin interchangeably. After gathering both the broad statistical data and performing in-
depth analyses of representatives of each genre, I can determine if there is any validity to the
claim that Latin comedic language uses demonstratives differently and provide a quantitative
assessment of exactly what that difference is. This study further examines whether the claim is
true only for select authors or specific genres and looks at what a higher use of demonstratives
means for comedic writing as a whole, such as whether it represents a characteristic of Latin
colloquial language or is a characteristic of a shared deictic space. Answers to these questions
facilitate our understanding of Latin demonstrative use and demonstratives more generally.

Studying demonstratives also contributes to our understanding of the texts in which they
occur. Jacobson (2011) claimed that these words are critical to unlocking the meaning of drama,
providing us with information on the “relationship between the actor and audience,” as well as the very relationship between tragedy and comedy themselves (p. 24). The analysis provided here will allow for improved understanding of texts that remain to us only in fragmented form, contributing to the classical field and posing new avenues for continuing research. Scholars have claimed that statistical analyses of the distribution of demonstrative use is necessary to “gain a deeper understanding not only of the distinct genres at play…but also for the larger dynamics of … drama, from the performance of individual plays to the cumulative effects of witnessing tragic tetralogies and comedies over the course of a festival” (Jacobson, 2011, p. 27-28).

Furthermore, this study examines data that to date have not been analyzed in studies of Latin demonstratives. Previous studies of demonstratives in classical languages have looked at demonstratives from corpora consisting of one author or one genre (such as Perdicoyianni-Paléologou in her examination of Euripides and Seneca (2004), Laidlaw’s examination of demonstratives within the plays of Terence (1936), or Jacobson in his thesis on demonstratives in all Athenian drama (2001)), which contain numerous full-length works. In fact, Cornish (2009) argued that demonstratives “only manifest their true values in the context of whole texts…they are intimately bound up with the structuring of the discourse that may be associated with a given text in some context” (p. 3). While there is no doubt that context is necessary in fully understanding a given demonstrative, if we avoid fragments altogether, we miss out on a more comprehensive picture of demonstrative use and meaning. The view taken in this work is that there is much to be learned from fragments of discourse containing demonstratives, especially where those fragments cover multiple authors and genres.
1.2 Outline

In the next chapter, I will discuss the meaning, usage, and semantic and syntactic roles of demonstratives generally and will introduce the extant theories of their use within Latin. I then introduce the different types of Latin demonstratives and present various ways in which they are described in Latin grammars. Following this, I present a number of different hypotheses from the literature concerning demonstratives’ meaning and usage. Finally, I provide some brief background information describing additional linguistic characteristics of Early Latin, discussion of the (potential) Greek origin of Latin comedies, and established differences between tragic and comedic language outside of demonstrative use.

Chapter Three presents the basic composition of the corpus used for investigation of demonstrative use in Latin. I begin by providing an explanation for the choice of authors included within the corpus and for focusing on a particular time period of Latin writing. I then present the total word counts for the entire corpus, as well as for the portions that are comedic, tragic, and non-dramatic, before providing biographical details and information on characteristic language use for each included author. I conclude this chapter by discussing the methods of analysis used to investigate this corpus.

In Chapter Four, I present my findings concerning demonstrative use in the corpus, addressing the initial claim for increased demonstrative use in comedy over tragedy, as well as the additional claims outlined in Chapter Two. Whole-corpus statistics are provided, followed by statistics of demonstrative use for the comic, tragic, and non-dramatic portions of the corpus. Following this, I present detailed statistics and analysis of each author individually, addressing how they compare to the overall statistics for demonstrative use in each genre. In the final
section of this chapter, I address statistical evidence for the additional claims regarding Latin demonstrative use as presented in Chapter Two.

After gathering the statistics on demonstrative use and analyzing their distribution within the corpus, in Chapter Five, I provide a discussion of the results. In this chapter, I synthesize all of my findings regarding the various claims about demonstrative use in Latin, and discuss the key themes and implications of the research. Finally, in Chapter Six, I summarize the preceding chapters. I also provide an overview of directions for continued research based on my results in this study.

Taken together, this work contributes to the understanding of genre-specific demonstrative use in Latin and of demonstratives more generally.
Chapter Two: Background

This chapter presents an introduction to the concepts and other information necessary for the investigation of demonstrative use in Latin. I begin by presenting basic information on demonstratives, defining how they are used and translated in English and what makes them different from other word classes. I then describe Latin demonstratives, including their forms, their translations, and how they differ from English demonstratives. Following this, I discuss multiple hypotheses that attempt to describe demonstrative use in Latin and how these hypotheses might impact the overarching claim of higher demonstrative use within Latin comedy.

2.1 Introduction to Demonstratives

Before examining the use of demonstratives in genres of Latin literature, it is first necessary to understand not only what these words are but also their syntactic and semantic characteristics. One important aspect of demonstratives that sets them apart from most closed-word classes is their apparent universality—while many languages lack certain entire classes of words, such as definite articles or auxiliaries (Diessel, 2006), studies have indicated that all languages have some sort of demonstrative (Diessel, 2006). Additionally, demonstratives are some of the earliest words that children produce while acquiring language, and some of the only non-content words acquired during the one-word stage (Diessel, 2006). Kwan (2007) has further reflected on the early acquisition of demonstratives:

Demonstrative pronouns are basically deictic in nature. But even among deictic pronouns, demonstratives distinguish themselves additionally through the use of direct pointers (such as a finger, a glance, or gestures) to identify the objects that are meant. As Holenstein
pointed out, children do rely on “this/that” to identify objects and to orientate themselves long before they develop the ability to handle personal pronouns such as “I.” (p. 249)

In addition to being some of the first words that children learn when acquiring language, demonstratives are also a universal language characteristic. “The communicative importance of demonstratives,” summarized Diessel (2006), “is not only reflected in their early acquisition but also in their cross-linguistic distribution” (p. 472). Diessel further discussed the universality of demonstratives as a characteristic that is unique to demonstratives and no other linguistic class. “Demonstratives,” he said, “constitute a small class of linguistic expressions that occur in all languages across the world... In the literature, demonstratives are commonly defined as spatial deictics indicating the location of a referent vis-à-vis the deictic centre” (p. 469). While the universality of demonstratives does not necessarily factor into the greater thesis of this work, it demonstrates the greater importance of increasing our understanding of how they are used. However, this analysis relies on other characteristics of the demonstrative, and it is therefore necessary to better grasp what a demonstrative is and how it functions within a sentence. Before discussing these aspects in Latin, it will be helpful to establish them in English.

2.1.1 Exophora and deixis. Demonstratives frequently aid in linguistic reference, which Cutting (2008) defined as “an act in which a speaker uses linguistic forms to enable the hearer to identify something” (p. 7). One of the most common forms of reference, and the most basic and foundational use of demonstratives as a whole, is deixis, or the act of identifying an object in the discourse relative to the speaker. Deixis comes from the Greek verb δείκνυμι (deiknumi), meaning “to point out” or “show,” providing us with the noun “deixis,” as well as the adverbial form “deictic.” The deictic function of demonstratives references their role in physically or metaphorically pointing at other items that are critical for the discourse. Greenberg (1985)
described deixis as the forerunner of all other uses of the demonstrative, saying that it can be “seen to be in some sense prior both conceptually and historically” to other uses of the demonstrative (p. 272). Cutting (2008) specified three types of deixis: person deixis, which points toward a person; spatial or place deixis, which frequently uses demonstrative adnominals, pronominals, and adverbials to point toward a location; and time deixis, which points adverbially toward a point in time. Frequently, this identification is accompanied by a literal pointing gesture, which Diessel (2006) said serves to “provide spatial orientation” for the object in discourse, as well as “manipulating the interlocutors’ joint attentional focus” (p. 270). This use of the demonstrative is called exophoric, coming from the Greek prefix ἐξ (ex), meaning “out of,” and verb φέρω (fero), meaning “to bear,” and refers to the act of bearing the focus out of the discourse to an object in the physical world (Perseus Project). The process of referring outside of the discourse is called “exophora.” Cutting (2008) described exophora as referring to both concrete items that exist “in the situation,” as well as intangible items that exist in the background knowledge of the discourse participants (p. 8). Exophora can broadly describe the uses of demonstratives that refer to objects extant in the deictic sphere, but outside of the discourse. Less concretely, exophora also describes references to objects and events in the interlocutors’ shared experience, things that are not physically present in the sphere of discourse but do, have, or will exist in the world external to the discourse. “While there are many linguistic means that speakers can use to coordinate a joint attentional focus,” wrote Diessel (2006), “there is no other linguistic device that is so closely tied to this function than demonstratives” (p. 469).

2.1.2 Endophora, Anaphora, and Cataphora. In contrast, demonstratives can also serve endophorically within the discourse and co-refer with another expression. From the Greek adverb ἐνὸν (endon) meaning “within” and verb φέρω (fero) meaning “to bear,” endophora
refers to something within the discourse or a part of the background knowledge, rather than something in the physical space surrounding the discourse. This most commonly takes the form of anaphora, where there is an antecedent referent (Cutting, 2008). From the Greek verb ἀναφέρω (anaféro), meaning “to bear back,” anaphora indicates a bringing (φέρω) up (ἀνα) (Perseus Project), such as to an earlier point in the discourse, allowing us to link a current expression to an earlier point in the text or speech. As Frajzyngier (1996) wrote, “An anaphor is a marker referring to a noun phrase, verb phrase, prepositional phrase, clause, or any other fragment of utterance previously mentioned in speech” (p. 171). For example,

1. Though Latin is not often spoken, this language has found a growing community of conversational speakers.

In Example 1, the this language refers “up” the discourse back to the Latin in the first clause. A postcedent referent where the item (in this case, this) refers down the discourse to a later referent, as in Example 2, is referred to as a cataphora. Similar to anaphora, this comes from the Greek verb καταφέρω (katafero), meaning bringing (φέρω) down (κατα), as in further down the discourse (Perseus Project).

2. Though this language is not often spoken, Latin has found a growing community of conversational speakers.

In Example 2, the this language refers “down” the discourse to the Latin in the second clause. The term anaphora is frequently broadly used to encompass both anaphora and cataphora and as a stand in for endophora. Endophora may also serve to link two noun phrases by associating both with other entities, known as associative endophora (Cutting, 2008). Endophora is often presented as a shift of the deictic center from the outside world, where the referent exists exophorically, to become internal to the discourse (Diessel, 2006). Thinking of endophora in this way allows the demonstrative to retain its deictic force while shifting its semantic interpretation.
to be internal to the dialogue. Frajzyngier (1996) specified that demonstratives may serve just
endophorically or they may be both anaphoric as well as deictic, indicating that, while these
functions may appear very different, they can co-occur.

2.1.3 Discourse deixis. Demonstratives are also used to fulfill a discourse deictic
function. Discourse deixis bears characteristics of both the endophora and exophora previously
discussed. Like exophoric deixis, discourse deixis points at an entity and establishes a link
between an object and the discourse. Unlike exophora, this specific form fills an endophoric role
and refers back to a previous aspect of the discourse. Unlike anaphora, however, discourse deixis
refers to entire preceding propositions rather than individual noun phrases. Example 3 shows an
instance of discourse deixis as described by Diessel (2006, p.476).

(3) The bluff is sort of worn away. That’s one reason it’s so hard to climb.
In this example, that’s refers not to a specific entity from the preceding phrase—say, the bluff—
but rather the idea expressed by the preceding phrase—that the bluff has been worn away.
Diessel wrote that these discourse deictic demonstratives serve to “establish links between
chunks of the ongoing discourse” (p. 476), rather than to further define individual concepts.

Discourse deixis and endophora in general are not usually accompanied by the physical
external pointing gesture that is so associated with exophora and seen so early on in the
development of demonstratives in language. Rather, these functions treat the pointing implied by
the name deixis more metaphorically, serving to direct attention in a certain direction within the
discourse itself. As Diessel (2006) wrote,

While the discourse use is more abstract than the exophoric use, it involves the same
psychological mechanism. In both uses demonstratives function to create a joint focus of
attention. In the exophoric use they focus the addressee’s attention on a concrete entity in
the physical world, and in the discourse use they direct the addressee’s attention on a linguistic element in discourse. (p. 481)

2.1.4 Characteristics of demonstratives. A common characteristic of demonstratives is deictic contrast, or their tendency to form multi-word pairs that stand in opposition of each other (Diessel, 2006). This can easily be seen in English demonstratives, where *this* stands opposed to *that* and can be used for explicit semantic distinction, as in “I want this book, not that book.”

This contrastive function has enabled the use of demonstratives to divide the sphere of discourse. Demonstratives associated with closeness—the English *this* or *these*—are used for objects closer to the speaker in a dialogue, while those demonstratives associated with distance—English *that* and *those*—became associated with the addressee as they were further from the speaker (Diessel, 2006).

2.1.5 Parts of speech. Another unique aspect of demonstratives is that they may occur as numerous different parts of speech, serving as an adnominal, pronominal, adverb, or even verb. Research within the field of linguistics, and especially if it is extended beyond the field of linguistics, may use different terms to discuss this phenomenon; because this study seeks to use the insight of advancements made in the field of linguistics to better explain phenomena within the field of Classical Languages, this study will make use of a combination of terminology. In particular, demonstratives classified as *adnominal* may also be referred to as phrasal (Acton & Potts, 2014), determiner (Diessel, 2006), specifier (Mithun, 1987), and adjectival (Himmelmann, 1996; Meader, 1901).

To accomplish coordination of joint attentional focus, languages employ demonstratives in four entirely separate syntactic contexts. They occur, according to Diessel (1999), as “independent pronouns in argument position of verbs and adpositions” (p. 1), serving as
pronominals and often referred to as demonstrative pronouns (Example 5). They also occur with an accompanying noun within a noun phrase, serving as adnominals (Example 4). Examples of these types of demonstrative are included below:

(4) I want those books.

(5) I want those.

Diessel (1999) wrote that the “majority of languages use the same demonstrative forms as independent pronouns and together with a co-occurring noun” (p. 4), and there is no exception in English. It is similarly grammatically correct to use Example 4 (the demonstrative those co-occurring with the noun books as an adnominal) as it is to use Example 5 (the demonstrative those standing independent as a pronominal argument of the verb want). Demonstratives can also serve adverbially as demonstrative adverbs, modifying the verb with a frequently locational meaning. English has adverbial demonstratives as well in the words here and there, as in Example 6.

(6) Bring the books here.

In this example, the demonstrative here is serving as a locative adverb to label the place where the books are to be brought.

The fourth and final syntactic context for demonstratives is the verbal demonstrative, occurring only in Boumaa Fijian, Dyirbal, and Ju’hoan (Dixon, 2003; Dickens, 2005; Lionnet, 2012). In Boumaa Fijian and Dyirbal, demonstrative verbs are action verbs that express manner (as can be seen in Boumaa Fijian in Example 7), and in Ju’hoan they are used for exophoric copular verbs (as can be seen in Example 8):

(7) [o ‘ae]s [‘ene‘i tuu gaa ‘ene‘i]PREDICATE
    ART 3SG  do.like.this ASP just  do.like.this
    “He did just like this.” [narrator mimes a spearing action] (Dixon, 2003, p.72)
While these verbal forms of the demonstrative are very interesting, they are also extraordinarily rare. According to Diessel (1999), these demonstratives are “virtually unknown in the typological and theoretical literature” (p. 9) and appear in neither English nor in our subject language of Latin. The remainder of this analysis, therefore, will not include these.

As can be inferred from the examples in the previous paragraph, English uses the demonstratives *this* and *that* both as pronominals and determiners. The same is true for Latin, which uses three different demonstratives to determine a noun phrase, to stand in as an argument for a verb, and act adverbially. It is important to remember, however, that although these forms look similar, they are filling different syntactic functions and are therefore distinct. As Diessel (1999) wrote,

Note that adnominal and pronominal demonstratives do not generally belong to the same category if they have the same form. Adnominal demonstratives in English are, for instance, phonologically and morphologically indistinguishable from demonstrative pronouns; but I would argue that adnominal *this* and *that* do not function as independent pronouns that are joined to an appositive noun. Pronominal and adnominal demonstratives have the same form in English, but their syntax is different... Moreover, pronominal and adnominal demonstratives are in paradigmatic relationship with elements of two separate word classes: pronominal *this* and *that* occur in the same syntactic slot as other pronouns, while adnominal demonstratives are in complementary distribution with articles, possessives, and other adnominal elements that are commonly considered determiners. Since pronominal and adnominal demonstratives are associated with
elements of two distinct word classes, I assume that they belong to different grammatical
categories despite the fact that they are phonologically and morphologically not
distinguished. (p. 6)

This division has been questioned by other scholars, notably Elbourne (2004) who claimed that
there is a “phonologically null noun…to handle bare demonstratives” (p. 36) so that pronominal
demonstratives are really still forms of adnominal demonstratives. However, for the purposes of
this study and the statistical analysis of various forms of the demonstrative, it only matters that
some demonstratives appear pronominal and not whether they truly are at the underlying level.

2.2 Introduction to Demonstratives in Latin

To better understand demonstratives in Latin, I will now describe various aspects of how
they are translated and how they are represented in grammars and textbooks, and I will outline
various historical viewpoints regarding their interpretation. These historical viewpoints will form
the hypotheses that my statistical analysis will investigate. After presenting each hypothesis, I
will provide in square brackets a label based on the author and number of hypotheses they have
provided. For example, the first hypothesis from Bach will be labelled [B1] while the third
hypothesis from Fruyt will be labelled [F3]. These labels will be used throughout the remainder
of this work.

Despite many similarities, the Latin demonstratives differ significantly from their English
counterparts. To begin with, Latin has three demonstratives, hic, ille, and iste, as opposed to
English’s this and that (and here and there, including adverbial forms; Diessel 2006).
Traditionally, the demonstrative hic is translated as “this” while both ille and iste are translated
as “that” (Wheelock, 2005), though some introductory textbooks draw a distinction between
“that” for ille and “that (yonder)” for iste (Allen et al., 2001), which is not present in the English
demonstratives. Because Latin is a significantly inflected language, defining grammatical role by the suffix on each word rather than its position in the sentence, each of its three demonstratives has different forms based on grammatical gender, number, and case. These forms are enumerated in Tables 1–3.

Table 1

*Forms of the Latin Demonstrative “hic”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>haec</th>
<th>hoc</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>hi</th>
<th>hae</th>
<th>haec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>huius</td>
<td>huius</td>
<td>huius</td>
<td>horum</td>
<td>harum</td>
<td>horum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td></td>
<td>huic</td>
<td>huic</td>
<td>huic</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td></td>
<td>hunc</td>
<td>hanc</td>
<td>hoc</td>
<td>hos</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>haec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td></td>
<td>hoc</td>
<td>hac</td>
<td>hoc</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Forms of the Latin Demonstrative “ille”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>illa</th>
<th>illud</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>illi</th>
<th>illae</th>
<th>illa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>illius</td>
<td>illius</td>
<td>illius</td>
<td>illorum</td>
<td>illarum</td>
<td>illorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td></td>
<td>illi</td>
<td>illi</td>
<td>illi</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td></td>
<td>illum</td>
<td>illam</td>
<td>illud</td>
<td>illos</td>
<td>illas</td>
<td>illa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td></td>
<td>illo</td>
<td>illa</td>
<td>illo</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With three separate demonstratives, each marked for number, case, and gender, with the occasional alternate form, the initial data set includes 90 separate forms. However, many forms are repeated across cases, genders, and even numbers, such as haec, which appears both as a feminine and neuter form as well as a singular and plural one. When these similar forms are accounted for, our full demonstrative set is reduced to only 45 unique members, as shown in Table 4.

While the Latin that does not have to fill the numerous syntactic functions that the English that fills, i.e., as a relativizer or complementizer, the different forms these demonstratives take represent multiple semantic and functional distinctions. Early on, students of Latin are taught the simple translation of this for hic and that for ille. In addition, students are taught that hic is frequently interpreted as referring to the former of two things mentioned, while ille refers to the latter. Other distinctions will be addressed below.
Table 4

All forms of the Latin Demonstrative

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hac</td>
<td>huic</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td>illuc</td>
<td>istanc</td>
<td>istoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hae</td>
<td>huius</td>
<td>illi</td>
<td>illud</td>
<td>istorum</td>
<td>istorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haec</td>
<td>hunc</td>
<td>illi</td>
<td>illic</td>
<td>istas</td>
<td>istos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanc</td>
<td>illa</td>
<td>illic</td>
<td>illuius</td>
<td>iste</td>
<td>istuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harum</td>
<td>illac</td>
<td>illic</td>
<td>illum</td>
<td>isti</td>
<td>istud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>illae</td>
<td>illis</td>
<td>illunc</td>
<td>isti</td>
<td>istuic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>illaec</td>
<td>illius</td>
<td>ista</td>
<td>istic</td>
<td>istuius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hic</td>
<td>illaec</td>
<td>illo</td>
<td>istac</td>
<td>istic</td>
<td>istum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>illam</td>
<td>illoc</td>
<td>istae</td>
<td>istic</td>
<td>istunc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoc</td>
<td>illanc</td>
<td>illorum</td>
<td>istaec</td>
<td>istius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horum</td>
<td>illarum</td>
<td>illos</td>
<td>istaec</td>
<td>isto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hos</td>
<td>illas</td>
<td>illuc</td>
<td>istam</td>
<td>istoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1 Personal force. Multiple scholars claim that Latin demonstratives have developed an association with the grammatical concept of person (Keller, 1946; Fruyt, 2010). The demonstrative *hic* has become associated with the first person, having some sort of direct connection or conceived direct connection with the speaker with a force that Keller describes as approaching that of the first person pronoun. The demonstrative *iste* has become associated with the second person, representing a real or perceived connection to the addressee and bearing a force similar to the second person pronoun. The demonstrative *ille* has become associated with the third person; it shows a connection external to the discourse and both the speaker and addressee, thereby bearing a force close to the third person pronoun (Meader, 1901; Keller, 1946). This personal force is claimed to be inherent to the words, meaning that it is not necessary for the demonstrative to co-occur with a pronoun in order to bear such force (Meader, 1901; Keller, 1946). However, the personal force of demonstratives is often identified and emphasized by their co-occurrence with their correlated personal pronoun (Keller, 1946). This provides a
practical tool for examining claims about demonstratives having personal force. This tool is especially helpful for this work given that the data are fragments, which often lack the context that could otherwise aid in assessing personal force. The rest of this discussion of the personal force of demonstratives in Early Latin assumes that demonstratives do in fact bear a personal force, though the reality of this will be evaluated in Chapters Four and Five.

While the division into first, second, and third person force has been established by the time period of the corpus and is visible within Early Latin fragments, it has undergone some gradual change. Prior to the Early Latin studied in this analysis, the contrast in Latin demonstratives was between the participants of the dialogue (that is, the speaker and the addressee) and the rest of the world (Fruyt, 2010). At that stage, the participants in the dialogue, both first and second person, make use of *hic* while the separated outside world makes use of *ille*. The Latin demonstrative traditionally translated like the English *that*—*ille*—is not the second person demonstrative but rather becomes associated with the third person, contrasting the combined speaker and addressee against the external world. Fruyt (2010) claimed that the division between *hic*, the first and second person demonstrative, and *ille*, the third person demonstrative, can be clearly seen in the language of early comedy:

This opposition between *hic* and *ille* is clearly exemplified in Plautus in the comedy of the Archaic period (end of the 3rd century B.C.) and Terentius (beginning of the 2nd century B.C.). The speaker uses *hic* for everything that belongs to his sphere, any entity with which he has any kind of relationship, either an inalienable or occasional possession. (p. 10)

After the division between the association of *hic* with the first and second person demonstrative and *ille* as the third person demonstrative had been established, *iste* began to
become associated with the second person demonstrative to further divide the personal space represented by *hic*. Greenberg (1985) referred to the varying types of use of the demonstrative as *Hic-Deixis, Iste-Deixis, and Ille-Deixis*, “whose connection with first, second, and third person is particularly strong in the Roman Comic writers Plautus and Terence” (p. 275). This division is described in Figure 1 below, adapted from Jacobson (2011, p. 10):

![Concentric circle schema of demonstratives.](image)

*Figure 1. Concentric circle schema of demonstratives.*

The portion of the sphere of discourse originally assigned for the use of *hic* was then further divided into those things relevant only for the speaker, or the first person, and those relevant only to the addressee, or the second person (Jacobson, 2011). This change occurred prior to the Early Latin period on which this study is based, yet remnants of the previous *hic/ille* division can still be seen in the writing of some Early Latin authors (Keller, 1946). Fruyt offered an example from the *Mostellaria* of Plautus to illustrate the use of *hic* as a first person demonstrative and *iste* as a second person demonstrative in Example 9.

(9) **Pl.** Heus vos, ecquis *has* -ce
Pinacio Hey you-Pl..Nom, anyone-SG.NOM *this*-Pl..ACC.FEM (demonstrative) aperit?
“Pinacio: Hey you! Is anyone opening these?
Phaniscus: Why are you knocking on that door when there is nobody inside?”
Plautus Mostellaria (Line 988)

Here Pinacio uses *has*, an oblique form of *hic*, in the first line since he, the speaker, is interacting directly with its referent, the doors on which he is knocking. When Phaniscus questions his actions in the next line, he instead uses *istas*, an oblique form of *iste*, since the person he is talking to (that is, the second-person addressee) is doing the knocking (Fruyt, 2010).

In fact, Joseph Bach (1888) accepted the personal definitions of these demonstratives as the only valid interpretation of the demonstrative, allowing that any may be used in a pejorative manner but that each “ retains its inherent personal force” (Keller, 1946, p. 262). Through the course of his thorough examination of the usage of demonstratives in the Early Latin period, during which time almost all remaining Latin comedies and tragedies were written, he maintained that each demonstrative is used only with reference to its corresponding grammatical person, even writing that *iste* occurs “in no passage in this period without bearing a distinct reference to the second person” (Meader, 1901, p. 113). Bach’s hypothesis, then, is that all forms of the demonstrative are always associated with their correlated personal force, visible by their co-occurrence with personal pronouns [B1].

In contrast, Ruth Mildred Keller (1946) argued that “under certain circumstances *iste* may be both non-deuterotritonic and non-derogatory” (p. 280). Though her terminology is somewhat antiquated, her argument is that *iste* is not limited to only a second person force, as Bach would have it, nor to either a second person force or a derogatory force, as many others
argue for. Rather, these demonstratives primarily fulfill a deictic role and take on personal or derogatory meanings secondarily and without regard for Bach’s trichotomous division between first, second, and third persons. In her own words,

...*iste* differs from *hic* and *ille*, but I think that the fundamental difference consists not in its reference to the second person, but in its deictic intensity. All three pronouns are deictic, but *iste* is the most strongly deictic, *hic* less so, and *ille* the weakest of the three.

(p. 316)

To support this hypothesis, Keller (1946) provided numerous example instances from the texts of Plautus and Terence of interchanged demonstratives, where demonstratives are not limited only to the personal force assigned to them by Bach but could also occur in contexts usually reserved for the other demonstratives. In particular, this includes taking on personal force that does not correspond to the *hic* first, *iste* second, and *ille* third trichotomy or appearing with purely deictic force. As an example of this, Keller cited Plautus’ *Asinaria* where Libanus discusses his plans by saying:

(10)  
\[\text{Em istuc ago}\]  
 Indeed that-SG.ACC.NEUT drive-1SG.PRES.INDIC

“Indeed, I am driving at that,”  
(Plautus *Asinaria*, line 358)

In Example 10, Plautus uses the demonstrative *iste* not with the second person but in a first person sentence, as denoted by the first person verb *ago*. Additionally, this use of *iste* does not add a derogatory force to the location of the speaker’s driving, thereby indicating that this demonstrative can serve without either the second person or derogatory force. In the lack of alternative explanations, Keller indicated that this use of *iste* is emphatic and deictic, serving

---

1Latin text provided by the Perseus Project, English translations are my own but aided by Warmington (1935)
only to point forward to the object addressed in the remainder of the passage with more force than *hic* or *ille* could have provided. Similar uses of *iste* without the derogatory or second person force are found in Plautus’ *Aulularia, Miles Gloriosus, Asinaria, Bacchides*, and *Truculentus*.

Keller therefore hypothesized that there should be little correlation of *hic* with the first person pronoun, *iste* with the second person pronoun, and *ille* with the second person pronoun. Instead, these demonstratives should appear with all personal pronouns [K3].

Keller’s claim that more than one force may be assigned to each of the demonstratives has been supported by Clarence Linton Meader (1901). On the whole, Meader seems ready to agree with Bach regarding the meaning of *iste*, claiming that “It may now be regarded as beyond dispute that one of the most important elements of the meaning of iste, in the ante-Augustan periods at least, is its distinct reference to the second person” (p. 113).

However, where Bach suggested that the frequent collocations between *iste* and the personal possessive pronouns serve to highlight this deuterotritonic force, Meader (1901) suggested that it is instead evidence of the weakening of *iste*. As this demonstrative became distanced from its personal force, it required the addition of a personal pronoun “in order to secure a more distinct reference to the second person” (p. 116). With this weakening came a gradual shift from the use of *iste* to refer to an object associated with the addressee to an object that the speaker wished to relate to the addressee. In such an environment *iste* holds at least as much first person force as it does second, given the interest of the speaker in the object, and stands in for what Meader (1901) posited should be *ecce hic* (“behold this”/“look here”) or an attempt to direct the attention of the second person addressee. This prototritonic shift, coupled with the strong deictic force provided by its adverbial origins and association with the Greek demonstrative pronouns, serve to distance *iste* from the solely second person force described by
Bach. Meader thus specifically claimed that the weakened demonstrative *iste* should appear frequently together with the second person pronoun because it has been distanced from any inherent second person force [M4].

2.2.2 Genre. In his argument, Bach (1888) asserted that the personal force associated with these demonstratives allows them to serve a dual function as both demonstrative and, in drama, the equivalent of modern stage directions. The choice of demonstrative used provides the reader of a play with information about where each speaker was standing, providing actors with directions for movement and readers millennia later with the ability to recreate this movement. Bach, therefore, theorized that a higher number of demonstratives in drama than in non-dramatic works should be observed [B2]. Additionally, the use of demonstratives for this function has led Bach to suggest that a similar number of demonstratives should be observed in both comedic and tragic plays [B3].

2.2.3 Affective force. Another interesting distinction in the use of the varying demonstratives is the affective force associated with *iste* and *ille*. A frequent accompaniment to any definition of *iste* is some sort of pejorative force, as in Allen and Greenough’s (2001) claimed that it “frequently implies antagonism or contempt” (p. 171) or Moreland and Fleischer’s assertion that it “frequently carries a pejorative or derogatory tone” (pg. 207). Bolkestein (2000) argued that the “pronoun *iste* is often used with a pejorative flavor, which according to the grammars derives from its use for the opponent’s arguments (the opponent being the accused or the defense for the accused addressed) or witnesses in a lawsuit” (p. 133). Latin textbooks offer up various translation options for *iste* that include “that damned” (Moreland & Fleischer, 1990) and “that awful” (Wheelock, 2005), attempting to demonstrate the pejorative force of this demonstrative. Contrariwise, *ille* is often granted a different affective
force and is frequently translated as “famous or well-known” (Allen et al., p. 171) or “well-known” (Gildersleeve, 2008, p. 193).

The affective force of the demonstrative has been a somewhat divisive subject despite the fact that it is almost always taught in beginning Latin textbooks. Keller (1946) claimed that while *iste* can supply a derogatory force, it cannot always be interpreted in such a way and, in fact, is not the only demonstrative capable of supplying a pejorative force. Here she draws attention to the play *Casina* by Plautus, where early on in Act II, the character Cleustrata engages in a tirade against her husband. In her monologue, she labels him “that disgrace of a man” (line 155), “the embodiment of wickedness” (line 161), “the pursuer of disgrace” (line 160), and “fodder for hell” (line 159), all derogatory phrases designed to demonstrate Cleustrata’s contempt for her husband. Yet despite the clearly pejorative connotation, the demonstrative given her throughout this invective is *ille*, as can be seen in Example 11.

(11)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ego} & \quad \text{illum} & \quad \text{fame,} & \quad \text{ego} & \quad \text{illum} \\
\text{I-SG.NOM} & \quad \text{that-SG.ACC.MASC} & \quad \text{hunger-SG.ABL.FEM,} & \quad \text{I-SG.NOM} & \quad \text{that-SG.ACC.MASC} \\
\text{sitii,} & \quad \text{maledictis,} & \quad \text{malefactis} \\
\text{thirst-SG.FEM.ABL,} & \quad \text{abusive words-Pl.NEUT.ABL,} & \quad \text{evil-Pl.ABL} \\
\text{amatorem} & \quad \text{ulcisir,} & \quad \text{ego} & \quad \text{pol} & \quad \text{illum} \\
\text{lover-SG.ACC.MASC} & \quad \text{punish-1SG.FUT.INDIC} & \quad \text{I-SG.NOM} & \quad \text{indeed} & \quad \text{that-SG.ACC.MASC} \\
\text{probe} & \quad \text{incommodis} & \quad \text{dictis} & \quad \text{angam...} \\
\text{right-ADV} & \quad \text{troublesome-Pl.ABL} & \quad \text{saying-Pl.ABL} & \quad \text{choke-1SG.FUT.INDIC} \\
\text{I shall punish that man with hunger, I shall punish that man with thirst, with abusive words, I shall punish that lover with evils, indeed, I shall rightly choke that man by means of troublesome sayings...} \\
\text{(Plautus *Casina*, lines 155-157)}
\end{align*}
\]

Here it can be seen that *ille* is clearly involved in pejoration, demonstrating that this role is not limited to *iste*. Keller found similar examples of *ille* adopting a derogatory force in Plautus’ *Bacchides, Captivi, Persa*, and *Miles Gloriousus*. Keller also provided examples of *hic* taking on derogatory force. In Plautus’ *Captivi*, the captive Aristophontes refers in rage to his fellow captive as “that scoundrel,” as seen in Example 12.
In Example 12 the speaker refers in rage to his fellow as a scoundrel, then discusses his murder. Despite indicating derogatory force, Plautus has here leaned on a form of the demonstrative *ille*.

Later on, this same scoundrel is discussed again:

In Example 13, Plautus has used the demonstrative *hic* in a disparaging sense to modify the noun “scoundrel.” Keller provided similar examples from Plautus’ *Peonulus, Trinummus, Pseudolus,* and *Miles Gloriosus* that show all forms of the demonstrative used to indicate such affective force. Keller therefore argued that that *iste* can bear derogatory force but so can the other demonstrative forms. In fact, she claimed that any demonstrative form can bear derogatory force [K1]. Furthermore, Keller’s hypothesis that all demonstrative forms can bear such force suggests that this should hold true outside the confines of the comic genre. If this is the case, then derogatory uses of all three demonstratives should appear in comedy, tragedy, and outside of dramatic works [K2].

While the Latin demonstratives embody differing semantic forces and exhibit, therefore, a wide-ranging set of meanings, it is also important to examine their syntactic use and determine any variation afforded them by their position and role in the sentence.
2.2.4 Forms and syntactic categories. One critical distinction to be made is the role that the demonstrative is playing in the sentence. In Latin, as with English, demonstratives can occur in pronominal, adnominal, and even adverbial form (Himmelmann, 1996). In their pronominal capacity, demonstratives serve to point at or refer to an object in place of their noun phrase, while their adnominal use modifies or determines an extant noun phrase (Mithun, 1987; Acton & Potts, 2014).

As a scholar not of Latin demonstratives in specific but rather of demonstratives as a whole, Himmelmann has discussed overall trends in demonstratives that can be observed in the frequency of adnominal forms. As Himmelmann posited,

...the use of demonstrative pronouns generally seems to be more restricted than that of adnominally-used demonstratives (at least in non-conversational discourse). This restriction can be seen in two respects: Quantitatively, demonstrative pronouns tend to occur less frequently than adnominally-used demonstratives. Qualitatively, there are fewer contexts for use of demonstrative pronouns than for adnominally-used demonstratives. (p. 206)

Himmelmann’s observations suggest that a larger number of adnominal demonstratives than pronominal demonstratives should be present in a study of Latin, with no reference to genre having an effect on this distribution [H1].

2.2.5 Multimembral sets. Latin demonstratives may also appear as members of sets of demonstratives, working together to indicate contrast or added emphasis. These sets are based on the contrastive pairs that Diessel (2006) noted are typical of demonstratives, the English here vs. there and this vs. that. Meader (1901) defined three different correlation series, the homogenous series hic...hic and ille...ille, where one demonstrative pronoun is repeated, and then the
heterogeneous series *hic...ille*. He further divided these series between bimembral, those having only two demonstratives, and multimembral, or those having more than two demonstratives.

Meader suggested that comedy should contain fewer instances of multimembral demonstrative sets, as these structures are indicative of a formal language found infrequently in comedy [M1]. He wrote that these sets do not appear in the writings of the comic authors Plautus and Terence “due simply to the fact that these correlations are appropriate only to description and narration, which are rarely found in comedy” (p. 95). Additionally, drama as a whole may contain fewer instances of these multimembral sets than formal prose [M2]. Meader also hypothesized that as a result of the presumed reduction in multimembral demonstrative sets, comedy should contain fewer demonstratives than other genres [M3], directly contradicting the main hypothesis of this study that comedies contain more demonstratives.

2.2.6 Endophora. Bolkestein (2000), while examining demonstratives in the writings of Caesar and Cicero, suggested that the primary function of demonstrative pronouns in Latin is deictic, pointing out entities within the physical sphere, while they may serve less frequently as anaphora. Moreover, he claimed that *iste* fills this secondary anaphoric function less frequently than either *hic* or *ille*. Fruyt (2010) agreed that because *iste* is filling a very particular semantic space when it occurs with personal force, there is no room for this demonstrative to regularly assume the weighty roles of endophor:

Since *iste* in Archaic and Classical Latin occurs only in this second opposition [*hic vs iste* in the sphere of discourse, *ille* beyond the sphere], it has a very specific function as it is a marked term; every occurrence of *iste* has its own specific justification in Archaic and Classical Latin. It follows that its frequency in the Latin texts is much smaller than that if *hic* or *ille*. (p. 18)
While *iste* may be used for endophor, its specialized personal function often overshadows or prevents this. In contrast, because *hic* and *ille* served both a deictic and endophoric function, Fruyt (2010) noted both have “an increase in their frequency and a decrease in their specificity” (p. 20). This means that there should be a lower frequency of use for forms of *iste* than either of the other two demonstrative forms, as Fruyt claimed that *iste* generally serves only a deictic function [F1].

Bolkestein’s (2000) research concluded that the organization of the discourse affects the choice of demonstrative used, especially when the demonstrative is serving anaphorically. He further asserted that “the differences in relative frequency of the various pronouns between the two samples can be related to characteristic properties of the two types of discourse,” i.e., between exophora and endophora (p. 117), a characteristic that may hold beyond the oratory and rhetoric of Republican writers and be found in the dramas of Early Latin. In this way, Bolkestein suggested that an analysis of Latin demonstratives should identify fewer instances of anaphoric *iste* than of the other two demonstrative forms, providing a possible explanation for different rates of occurrences between the demonstrative forms.

While analysis of the fragments of Early Latin can provide a great deal of information on the use of demonstratives, one area where it falls short is in the examination of exophora and endophora. Within such a fragmented context it can be easy to identify adnominal demonstratives where the noun and demonstrative modifying it are both visible. When examining pronominal or adverbial demonstratives, however, there is usually no context beyond the clause or sentence where it appears. With no information about what comes before or after, and little idea about what exists in the physical space where the fragment was to be spoken, we are unable to make a determination about whether the demonstrative was pointing forward or
backward within the text or outward into the physical world. It seems, then, that using fragments to study the exophoric or endophoric tendencies of pronominal or adverbial demonstratives is insufficient. Similarly, while it may be easy to identify the noun associated with an adnominal demonstrative, determining whether the demonstrative is serving exophorically and pointing to the noun in the physical world is difficult without full textual context. In this way, Cornish’s (2009) argument about the necessity of studying demonstratives within the context of whole texts (p. 1) bears out, highlighting the shortcomings of using fragments for such an analysis. Nonetheless, while these fragments may not be able to provide information on exophora and endophora in Early Latin, they do provide enough content for analysis of the other aspects of the Latin demonstrative described previously. Additionally, the lack of previous studies that focus on demonstrative use in these authors means that analysis of these fragments will still provide valuable new information to the field.

2.2.7 Summary. This section presented various claims about demonstrative use in Latin that will be evaluated in addition to the overarching claim of this study, namely that comedy should contain more demonstratives than non-comedic texts. I began by presenting hypothesis on the personal force of demonstratives and their co-occurrence with personal pronouns. This included conflicting hypotheses suggesting that each demonstrative form should be found co-occurring with only its correlated personal pronoun, that is *hic* with the first person pronoun, *iste* with the second person pronoun, and *ille* with the third person pronoun and that these demonstratives may co-occur with any and all personal pronouns. I next presented claims suggesting that a higher number of demonstratives should be found within drama than within the non-dramatic texts and that tragedy and comedy should contain a relatively equal amount of demonstratives. I then presented two hypotheses suggesting that all demonstrative forms may be
found bearing derogatory force and that this force should be found in all genres. I further presented the claim that more adnominal demonstratives should be used than pronominal or adverbial ones. I next presented hypotheses on the appearance of demonstratives in multimembral sets, suggesting that more of these sets should be found outside of the comedy genre and outside of drama altogether, leading to a reduction in the overall demonstrative occurrence in drama and especially in comedy. I finally addressed the hypothesis that *iste* should be the least frequently occurring demonstrative form and hypotheses concerning the use of demonstratives for exophora and endophora, explaining how the fragmented nature of the Early Latin corpus would not allow for investigation of the latter of these claims. The analysis presented in Chapter Four, and the general discussion provided in Chapter Five, discuss the evidence for and against the hypotheses I have presented in this section.

### 2.3 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have described what demonstratives are and how they function. I then presented existing research on demonstrative use in Latin, beginning with the claim that initially set this study into motion, namely that demonstrative use is more frequent in comedy than in other genres of Latin writing. I have presented hypotheses of numerous scholars that describe aspects of the Latin demonstrative that would impact or help to explain patterns of demonstrative use. These hypotheses are summarized in the list in Table 5.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the creation and composition of a corpus designed to allow these hypotheses to be tested. I will provide background information on the authors whose works are included in the corpus and discuss why these authors have been selected. I will also present the methods used to evaluate each hypothesis, including how statistics will be gathered.
and how each individual use of the demonstrative will be categorized by type, syntactic function, genre, co-occurrence with pronouns, affective force, and singular or multimembral occurrences.

Table 5

List of Hypotheses on Demonstrative Use in Latin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Bach:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1:</strong> Personal possessive pronouns should occur with demonstratives due to their personal force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2:</strong> Drama should contain more demonstratives than non-dramatic works due to their service as stage directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3:</strong> Tragedy and comedy should contain a similar number of demonstratives because both use stage directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Keller:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K1:</strong> All three demonstratives should appear with pejorative force at some point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K2:</strong> Pejorative force should be found in all genres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K3:</strong> The demonstratives should appear co-occurring with all personal pronouns and are not limited to co-occurring only with their correlated personal pronoun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Meader:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1:</strong> Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of comedy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2:</strong> Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3:</strong> Comedy especially, and maybe drama, may contain fewer demonstratives due to the reduced occurrence of multimembral sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4:</strong> Use of <em>iste</em> should be correlated with the second person pronoun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Himmelman:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1:</strong> Adnominal demonstratives should be more frequent than pronominal demonstratives throughout the whole corpus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Fruyt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1:</strong> <em>Iste</em> should be less frequent than either <em>ille</em> or <em>hic</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Three: Methodology

In order to investigate the validity of the claim that more demonstratives can be found in Latin comedies, as well as the additional hypotheses regarding demonstrative use described in Chapter Two, I will gather statistics on demonstrative use through a corpus analysis. This chapter will describe the creation and composition of the corpus, as well as the methods used for analysis. First, I will describe the overall characteristics of the Latin included within the corpus. I will then describe the authors whose work is included within the corpus, giving a brief background and some pertinent information on overall characteristics of their language. I will further describe authors whose absence from the corpus may be noted and describe reasons for not including them. After describing the composition of the corpus, I will then discuss the statistics I will be gathering from the corpus and the methods used to gather them. These statistics are designed to provide evidence to support or contradict the hypotheses described in Chapter Two.

3.1 Corpus Composition

The main hypothesis under investigation within this study is that Latin comedy contains more demonstratives than Latin tragedy. In order to test this, the corpus used for analysis must therefore contain text from both the comedy and tragedy genres. Furthermore, to test the additional theories presented in Chapter Two that describe demonstrative use in Early Latin, this corpus should also contain texts from non-dramatic sources for comparison. Latin drama authors were active in Rome from roughly 240 to 86 B.C.E (Duckworth, 2015). The language spoken during this period of Roman history is referred to as Early Latin, Archaic Latin, or Old Latin interchangeably, and refers to Latin as spoken before the time of Sulla’s Dictatorship in Rome around 80 B.C.E. (Wheelock, 2005). Limiting all of the authors included within the corpus to
only those from an established time period of language use helps to limit the effects of language change and is therefore ideal for the purposes of this study. Additionally, because the examples of the comic and tragic needed for this study all come from the Early Latin period, the analysis will necessarily also reflect on demonstrative use within this Early Latin time period. The majority of research on the Latin language is focused on the language and texts of the classical period, when writers such as Cicero, Virgil, and Caesar flourished (Wheelock, 2005), and often neglects the period of Early Latin. Research on demonstrative use in Early Latin, therefore, has been likewise limited due to this neglect. This focus on Early Latin therefore extends the value of the results of this analysis as it provides new information on a relatively less-studied aspect of the Latin language.

In order to determine whether genre has any significant impact on the use of demonstratives, it is important to reduce the impact of any additional variables while attempting to include as much accepted comedic writing as possible. While this might at first seem trivial, variable reduction poses an interesting dilemma due to the timeframe and origin of Roman comedic writing. Roman comedy reached its height during the Republican Era of 240 B.C.E. to 140 B.C.E., and what Duckworth (1952) called the “Golden Age of Drama.” As comedic works most often took the form of plays, the Republican period is home to the majority of extant comedies (Von Albrecht, 1997). This golden age, however, represents an early era for Roman writing of any genre in general—in fact, the earliest complete work of Roman writing is from a comic author (Richlin, 2005). As the Republican period ended and the Roman Empire began, the golden age of drama faded before the golden age of literature, and non-dramatized works overshadowed the tragedies and comedies of the Republic. The majority of orations, poetry, and non-dramatized works originated in this later period of Roman culture, separated from the
comedic and tragic works by a period of time longer than the American Constitution has existed. During those centuries, the Latin language shifted and changed along with the prevailing culture. More importantly, this drastic difference in time periods seems to run down the genre line; that is, each genre is relatively (though not entirely) isolated to a single time period, with comedies and tragedies originating in the Republic and orations and poems originating in the Empire. Without accounting for this, any differences in demonstrative usage may be related not to genre but rather to time period and language shift. For example, the clitic -ce was appended to demonstratives only in older Latin, and as a result appears commonly in comedic texts, but rarely in any works from post-Republican Rome. Thus, while statistical analysis would identify illic and istic as significant indicators of a comedic texts, much more common in these dramatic works than in prose, such a difference is in fact nothing more than an indication of a work from an earlier time. It is therefore critical to limit our corpus to works from only one period.

Examining drama from the Republican period allows us to examine Roman comedy at its zenith and, most importantly, provides the largest body of comedic works for our corpus. An additional benefit to focusing on this time period is the crossover between comic and tragic authors. While individual works are unambiguously either comic or tragic, authors frequently produced works of both genres. This crossover allows us to study the language differences between genres for a single author, ensuring that observed differences are not simply related to author or period distinctions.

The majority of the Latin from the early time period remains only in the form of fragments, preserved in the writing of other authors. Warmington (1936), in the introduction to his collection and translation of these fragments, described that some fragments survive “because the renown of these was still great, and their plays were still widely performed or read, and their
whole work had some meaning in the public life of Rome and Italy” while others survived because they exhibited “linguistic peculiarities of various kinds” (p. ix). It should be noted, therefore, that while these Early Latin authors are the only available option for studying Latin comic and tragic language, the available fragments have likely survived due to their uniqueness. While they are likely still characteristic of the genre as a whole, specifically when taken altogether, many fragments were only passed down as examples of unique spelling, word application, or meaning. For example, fragment 80 of Pacuvius has been retained in the text of Priscian, a Latin grammarian from 500 C.E. (Warmington, 1936, p.194-195), as seen in Example 14.

(14)  

Quidam tamen veterum et hoc ossu et hoc ossum proferebant, unde Pacuvius in Chryse—
‘ossum inhumatum aestuosam aulam’
“Still some old writers used to inflect ‘os’ from a nominative ‘ossu’ and from a nominative ‘ossum.’ Hence Pacuvius in Chryses—‘sea-battered urn of bones unburied’”

Pacuvius has used the form *ossum* to mean “bones,” while the more established form would have been *ossa*. Prician noted this unique spelling and included it in his grammatical text as an example of alternative yet accepted forms. This is lucky, because while Pacuvius’ text of *Chryses* does not survive, Prician’s account of it does, providing a sample of the language of this important Latin tragedian.

In addition to noting unusual forms and spellings, authors also commented on unique application of words among the Early Latin authors. For example, the Roman grammarian Festus around 200 C.E. wrote Example 15 concerning Naevius (Warmington, 1936, pp. 142-143).

(15)  

Antiqui ‘tam’ etiam pro tamen usi sunt, ut Naevius—‘Quid si taceat? Dum videat, tam sciat…’
“Archaic writers used ‘tam’ even in the sense of ‘tamen,’ as in Naevius—‘What if he says nothing? So long as he sees, let him still know…”"
Though the form *tam* is established among the Classical Latin of Festus’ time, its use in this context is somewhat unusual. In noting this unique usage, Festus provided Line 13 of Naevius’ unassigned fragments. Lines 327-328 of Accius are provided by Nonius, a Roman grammarian from the same period as Prician (Warmington, 1936, pp.440-441), in Example 16.

(16) ‘*Extorris*’ dicitur extra terram vel extra terminus. Accius Eurysace—

*Nunc per terras vagus extorris regno exturbatus, mari...*

‘*Extorris*’ is a term used for one ‘extra terram’ or ‘extra terminus.’ Accius in Eursaces—

Outlander now, out of my kingdom thrust, A wanderer over lands, on sea...

Here Nonius uses a sample of Accius’ writing to demonstrate how the word *extorris* is used in context. *Extorris* is not a unique form or unusual usage of an established word, rather Nonius has chosen to rely on a sample from Accius to provide an example of how this word is used.

Examples 14–16 demonstrate various reasons for the preservation of fragments from Early Latin, and show how the fragments from this time period have been passed down to present day. Additionally, the fragmented survival of the texts from this time period means that frequently there is little context for a given line. This affects the ability to distinguish, for example, exophora from endophora or to determine the affective force of a demonstrative. However, the size and diversity of the corpus overall will allow for an analysis of numerous aspects of demonstrative use, including statistical analysis of the frequency of use within various genres, the distribution of the thee Latin demonstrative forms, and the syntactic roles these demonstratives play, as well as their co-occurrence with personal pronouns and service in multimembral sets.

The Early Latin dramatists include Titus Maccius Plautus (Plautus), Publius Terentius Afer (Terence), Livius Andronicus, Gnaeus Naevius (Naevius), Caecilius Statius (Caecilius), Marcus Pacuvius (Pacuvius), Quintus Ennius (Ennius), and Lucius Accius (Accius). These authors wrote comedies, tragedies, and even some non-dramatic works. In the following, I will
introduce each of these authors in chronological order of their birth, including discussion of any notable characteristics of their language use and influence. While it is beyond the scope of this work to provide a detailed analysis of the potential role of native language or languages in demonstrative use, some commentary on the matter will be included in the conclusion. I will also detail their contribution to the corpus, including which genres they wrote in and how many words they have contributed.

3.1.1 Excluded authors. The most prominent authors from the Early Latin period are Titus Maccius Plautus (Plautus) and Publius Terentius Afer (Terence). Twenty full comic plays authored by Plautus remain, forming the largest corpus of Roman drama available (Segal, 1968). From Terence, six comedies remain in full, composing the second largest corpus of Roman dramatic works (Bovie et al., 1974). While these works may provide good examples of the use of demonstratives in the comedy genre, I have elected to focus on authors for whom no complete texts remain, as their work is less frequently studied and may provide new information on the patterns of demonstrative use during this time period.

Plautus and Terence have, however, provided numerous examples used within this study (including all of the Latin examples from Chapter Two). This is because these authors have been the focus of previous investigations into demonstrative use in Latin (e.g., Karakasis 2005; Laidlaw, 1936), which has provided numerous examples to draw from. By not including the frequently analyzed Plautus and Terence, my investigation gives a broader perspective of demonstrative use among Early Latin authors. It examines texts not only from the comedies that were the sole genre of both Plautus and Terence, but also tragedies and non-dramatic works. It also includes six different authors, providing a more varied corpus. More importantly, this investigation is focused on authors who have not previously been included in analyses of
demonstrative use, which can provide novel data to use in conjunction with those already obtained from the works of Plautus and Terence.

3.1.2 Livius Andronicus. The first author included within the corpus is Livius Andronicus, a unique writer who penned both comedic plays as well as tragic ones. Unfortunately, little is known about this pioneering writer and his works remain only in fragmentary form. In fact, although Livius Andronicus has been called the “founder of Latin literature” (Beare, 1964), what little remains of his writing has been considered by scholars as relatively unimportant and preserved only as a representation of archaic forms of language by later grammarians (Sellar, 1881). In fact, Sellar wrote that “there is no ground for believing that Livius was a man of original genius” and that his importance “consists in his being the accidental medium through which literary art was first introduced to the Romans” (p. 51). Despite the little regard afforded him by scholars such as Sellar, Livius Andronicus’ inclusion in the corpus is no doubt important. As the first Roman dramatist and speaker of Early Latin, his language certainly meets all necessary requirements—that its content may demonstrate no “original genius,” as described by Sellar, is irrelevant for this analysis.

Livius Andronicus’ fragments contribute more than 2,000 words to the corpus of Early Latin, further identifying him as an important author for the sake of this investigation. Moreover, Livius Andronicus’ place as the author of the first remaining Latin literature affords him important status, and as Segal wrote “makes him some lines and a legend” (p. 5). While the Trojan myths represented in his Odyssey were well known throughout Rome before he wrote them down, due to their frequent appearances in other art forms of the time (Segal, 1968, p. 209), Livius Andronicus earns no less of a place in the history of Latin literature for it.
Livius Andronicus flourished around 240 B.C.E., though the exact year of his birth is unknown (Sellar, 1881). While his exact place of origin is somewhat unclear, it is widely accepted that he was a Greek slave in the service of Livius Salinator (Beare, 1964; Sellar, 1881). Prior to Livius Andronicus’ work, there was no extant literary tradition in Latin, forcing him to rely on the Greek stories and dramas to inspire his Latin writing. This influence, coupled with his Greek origin and probable non-native knowledge of the Latin he used in his plays, may likely influence the resulting use of demonstratives in his works and substantially influence his language use all together. Some authors have noted the presence of “dialect glosses” of Greek in his work (Adams, 2013, p. 122), and in his fragments can be seen the use of the neuter plural adjective as an adverb, a common Grecism eschewed by later Latin writers (Adams, 2013, p. 122). Despite this influence, Livius Andronicus routinely Latinizes Greek names by giving them Latinate endings (e.g., Calypsonem, rather than Καλύψω) and even replaces some standard Greek names within his texts (e.g., the Muses (Μοῦσα) become Camena, The Fates (Μοῖρα) Morta, and (Μνημοσύνη) Moneta; Adams, 2008, p. 373).

Livius Andronicus did not limit his writing to one particular genre but rather wrote both tragedies and comedies, as well as some epic poetry. In total, the names of eight or nine tragedies are known (Achilles, Aegisthus, Aiax Mastigophoros, Andromeda, Danae, Equos Trojanus, Hermione, Terreus, and possibly Ino), providing 242 words in total. Additionally, three comedies remain (Gladiolus, Ludius, and the likely corrupt Virgo) with only 32 remaining words, and 212 words from his Latin retelling of the Odyssey (Beare, 1964). Livius Andronicus’ Odyssey carries the extra weight of being identified as the first piece of Roman literature, securing this author’s place as a legend (Segal, 1968). Altogether, we have 486 words remaining of Livius Andronicus’ writing to add to the corpus. These words all come from fragments
appearing in works by other authors to demonstrate archaic words, differing verb voices, strange
meter, and rarely for the contained thought (Sanford, 1923). All of these fragments are therefore
short, many only one line each.

### 3.1.3 Gnaeus Naevius

Gnaeus Naevius, sometimes Cnaeus Naevius, was a younger
contemporary of Livius Andronicus who flourished in 235 B.C.E. (Sellar, 1881). While he was
born in Campania, the region had been Latinized prior to his birth, making Naevius the first
native Roman author (Conte, 1987). He has further been identified as the first Roman epic poet
(De Graff, 1931) and wrote texts in many genres including historical epics, historical plays,
tragedy and comedy (Warmington, 1935). In his writing, Naevius was outspoken not only about
historical characters but also about living persons (De Graff, 1931).

Fragments remain from 22 of Naevius’ comedies, including *Acontizomenos, Agitateria,
Agrypnumtes, Apella, Ariolus, Carbonaria, Clamidaria, Colax, Corollaria, Demetnes, Dolus,
Figulus, Glaucoma, Gymnasticus, Pellex, Proiectus, Quadrigemini, Statagmus, Tarentilla,
Testicularia, Triphallus, and Tunicularia*. Included with fragments from these plays are
fragments from unknown plays yet recognized as comedic fragments, bringing the total size of
the comedy portion of Naevius’ corpus up to 778 words. We also have fragments from six
tragedies, namely *Danae, Equos Troianus, Hector Proficiscens, Hesiona, Iphigenia*, and
*Lycurgus*, as well as some unassigned tragedy fragments, totaling 370 words. Of his Historical
Epics we have 314 words, all from the *Bellum Poenicum*. Additionally, we have 37 words
unassigned to any genre, bringing the total size of Naevius’ corpus to 1,499 words.

### 3.1.4 Caecilius Statius

Caecilius Statius was a foreigner to Rome, originally from an
Insubrian tribe in the city of Milan and either Gaulish or Celtic himself (Warmington, 1936, p.
xxvii; Conte, 1987, p. 65). While the place of his birth is well established, his exact background
is otherwise somewhat hazy, with no exact record of his date of birth and a doubtable record of his death. The height of his activity has been placed around 180 B.C.E., leading scholars to place his birth around 225 B.C.E. (Warmington, 1936, p. xxvii), and his arrival in Rome sometime after the battle of Clastidium in 222 B.C.E. (Conte, 1987, p. 65). This timeline means that Caecilius was a young child when he arrived in Rome, limiting the influence of the Gaulish or Celtic languages on his writing and establishing him as one of the more native Latin speakers included in this corpus.

Early critics, including Varro, Cicero, Horace, and Volcius Sedigitus, place Caecilius first among the Roman comedians, even ranking him higher than the more famous Plautus (Bailey, 1983, p. 245-6). His plots and the “gravity of his feelings” (Conte, 1987, p. 66) are lauded highly, and he was thought of as an author of the “first rank” (Conte, 1987, p. 66). The only complaint levied against Caecilius is regarding the purity of his Latin (Conte, 1987, p. 66). His language is notable for lacking the innovative features found in Pacuvius or some of the later authors, and instead held close to the “traditional linguistic pattern of Roman comedy” (Karakasis, 2005, p. 168). Karakasis (2005) noted that, despite belonging to the category of Early Latin himself, Caecilius deliberately used features of Early Latin as archaisms, indicating that some aspects of the language had shifted in meaning or style, even within the period of Early Latin (p. 168-9). In addition, Caecilius seems to have been heavily influenced by the Greek models on which his dramas were based. As the majority of his works claim only a Greek title, scholars suggest that this indicates varying levels of closeness to Greek originals (Warmington, 1936, p. xxviii). In fact, Conte (1987) claimed that a characteristic of Caecilius’ writing is his adherence to the Greek models of the plays he adopted and that his works represent a more “Hellenizing phase” of the culture (p. 66).
Caecilius’ corpus is entirely comedy, containing 1,668 words from 42 plays, including Aethrio, Andria, Androgynos, Asotus, Chalcia, Chryson, Dardanus, Davus, Demandati, Ephesio, Epicleros, Epistathmos, Epistula, Exhautuhestos, Exul, Fallacia, Gamos, Harpazomene, Hymnis, Hypoibolimaeus, Aeschinus, Imbrii, Karine, Kratinus, Meretrix, Namclerus, Nothus Nicasio, Obolostates, Pausimachus, Philamena, Plocium, Polumeni, Portior, Progames, Pugll, Symbolur, Synaristosae, Synepebi, Soracusii, Titthe, Triumphus, and Venator, as well as some fragments not assigned to any play.

3.1.5 Marcus Pacuvius. Marcus Pacuvius was born in 220 B.C.E. to a sister of Ennius’, establishing him as a member of a family prone to the dramatic arts. Unusual among the Early Latin dramatists, however, Pacuvius held multiple careers during his lifetime. Before turning to drama, he served as a painter, the result of which was that despite his relative longevity he had a reduced literary output when compared with the likes of Ennius and Accius (Conte, 1987, p. 104). Pacuvius’ dramas are exclusively tragedies, once again putting him in opposition to predecessors like Ennius or Naevius. Despite “vague notices” (Conte, 1987, p. 104) that he composed satiric works along with his tragedies, none remain to be studied. Perhaps because of his relatively limited output, Pacuvius was afforded a well-established reputation as a leader among the tragedians: Wallach (1979) described how Roman citizens considered him doctus, or learned (p. 142), Conte (1987) mentioned that he “is regarded as holding first place...among the Roman tragedians” (p. 105), and Bailey (1983) says that he has “primacy among Roman tragedians” (p. 245)

Born in Brundisium, a Roman settlement on the southern peninsula of Italy, whose culture is influenced by both the Greek and Oscan languages (Conte, 1987, p. 104), Pacuvius was certainly familiar with more languages than just the Latin that he wrote in. His birthplace
and relation to Ennius, a student of Greek drama, means that Pacuvius was presumably familiar with Greek tragedies in their original, as well as Latin adaptations (Wallach, 1979, p. 153). The Greek influence on his writing may be seen in his use of compound nouns, regarded by Quintilian as a feature of Greek rather than of Latin, and perhaps best visible in the famous line Nerei repandirostrum incurvicervicum pecus, or ‘Nereus’ upturnsnouted and roundcrooknecked flock’ to refer to dolphins (Halla-aho & Kruschwitz, 2010, p. 131.).

Pacuvius was noted (and frequently criticized) for his use of neologisms, awkward constructions, and excessive wordplay, all of which established his style as “impure” Latin when compared to the works of Classical Latin (Conte, 1987, p. 108). The author Lucilius criticized him for being contorted and bombastic (Conte, 1987, p. 105). Conte asserted that this “impure” Latin is Pacuvius’ purposeful experimentation with the language, which can trace its roots back to the language stylings of his Uncle Ennius (p. 108).

Of Pacuvius’ writings there remain fragments from 11 Tragedies—Antiopa, Armorum Iudicium, Atalanta, Chryses, Dulorestes, Hermiona, Iliona, Medus, Niptra, Periboea, and Teucer—totaling 2,279 words. In addition, 317 words remain from fragments unassigned to any title, bringing the total size of Pacuvius’ corpus to 2,596 words.

3.1.6 Quintus Ennius. In 204 B.C.E., Quintus Ennius was brought to Rome by Cato, where he found work as a dramatist and contributed more than 20 plays before his death in 169 B.C.E. Unlike many other authors, Ennius wrote both comedies and tragedies, though he seemed to excel only at one. Goldberg (1989) noted that Ennius’ “comedies took but last place in Volcacios Sedigitus’ cannon of comic poets” (p. 256), which Conte (1987) confirmed, saying that “the extant comic fragments are too meager to confirm or refute the judgment of the ancients, but the genre of comedy was certainly not congenial to him” (pp. 77-78). Despite his
weak comedies, many of his contemporaries found his more than 20 tragedies masterful, allowing for their continued production throughout Roman theaters well into Augustan times (Goldberg, 1989).

Like many of his predecessors, Ennius was not a native Latin speaker. His native language was Oscan, while his education was in Greek and his writings were in Latin (Adams, 2008). Though it was common for men like Ennius to learn Latin through military service in the Roman army, in which he did serve, it is likely that the more “archaic and artificial” (Adams, 2008, p. 117) variety of Latin seen in his writings was more likely learned elsewhere and before his military service (Adams, 2008, p. 153). As noted by Aulus Gellius, *Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret* (“Quintus Ennius said that he has three hearts, because he wrote that he spoke Greek and Oscan and Latin”; Adams, 2008, p. 116).

While Ennius’ trilingualism is rarely in doubt, many scholars believe that his third language was not Oscan, but rather Messapic. Coming from the Messapic foundation of Rudiae in Calabria and claiming “descent from the legendary King Messapus” (Goldberg, 1989, p. 256), the nature of this third “heart” is still debated, with some saying that he spoke all four tongues (Adams, 2008). More important for our purposes, however, is not necessarily which languages Ennius knew but rather that he was influenced by multiple ones. The particular nature of the impact of his familiarity with Greek on his writings is discussed below, although Adams claimed that “[a]ny attempt to find the influence of Oscan or any other vernacular language on the Latin of Ennius would not incidentally be fruitful” (p. 117).

In addition, Ennius has been credited with not only the invention of the Latin shorthand, but also the double spelling of long consonants, introducing language change at least in orthography (Newman, 1965). Newman (1965) attested to Ennius’ reformative actions, saying
that he “took occasion to reform the metrical usage of his predecessors, and even spelling” (Newman, 1965, p. 45). Gildersleeve and Lodge (2008) credit Ennius with introducing the *et...que...* and *que...que...* construction to mean “both...and...” (p. 301), a formation that would become common not only in Early Latin, but throughout its history.

Varro attested to his choice to inflect Greek names, such as Hector and Nestor, with Latin endings, creating *Hectorem* and *Nestorem* (Adams, 2008, p. 371). We begin to see some differences, however, in the language used in Ennius’ tragedies and his comedies in his choice to follow this Latinised inflection pattern that he introduced. Adams said there may be a “distinction between the tragedies (where Latinisation is the norm) and the [non-dramatic] *Annales* (where there are some Greek inflections)” (Adams, 2008, p. 371). Adams further discussed Ennius’ choice to use Greek syntax in his poetry, especially the use of the neuter plural adjective as an adverb (p. 422), further identifying the influence that Greek had on Ennius’ language choice. Additionally, Ennius adopted the fad of translating Greek compound verbs into Latin phrases designed to imitate Greek originals. For instance, in his *Annales*, we find the Latin *dicti studiosus* (“fondness of words”) representing the Greek φιλόλογος (philologos, or “love of words”). Adams further provided multiple instances where Ennius relies on the original Greek gender of a noun rather than the established or common Latin gender. In his *Annales*, he treats *pulvis* as feminine to match the Greek feminine κόνις, as well as *aer*, matching the Homeric feminine form (Adams 2013, pp. 387-8). As Adams wrote, “[by] a distinctive Greek usage a Latin writer might subtly advertise his indebtedness to a Greek predecessor” (p. 423).

Ennius’ most famous work, an Epic History called *Annales*, remains in 3,130 words, while the 20 tragedies of his that remain—*Achilles, Alcmeo, Alexander, Andromacha, Andromeda, Athamas, Crespontes, Erectheus, Eumenides, Hectoris Lytra, Hecuba, Iphigenaia, *
Medea, Melanippa, Nemea, Phoenix, Telamo, Telephus, and Thyestes—give us 2,717 words. Additionally, 44 words of Comedy, 89 of Didactic Poetry, 740 of Latin Translation, and 351 from unassigned fragments comprise the non-dramatic portion of Ennius’ fragments and complete the remainder of the Ennius corpus.

3.1.7 Lucius Accius. Born in Pisaurum in 170 B.C.E., Lucius Accius was a “poet-philologist” who wrote tragedies, comedies, and non-comedic works (Conte, 1987, p. 106). He flourished around 140 B.C., working for a brief while, therefore, in competition with Pacuvius (Conte, 1987, p. 105). Accius’ love of language led him to use many unique forms and words, contributing to the survival of fragments of his writing within the works of grammarians (Conte, 1987, p. 108). His love of language also led him to suggest a number of reforms in Latin spelling, including a reduction in the number of letters, how to incorporate Greek spelling, and how to distinguish short and long vowel sounds, and Warmington (1936) wrote that “some of his suggestions were taken seriously by the Romans” (p. xxiii-xxiv). Accius is also interesting for his reputation as “the first known scholar of Plautinity” (Segal, 1968, p. 175), demonstrating Accius’ knowledge of the works and language of the Early Latin author.

Fragments remain from 44 Tragedies of Accius, including Achilles, Aegisthus, Agamemnonidae, Alcestis, Alcmeo, Alphesiboea, Amphitryo, Andromeda, Antenoridae, Antigona, Armorum Iudicium, Astyanax, Athamas, Atreus, Chrysippus, Clytaemnestra, Deiphobus, Diomedes, Epigoni, Epinausimache, Erigona, Eriphyla, Eurysaces, Hecuba, Hellenes, Medea siva Argonautae, Melanippus, Melleager, Minos sive Minotaurus, Myrmidones, Neoptolemus, Nyctegresia, Oenomaus, Pelopidae, Persidae, Philocteta sive Philocteta Lemnius, Phinidae, Phoenissae, Prometheus, Stasiastae sive Tropaeum Liberi, Telephus, Terteus, Thebais, and Troades. These tragic fragments account for 3,953 words of the corpus of Accius’ writing. In
addition, we have 204 words from Accius’ *Records of the Stage, Poemata Amatoria, Parerga*, and *Annals*, and 222 words from unassigned fragments. The total size of Accius’ corpus is therefore 4,379 words.

**3.1.8 Summary.** Altogether, our corpus of Early Latin comedic texts contains fragments from Caecilius, Naevius, Livius Andronicus, and Ennius, and totals 2,535 words. Our corpus of tragedy fragments contains text from Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius, but also fragments from Pacuvius and Accius, and none from Caecilius. In total, this tragedy corpus is 9921 words. The non-dramatic portion of this corpus contains fragments from Naevius, Ennius, Accius, and Livius Andronicus, totaling 5,525 words.

The final composition of the corpus used in this study is described in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Comedy Word Count</th>
<th>Tragedy Word Count</th>
<th>Non-Drama Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caecilius</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naevius</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennius</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accius</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>4,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacuvius</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livius Andronicus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Word Count</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>9,623</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>17,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Methods

The previously described corpus served as the basis of the analyses in this study. The hypotheses tested are found in Table 7.

Table 7

Hypotheses Listed by Subject Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Overarching Claim</strong>: Comedy will contain more demonstratives than tragedy (Karakasis, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>B2</strong>: Drama should contain more demonstratives than non-dramatic works due to their service as stage directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>B3</strong>: Tragedy and Comedy should contain a similar number of demonstratives because both use stage directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Form and Syntactic Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>F1</strong>: <em>Iste</em> should be less frequent than either <em>ille</em> or <em>hic</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>H1</strong>: Adnominal demonstratives should be more frequent than pronominal demonstratives throughout the whole corpus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronoun Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>B1</strong>: Personal possessive pronouns should occur with their correlating demonstratives (i.e., <em>hic</em> with the first person, <em>iste</em> with the second person, and <em>ille</em> with the third person) due to their personal force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>K3</strong>: The demonstratives should appear co-occurring with all personal pronouns and are not limited to co-occurring only with their correlated personal pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>M4</strong>: Use of <em>iste</em> should be correlated with the second person pronoun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>K1</strong>: All three demonstratives should appear with pejorative force at some point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>K2</strong>: Pejorative force should be found in all genres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multimembral Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>M1</strong>: Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of comedy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>M2</strong>: Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>M3</strong>: Comedy (and drama) may contain fewer demonstratives than non-dramatic texts due to the reduced occurrence of multimembral series of demonstratives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exophora and Endophora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>F2</strong>: <em>Hic</em> should be the most frequent cataphoric demonstrative pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>F3</strong>: <em>Ille</em> should be the most frequent anaphoric demonstrative pronoun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The original texts that I used to create the corpus were the standard Loeb “Remains of Old Latin” (Warmington, 1936), providing both the standardized Latin text as well as established English translations. I began by creating text files containing all of the fragments for each genre of each author—for example, I created one text file for Pacuvius, since all of his writing was in the tragic genre, while I created three text files for Ennius, who wrote comedy, tragedy, and non-dramatic works. Each fragment varies in length from a phrase to a paragraph, based on how much material remained from the original source. These text files allowed me to obtain information such as total word count, and allowed me to search for the demonstratives that I was interested in. I used the corpus analysis toolkit AntConc (Anthony, 2014) to help identify every occurrence of the demonstrative within each text file. I added each fragment containing a demonstrative to a database, along with the standard Loeb translation for the fragment and a genre label corresponding to the genre of the work it belonged to. Analysis of this database of demonstratives allowed for the examination Karakasis’ claim that demonstratives are more frequent in comedic writing, providing the statistical evidence that this claim had been missing.

Once I had identified every occurrence of demonstratives within these fragments, I coded and labeled each fragment based on particular characteristics in order to analyze the fragments. The initial statistics I gathered are on the number of demonstratives used in each genre within the corpus. This allowed me to determine which genre contains the highest absolute number of demonstratives, and more importantly the relative amount of demonstrative use for each genre. I identified which demonstrative form was used in each fragment—*hic, ille, or iste*—based on the form that appeared in the fragment, and I identified if the demonstrative was serving pronominally, adnominally, or adverbially by comparing my own personal translation with the standard translation provided by Warmington (1936). Data on the distribution of demonstrative
use between these forms and syntactic categories provided information on what types of
demonstratives are most frequent within each genre, indicating which forms may impact overall
demonstrative use the most. In addition, these data addressed hypotheses [B1] and [B2],
describing the impact of genre on demonstrative use, as well as [F1] and [H1], describing the
impact of demonstrative form and syntactic category on demonstrative use.

I also labeled each demonstrative for co-occurrence with personal pronouns in order to
examine hypotheses concerning the personal force of demonstratives. While demonstratives
could bear personal force without co-occurring with a personal pronoun, such co-occurrence is
common and provides a good metric for the presence of such personal force in the context-less
environment of the Early Latin fragments (Keller, 1946). These data were gathered by
identifying all sentences that contained both a demonstrative and a personal pronoun. Relying on
my own translations as well as those of Warmington (1936), I determined whether the
demonstrative and personal pronoun were related in any way within the sentence. For the
purposes of this study, the demonstrative and personal pronoun did not have to exhibit any
locational relationship within the fragment; that is, they did not need to occur in the same noun
phrase or some restricted set of possible locations, but rather it was enough for them to relate
semantically based on the translations. For those that were related, I then noted the form of
demonstrative and whether the personal pronoun was first, second, or third person. These data
provided statistics to evaluate hypotheses [B1], [K3], and [M4].

I also examined each demonstrative for affective force, based again on a comparison
between my own translations and Warmington's. The limited context available for most
fragments made assigning affective force a challenge, and I often relied upon clues provided by
other content words within the fragment. For instance, the presence of clearly pejorative
adjectives (such as “whorish”) led me to classify fragments as derogatory, while demonstratives used in prayer or invocation I classified as laudatory. Borderline cases, or instances where neither translation nor context indicated the presence of affective force, I assigned a neutral force. Based on this assessment, I labeled each fragment as either derogatory, laudatory, or neutral. I then associated affective force with demonstrative form in order to determine if there are any patterns to the force of the demonstrative and the form chosen to represent this. These statistics provided information on the hypotheses [K1] and [K2] in which demonstrative forms are most frequently associated with pejorative force and also provided information on whether there are patterns in demonstrative force based upon the genre in which the demonstrative appears.

Finally, I identified occurrences of multimembral demonstrative sets within fragments contained in the corpus. Such sets were identified by the occurrence of two or more demonstratives within a given sentence and were divided between multimembral sets, sets with two or more linked demonstratives, and instances where multiple demonstratives are used but with no relation to each other. To make this distinction, I have compared translations of each fragment (my own translations as well as the standard translations from Warmington) in order to determine whether demonstratives were working together to provide contrast (e.g., “the former…the later,” “some…others…,” and deictic contrast “I want this, not that”). Those sets that do operate together I have classified as multimembral sets. Analysis of these multimembral demonstrative sets addresses the hypotheses [M1], [M2], and [M3].

3.3 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have described the methods that will be used in this study to determine how demonstratives are used in genres of Early Latin. I began by describing the composition of
the corpus, including why it is limited to Early Latin. I then introduced all of the authors whose work appears in the corpus, describing their backgrounds, language characteristics, and what fragments of theirs have been included. I then identified the hypotheses to be addressed in the analysis and the methods by which they were tested. The results of the analysis of the data are described in Chapter Four, while a discussion of the results is included in Chapter Five.
Chapter Four: Analysis

This chapter presents my analysis of the data concerning demonstrative use within the corpus of Early Latin fragments (henceforth “the corpus”). The makeup of the corpus and methods of analysis have been presented in Chapter Three. In this chapter, particular attention is paid to characteristics of demonstrative use that might support or contradict theories of demonstratives presented in Chapter Two. I will begin by analyzing statistics impacting the main hypothesis that drove the rest of the investigations in this thesis, namely that comedy should contain more uses of demonstratives than tragedy. This analysis will focus on the effect that genre has on demonstrative use within the corpus. I will then analyze the data for support of the various theories discussed in Chapter Two that attempt to provide an explanation for differences in demonstrative use. I will begin by examining the distribution of demonstrative use into the three forms and three syntactic categories available to the Latin demonstrative, namely hic, ille, and iste, as well as pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial forms. Next, I will analyze the co-occurrence of demonstratives and personal pronouns. I will then examine the derogatory, laudatory, or neutral force associated with each demonstrative, followed by an analysis of their occurrence in multimembral sets. I will conclude by summarizing the results of my analysis.

4.1 Genre

I begin by examining the total number of demonstratives found in the corpus and any identifiable trends associated with genre, in an attempt to address Karakasis’ claim and the overarching hypothesis of this study. The full corpus includes 335 demonstratives from a total of 17,660 words, indicating that demonstratives comprise roughly 1.9% of the entire corpus. When the corpus is divided into dramatic and non-dramatic fragments—that is, fragments from either tragic or comic plays and fragments from all other genres—statistical differences begin to
emerge. The non-dramatic portion of the corpus contains 5,525 words, among which are 65 demonstratives, representing 1.2% of this portion of the corpus. The dramatic portion contains 12,135 words, including 270 demonstratives, representing 2.2% of the entire dramatic corpus. Not only is the number of demonstratives found among the dramatic fragments higher than that found among non-dramatic fragments (270 compared to 65), but more importantly the relative proportion of demonstratives within each corpus is similarly increased (2.2% compared to 1.2%).

This information can further be broken down into comic and tragic fragments. The corpus includes 9,623 words from tragic fragments, of which 197 or 2.0% are demonstratives. It also includes 2,512 words from comic fragments, of which 73 or 2.9% are demonstratives. The comic fragments show a demonstrative use rate that is higher than that found in tragedy, which in turn is higher than that found in the non-dramatic fragments. These data are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Use by Genre</th>
<th>Whole Corpus</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can easily be seen that fragments from comic dramas include the highest relative amount of demonstratives (2.9%), more than double the amount found in non-dramatic fragments (1.2%) and nearly one and a half times the amount found in tragic drama fragments (2.0%). These statistics broadly support Karakasis’ claim that comedy makes greater use of
demonstratives by demonstrating a much higher proportion of demonstratives in this genre than in any other.

The data also provide support for Bach’s claim [B2] that we should find more demonstratives in drama than in non-dramatic works. However, the fragments provide no direct evidence that the reason for this is that demonstratives were used in drama as stage directions. Furthermore, Bach’s claim [B3] that a similar number of demonstratives should be found in both tragedy and comedy because of their service as stage directions is likewise unsupported. While it may still be true that demonstratives were used as stage directions, no direct evidence for this is found in these fragments and Bach’s predicted pattern of demonstrative usage based on this claim is unsupported—in fact, we find almost one and a half times as many demonstratives in comedy.

In order to determine how robust this statistical difference in demonstrative use between genres truly is, I will now examine the fragments of the individual authors within the corpus to see if each demonstrates the same characteristics observed in the overall corpus.

4.1.1 Caecilius. Of Caecilius, we have only comedic fragments remaining, including a total of 1,658 words. This includes 52 instances of the demonstrative, representing 3.1% of all of Caecilius’ words, and is described in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Caecilius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caecilius Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that Caecilius only wrote comedies means that while I cannot compare Caecilius’ rate of demonstrative use between genres, it is still worth comparing his demonstrative use to the average provided by our analysis of the corpus as a whole. His 3.1% demonstrative rate is certainly comparable to the 2.9% rate expected by our general statistics for the comedy genre. In this way Caecilius supports the overarching hypothesis that we should find a high rate of demonstrative use within comedy.

4.1.2 Naevius. Unlike Caecilius, Naevius wrote in multiple genres. The remaining fragments of Naevius’ writing contains 1,499 words in total, divided among tragedy (370 words, 24.7% of the Naevian fragments), comedy (778 words, 51.9% of the Naevian fragments), historical epics (314 words, 20.9% of the Naevian fragments), and unassigned fragments (37 words, 2.5% of the Naevian fragments). Of these 1,499 words, 27 are forms of the demonstrative (1.8% of the Naevian fragments). Naevius’ rate of demonstrative use is described in Table 10.

Table 10

| Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Naevius |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Whole Corpus | Drama | Non-Drama | Comedy | Tragedy |
| Total Words     | 1499         | 1148  | 351        | 778    | 370     |
| Number of Demonstratives | 27      | 25    | 2          | 18     | 7       |
| Percent of Demonstratives | 1.8% | 2.2%  | 0.6%       | 2.3%   | 1.9%    |

When we compare the distribution of demonstratives in his tragic and comedic fragments, some patterns of Naevius’ use of demonstratives become clear. Naevius’ 1.9% rate of demonstrative use in tragic fragments is similar to the 2.0% rate we find in the corpus as a whole. While his 2.3% rate used in comedy is somewhat reduced from the 2.9% rate expected from our
whole corpus, it is still higher than his rate in tragedy. Similarly, his 0.5% demonstrative use rate in non-dramatic fragments is much lower than his rates in other genres. In this way, Naevius’ use of demonstratives lines up with the expectations based on the analysis of the corpus as a whole and supports the overarching hypothesis that we should find a higher use rate in drama and especially comedy.

4.1.3 Ennius. Similar to Naevius, Ennius also wrote in multiple genres. In Ennius, we find remnants of tragedy (2,550 words, 35.4% of all Ennian fragments), historical epic poetry (3,110 words, 43.1% of all Ennian fragments), satire (246 words, 3.4% of all Ennian fragments), didactic poetry (89 words, 1.2% of all Ennian fragments), translation (740 words, 10.3% of all Ennian fragments), comedy (44 words, 0.6% of all Ennian fragments), and unassigned fragments (351 words, 4.9% of all Ennian fragments). Of these total 7,130 words, 114 are demonstratives (1.6% of all Ennian fragments). We can see Ennius’ use of demonstratives displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Ennius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives in Ennius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, Ennius’ use of the demonstrative lines up with our overall statistics for the corpus as a whole. While his 2.2% rate of demonstrative use among his tragic fragments is higher than the 2.0% rate in the tragic fragments of the corpus as a whole, it is not substantially higher. More importantly, it is still smaller than his rate of demonstrative use within the comic
fragments, as predicted by our overarching hypothesis. In these comedic fragments, we find three total uses of the demonstrative among the 44 words, representing 6.8% of his entire comedy corpus. The small size of the collection of his comedic fragments suggests that we should assign only so much weight to this information, though it is worth noting that even with only 44 words of this genre we still find a much higher rate of demonstrative usage within the comedy genre than any other. The remaining Ennian fragments come from didactic poetry, satires, translation, histories, and unassigned genres, containing altogether 55 uses of the demonstrative out of a total of 4,536 words or representing about 1.2% of his non-dramatic corpus. This rate of demonstrative use is considerably less than both the 6.8% rate in comedy as well as the 2.2% rate in tragedy, further supporting our hypothesis. Additionally, it is only slightly higher than the 1.2% rate found in non-dramatic fragments within our corpus as a whole.

4.1.4 Accius. While Accius did not write any comedies, he did write both tragedies and non-dramatic works. The extant fragments from Accius include 3,953 words from tragic plays (90.3% of the Accian fragments), 204 words from the prose accounts *Annales* and *Records of the Stage* (4.7% of the Accian fragments), and finally 222 words of fragments unassigned to a genre (5.1% of the Accian fragments). Of these total 4,663 words, 82 are demonstratives (1.9% of the Accian fragments). Accius’ corpus is described in Table 12.

Accius’ demonstrative use aligns with the statistics provided by the overall corpus, as well as with the predictions regarding different genres. One point nine percent of his tragic fragments are demonstratives, only slightly below the 2.0% found in the corpus as a whole, while his 1.6% demonstrative use in non-dramatic fragments is some degree higher than the 1.2% rate found in the corpus as a whole. We can also explicitly observe a higher rate of demonstrative use
among Accius’ drama fragments when compared with his non-dramatic ones. The fragments of Accius, therefore, further support the overarching hypothesis and bolster the overall distribution.

Table 12

*Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Accius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstratives in Accius</th>
<th>Whole Corpus</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
<td>4379</td>
<td>3953</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.5 Pacuvius. As Pacuvius was a writer of only tragedies, all remaining Pacuvian fragments are from tragedies, including some tragic fragments that are unassigned to a play but are recognized as belonging in the tragedy genre. The fragments of Pacuvius total 2,508 words and include 56 demonstratives (2.2% of Pacuvius’ corpus). This corpus is described in Table 13.

Table 13

*Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Pacuvius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Corpus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
<td>2508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While I cannot compare these statistics with Pacuvius’ use of demonstratives in other genres, it is still interesting to examine his relative rate of demonstrative use within tragedy itself. His 2.2% demonstrative use rate is equal to Ennius’ use of demonstratives but slightly higher than that of both Naevius and Accius, whose tragic fragments are only 1.9%
demonstratives. It is also only slightly higher than our average 2.0% demonstrative use rate for the entire corpus. It may thus be said that Pacuvius’ rate of demonstratives used within tragedy is consistent with the overall statistics from the corpus as a whole.

4.1.6 Livius Andronicus. The number of fragments available from Livius Andronicus is noticeably smaller than those of the other authors included in this study. His fragments contain only 32 words of comedy (6.6% of Livius’ Andronicus’ fragments), 242 words of tragedy (49.8% of Livius’ Andronicus’ fragments), and 212 words of Epic Poetry (43.6% of Livius’ Andronicus’ fragments). In this entire corpus of 486 words, only four are demonstratives (0.8%), a much smaller portion than is found in any of the other authors Table 14 shows Livius Andronicus’ demonstrative usage among the different genres.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Use in Fragments of Livius Andronicus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives in Livius Andronicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Demonstratives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, Livius Andronicus is the only author in the corpus whose demonstrative use does not uniformly support the overarching hypothesis and is not in line with the overarching statistics. He uses no demonstratives in his comic fragments, meaning that his frequency of demonstrative use in both non-drama and tragedy is greater than it is in comedy. Given the very small size of his corpus, however, and the small sample of comedic fragments from which to draw statistics, little weight should be assigned to this distribution on its own. Moreover, his rate
of demonstratives is higher in drama than in non-drama—consistent with the broader patterns in the corpus.

4.1.7 **Summary.** All authors who wrote multiple genres, with the exception of Livius Andronicus, demonstrated a higher rate of demonstrative use in drama compared to non-drama and in comedy compared to tragedy. Livius Andronicus, the only exception, had a higher rate of demonstratives in drama than in non-drama, but did not have a higher rate for comedy than for tragedy. It must be noted, however, that his comedic corpus is extremely small, consisting of only 32 words, so the exception is not robust. Our overarching hypothesis, therefore, is fully supported by this corpus. Moreover, even those authors who wrote only one genre showed demonstrative usage comparable to the overall distribution for the whole corpus. This means that the distribution patterns are highly stable and indicative of all of the authors contained within this corpus.

4.2 **Demonstrative Forms and Syntactic Roles**

The preceding analysis examined the overarching claim, finding that more demonstratives are used in comedy than in tragedy and that more are used overall in drama than in non-dramatic works. In the remainder of this chapter, I examine the additional claims described in Chapter Two that help to better explain the patterns of demonstrative use. I begin by examining the theories that attempt to explain the choice of different demonstrative forms and syntactic roles. Fruyt (2010) claimed that in Early Latin we find forms of *hic* and *ille* serving multiple demonstrative functions, namely exophorically for first and third person deixis, as well as for endophorically, while forms of *iste* were used exophorically for second person deixis. Because *hic* and *ille* serve multiple roles, Fruyt theorized that they should be more frequent among our fragments of Early Latin than forms of *iste* (p. 20) [F1]. This analysis shall therefore
examine the relative frequency of all three forms of the Latin demonstrative to determine if their distribution lines up with Fruyt’s predictions.

In addition to observing the relative frequency of occurrence of the three different forms of Latin demonstratives that occur in our corpus, I shall also examine the distribution of use among the three syntactic categories. Latin demonstratives may take the form of pronominals and serve as the head of the noun phrase, adnominals modifying or determining the head of the noun phrase, or as adverbials serving as the head of the adverbial phrase. Himmelmann (1996) theorized we should find more instances of adnominal demonstratives than of pronominal ones, as fewer contexts allow for the use of demonstrative pronouns (p. 206) [H1]. Himmelmann made this claim not just for Latin but for demonstrative use in general, across all languages, and certainly not limited to any particular genre.

The analysis in this chapter will therefore seek to determine which forms of the demonstrative are more frequent, in order to determine if Fruyt’s theory is supported, and will also seek to determine which syntactic categories are more frequent, in an attempt to determine if Himmelmann’s theory is supported. I will also provide data on the overall distribution of demonstratives among the three different forms and three different syntactic categories for the corpus as a whole, as well as for the individual genres. This information will help further understanding of the patterns of demonstrative use in Early Latin.

I will begin this analysis by analyzing the distribution of the three demonstrative forms in the corpus as a whole, as well as in the individual genres. This distribution is presented in Table 15. In every genre, forms of the demonstrative *hic* are the most frequent. However, reliance on *hic* decreases in the dramatic fragments, where instead use of both forms of *ille* and forms of *iste* increase. In fact, dramatic fragments contain nearly twice the relative amount of *iste* found in
non-dramatic fragments. Among comedy fragments, this value is even higher, at more than twice the relative frequency found in non-dramatic fragments. Even at this high rate of occurrence, however, *iste* is still about half as frequent as the use of *ille* and one fifth the frequency of *hic* occurrences. This distribution, with markedly less frequent occurrence of *iste*, also falls in line with Fruyt’s (2010) prediction regarding the limited use of *iste* in Early Latin [F1].

Table 15

*Different Forms of Demonstratives in Genres of Early Latin*

| Number of Demonstratives (Percent of Demonstratives) for Each Demonstrative Type |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                  | Whole Corpus | Drama | Non-Drama | Comedy | Tragedy |
| *hic*                            | 211 (62.6%)  | 162 (60.0%) | 49 (73.1%) | 48 (65.8%) | 115 (58.4%) |
| *ille*                           | 91 (27.0%)   | 77 (28.5%) | 14 (20.9%) | 16 (21.9%) | 60 (30.5%) |
| *iste*                           | 35 (10.4%)   | 31 (11.5%) | 4 (6.0%) | 9 (12.3%) | 22 (11.2%) |
| **Total**                        | 337 (100.0%) | 270 (100.0%) | 67 (100.0%) | 73 (100.0%) | 197 (100.0%) |

Of additional interest is what the distribution of demonstrative use can tell us about characteristics of different genres. While overarching analysis of overall demonstrative use demonstrated that this use is increased within comedic fragments, the breakdown of use for each type of demonstrative is similarly informative. Tragedy makes more frequent use of forms of *ille* (30% to comedy’s 23%). Comedy in turn has a higher use of both forms of *hic* (65% to tragedy’s 58%). However, comedy and tragedy are most similar in their use of the demonstrative *iste*.

In this section, I present the distribution of demonstratives among the three syntactic roles within the corpus as a whole and among the individual genres. Table 16 shows the distribution of pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial forms for each demonstrative type within the corpus as a whole.
Table 16  

*Demonstrative Syntactic Categories in Genres of Early Latin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole Corpus</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>204 (60.5%)</td>
<td>162 (60.0%)</td>
<td>42 (62.7%)</td>
<td>45 (61.6%)</td>
<td>116 (58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>72 (21.3%)</td>
<td>56 (20.7%)</td>
<td>16 (23.9%)</td>
<td>17 (23.3%)</td>
<td>40 (20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>61 (18.1%)</td>
<td>52 (19.3%)</td>
<td>9 (13.4%)</td>
<td>11 (15.1%)</td>
<td>41 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337 (100.0%)</td>
<td>270 (100.0%)</td>
<td>67 (100.0%)</td>
<td>73 (100.0%)</td>
<td>197 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, fragments from drama have slightly reduced use of both pronominal and adnominal demonstratives. However, this deficit is made up in the highly increased occurrence of adverbial demonstratives (19.3% compared to the 13.4% found in non-dramatic fragments), particularly in tragedy, where demonstratives are 20.8% adverbials. The comedic fragments more closely resemble the non-dramatic fragments, with a reduced rate of occurrence of adverbial demonstratives when compared with tragic fragments yet an increased rate of occurrence of both pronominals and adnominals. These data go against Himmelmann’s prediction that we should find more adnominal demonstratives than pronominal ones [H1]. Not only do we find a higher proportion of pronominal demonstratives reliably across all genres, but within our tragic fragments we find slightly more adverbial instances as well.

I also examine the demonstrative forms and syntactic category distributions simultaneously, as in Table 17. From this it can be seen that Fruyt’s hypothesis that *iste* is the least frequent of the demonstrative forms is supported for every syntactic category within the corpus as a whole. It can also be determined that Himmelmann’s theory is unsupported for all three demonstrative forms within our corpus as a whole. However, it is worth examining this simultaneous demonstrative form and syntactic category distribution within the genres of the
corpus individually in order to determine if any genre individually displays this expected
distribution.

Table 17

**Demonstrative Use by Form and Category in the Entire Corpus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>106 (31.4%)</td>
<td>54 (16.0%)</td>
<td>53 (15.7%)</td>
<td>213 (63.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>76 (22.5%)</td>
<td>10 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>91 (26.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>21 (6.2%)</td>
<td>9 (2.7%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>34 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203 (60.1%)</td>
<td>73 (21.6%)</td>
<td>62 (18.3%)</td>
<td>338 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of demonstrative use between the three forms and categories for all the
comedic fragments in our corpus is described in Table 18.

Table 18

**Demonstrative Use by Form and Category in Comedic Fragments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>28 (37.8%)</td>
<td>9 (12.2%)</td>
<td>11 (14.9%)</td>
<td>48 (64.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>14 (18.9%)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>17 (23.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>6 (8.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45 (60.8%)</td>
<td>18 (24.3%)</td>
<td>11 (14.9%)</td>
<td>74 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As earlier analysis demonstrated, the comedy corpus in general shows similar support for Fruyt’s
theory, with forms of *hic* and *ille* being the most common overall. However, among adnominal
forms alone *iste* is more common than *ille*, disagreeing with Fruyt’s theory and identifying a
unique comedic characteristic of demonstrative use. Additionally, the comedic fragments use
only forms of *hic* as adverbial demonstratives. The prominence of forms of *ille* over forms of *iste*
in the comedic fragments is therefore a result primarily of its occurrence in pronominal forms. Additionally, earlier analysis indicated that in general the comedic corpus does not provide support for Himmelmann’s hypothesis, in that adnominal forms are less frequent than pronominal ones overall. However, in forms of *iste* alone adnominal forms are indeed more frequent than pronominal forms. This shows weak support for Himmelmann’s theory in one demonstrative form within the comedy corpus and further identifies elevated rates of adnominal forms of *iste* as a characteristic unique to the comedic corpus.

The distribution of demonstrative forms and categories within the tragic fragments is described in Table 19.

Table 19

*Demonstrative Use by Form and Category in Tragic Fragments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Demonstratives</th>
<th>Percent of Demonstratives</th>
<th>in all Tragic Fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td><em>50</em>   (25.4%)</td>
<td><em>32</em>   (16.2%)</td>
<td><em>33</em>   (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td><em>51</em>   (25.9%)</td>
<td><em>5</em>    (2.5%)</td>
<td><em>4</em>   (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td><em>15</em>    (7.6%)</td>
<td><em>3</em>    (1.5%)</td>
<td><em>4</em>   (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><em>116</em> (58.9%)</td>
<td><em>40</em> (20.3%)</td>
<td><em>41</em> (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tragedy distribution provides good support for Fruyt’s theory in most syntactic categories, with even more reliance on forms of *hic* and *ille* than was observed in the comedic genre. Forms of *ille* are more frequent than forms of *iste* among adnominal demonstratives, unlike the distribution among the comic fragments, though the two demonstrative forms are equal for adverbial demonstratives. Unique to these tragic fragments, however, is that forms of *ille* are even more frequent than forms of *hic* for pronominal demonstratives. Additionally, the tragic fragments do not provide support for Himmelmann’s theory for any demonstrative form. This
holds especially true for forms of *hic* and *iste*, which are not only more frequently pronominal than adnominal but are also more frequently adverbial than adnominal, indicating that Himmelmann’s theorized most frequent syntactic category is actually the least frequent within the tragic corpus.

The distribution of demonstrative forms and categories for all non-dramatic fragments is described in Table 20.

Table 20

*Demonstrative Use by Form and Category in Non-Dramatic Fragments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>28 (41.8%)</td>
<td>13 (19.4%)</td>
<td>9 (13.4%)</td>
<td>50 (74.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>11 (16.4%)</td>
<td>2 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>14 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (62.7%)</td>
<td>15 (22.4%)</td>
<td>10 (14.9%)</td>
<td>67 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-dramatic fragments show the highest support for Fruyt’s theory of any genre in the corpus, with each syntactic category containing more forms of *hic* and *ille* than of *iste*. In fact, the non-dramatic portion of the corpus contains only three instances of the demonstrative *iste* out of a total of 67 demonstratives, indicating how infrequently this form is used in this genre. Himmelmann’s theory is unsupported in the non-dramatic fragments for each of the three demonstrative forms as well, though unlike within the tragic portion of the corpus adnominal forms are still more frequent than adverbial forms.

Overall, each individual genre has supported Fruyt’s theory and has not supported Himmelmann’s theory. Additionally, the comic genre showed a uniquely high occurrence of adnominal forms of *iste*, while the tragic genre showed a higher reliance on pronominal forms of
ille than of hic and a higher use of adverbial forms in general than of adnominal forms. In
general, however, the adnominal and adverbial uses of iste were comparable to the adnominal
and adverbial uses of ille, with the substantially reduced pronominal uses of iste being
responsible for its overall reduced frequency. To determine how robust these findings are, I will
now examine the authors within the corpus individually, comparing their demonstrative
distributions\(^2\) to the overarching genre trends and observing whether each author individually
provides support for Fruyt’s and Himmelmann’s theories.

### 4.2.1 Caecilius

The fragments of Caecilius all come from comedic texts, and the
distribution of demonstrative use between pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial forms reflects
the distribution for comedy as a whole fairly well. These data are displayed in Table 21. Overall,
however, Caecilius is more than twice as likely to use a pronominal demonstrative than an
adnominal one, contradicting Himmelmann’s claim [H1] but consistent with the rest of our data.
Additionally, Caecilius makes greater use of forms of hic and ille in support of Fruyt’s
hypothesis [F1], though his use of ille is only slightly greater than his use of iste and the two
appear much more equally used than they do in the overarching distribution. In fact, in the
adnominal category, iste is far more common than ille for Caecilius.

\(^2\)The demonstrative distributions provided in the following analysis are for all fragments of each author.
To see a breakdown of the distributions for each genre (for those authors who wrote in multiple genres),
please see Appendix A.
Table 21

*Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Fragments of Caecilius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Demonstratives (Percent of Demonstratives) in all Caecilius Fragments (All Comedic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Naevius. The Naevian fragments are primarily comedic (52%) but also contain tragedy (25%) and non-dramatic works (23%). The overall distribution of demonstrative use for Naevius does not quite match the overarching distributions for any genre, yet it shows support for Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1] and seems to contradict Himmelmann’s hypothesis [H1]. This distribution is displayed in Table 22.

Table 22

*Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in All Fragments of Naevius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Demonstratives (Percent of Demonstratives) in all Naevius Fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data indicate certain trends in demonstrative use among the Naevian fragments that line up with the overall statistics for each of our genres. For instance, the only adverbials that appear in Naevius are forms of *hic*, which is characteristic of our comedy fragments, yet Naevius is also
more likely to use *hic* as an adverb than in any other syntactic role, which is a uniquely Naevian characteristic. When using a pronominal demonstrative Naevius appears most likely to choose a form of *ille* (slightly more than *hic*), a tendency also found in our overarching tragedy statistics.

Naevius’ comedic fragments display the expected distribution for adverbial uses in that they only appear as forms of *hic*, but his use of both pronominals and adnominals differ from the expected. While his pronominal demonstratives are most frequently forms of *hic*, we see an almost equal number of forms of *ille*. In the entire comedic corpus, forms of *hic* are twice as frequent as forms of *ille* (37.8% compared to 18.9%), a distribution not reflected in the fragments of Naevius. Additionally, he seems to rely equally on forms of *ille* and forms of *iste* when using an adnominal demonstrative, while the comedy portion of our corpus predicts heavier reliance on forms of *iste*. Overall, however, Naevius’ comedic fragments demonstrate a higher frequency of pronominal uses and an even number of adnominal and adverbial uses of the demonstrative. These fragments do not support Himmelmann’s theory and only weakly match the expected comedic demonstrative distribution.

While there are only seven uses of demonstratives within Naevius’ tragic fragments, the distribution pattern still appears similar to that for the overall tragedy corpus. They display a preference for forms of *hic* for Naevius’ adnominal and adverbial demonstrative uses, both consistent with the distribution for all tragic fragments. Consistent with our overall distribution of demonstrative use for tragedy, these data do not lend support for Himmelmann’s theory that adnominal forms of demonstratives should be the most frequent. In fact, among Naevius’ tragedies adnominals are the least frequent form of the demonstrative used.

In Naevius’ non-dramatic fragments, there are only two uses of the demonstrative, one instance of a pronominal *hic* and one of pronominal *ille*. While this is probably too small a data
set from which to draw any conclusions, it may still be worth noting that all demonstratives in this set of fragments are pronominals, further contradicting Himmelmann’s claim.

While the overall distribution of Naevius’ demonstrative use does not seem to match the overarching distribution of any genre, when separated by genre his distributions show sufficient similarity to suggest that the overarching distributions are indeed representative. Furthermore, neither in an examination of his demonstrative use all together nor separated by genre can any support for Himmelmann’s hypothesis be seen. In every case there were more occurrences of pronominal demonstratives than adnominal ones. Additionally, in all cases Naevius made substantially greater use of the demonstrative forms *hic* and *ille* than he did *iste*, supporting Fruyt’s hypothesis.

4.2.3 Ennius. The fragments of Ennius are 64% non-dramatic, 1% comedic, and 36% tragic; however, the overall distribution of the demonstratives in his fragments altogether most resembles the distribution found in the comedic fragments as a whole. This distribution of Ennius’ demonstrative use is described in Table 23.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denominative Use by Type and Category in All Fragments of Ennius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Demonstratives (Percent of Demonstratives) in all Ennius Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His demonstrative use shows a much higher reliance on forms of *hic* and *ille* for pronominal forms, and even for adnominal ones, though he seems equally likely to use *ille* as *iste* for
adverbials. This provides support for Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1], though more for pronominal and
adnominal forms than for adverbial ones. Ennius also makes much greater use of pronominal
demonstratives of any form than of adnominal ones, in contrast to Himmelmann’s prediction
[H1]. In fact, Ennius uses pronominals more than twice as often as adnominals and uses
adnominals only slightly more than adverbial forms.

Within Ennius’ comedic fragments we find only three demonstratives, including one
adverbial form of *hic* and two pronominal forms of *ille*. However, because our sample size for
Ennian comedic fragments is so small, it would be unwise to draw any substantive conclusions
based on a comparison between demonstratives in comedy and tragedy in his work alone.

The distribution of Ennius’ non-dramatic fragments matches almost perfectly our
overarching data from all non-dramatic fragments. This should not be a surprise, however, as his
work accounts for 55 out of the total 67 available non-dramatic fragments, or more than 80% of
the whole non-dramatic corpus. These non-dramatic fragments, however, provide further
evidence contradicting Himmelmann’s claim [H1] and show substantially more pronominal use
than adnominal use. They also match Ennius’ overall statistics in that *hic* and *ille* are more
frequent than forms of *iste*, further supporting Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1].

Ennius’ tragic fragments vary slightly in their use of demonstrative from the overarching
distribution. While forms of *hic* and *ille* are the most frequent, supporting Fruyt’s claim [F1], and
pronominal forms are more frequent than adnominal ones, contradicting Himmelmann’s claim
[H1], the most frequent form is pronominal *ille*. In the rest of Ennius’ fragments, and indeed in
the overarching distributions for the corpus as a whole, *hic* is much more frequent for all three
syntactic categories. However, this increase in pronominal *ille* is also seen in the overall
distribution for all tragic fragments, indicating that the distribution of demonstratives in Ennius’
tragic fragments, while not matching his own overall distribution, align well with the overall distribution for tragic fragments as a whole.

Overall, Ennius’ demonstrative use in each individual genre is similar to his overall distribution. Each individual genre and his overarching statistics suggest that forms of *hic* and *ille* are more common than forms of *iste*, agreeing with Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1]. However, Ennius uses *ille* much less frequently than he uses *hic*, and his rate of *ille* use is only slightly elevated from his rate of *iste* use in adverbial and adnominal forms. In his overarching distribution, as well as in each individual genre, it is evident that Ennius relied on pronominal forms more than adnominal ones, contrasting with Himmelmann’s claim [H1].

### 4.2.4 Accius

Accius’ fragments are 85% tragic and 15% non-dramatic, so it is perhaps surprising that the overall distribution of his demonstrative use most resembles the distribution found in comedic fragments. This distribution can be seen in Table 24.

**Table 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Demonstratives (Percent of Demonstratives) in all Accius Fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>20 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>18 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>8 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46 (56.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accius’ distribution shows a preference for forms of *hic* and *ille*, as predicted by Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1]. He also favors pronominal forms over adnominal forms, differing from the expectations of Himmelmann’s hypothesis [H1]. In this way, Accius’ overall distribution is consistent with the findings from the overall distributions for the corpus as a whole.
The distribution of Accius’ tragic fragments is similar to his overall distribution and matches the overall distribution from all tragic fragments. He has a similar number of pronominal *hics* and *illes*, compared to the comedy and non-dramatic fragments, which favor pronominal *hics*. Additionally, this distribution shows a more frequent use of pronominal demonstratives than adnominal demonstratives, contradicting Himmelman’s hypothesis [H1]. It also shows that forms of *hic* and *ille* are more frequent than forms of *iste*, as predicted by Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1]. However, while pronominal forms of *ille* are equally as frequent as forms of *hic*, they do not occur at all as adverbials and only once as an adnominal. While *ille* is still more frequent than *iste* in the tragic fragments of Accius, this is predominately due to the frequency of this form in pronominal occurrences.

There are only nine demonstratives in his remaining non-dramatic fragments. It is worth noting, however, that the majority of the demonstratives used within the Accian non-dramatic fragments are forms of the most frequent demonstrative, namely *hic*, according to his overall distribution as well as the distributions for the corpus as a whole.

Overall, the distributions of Accius’ demonstrative use by genre align well with the distributions of the corpus as a whole. Furthermore, his overall distribution as well as his genre-specific ones show support for Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1], with more occurrences of *hic* and *ille* than of *iste*, and provide no support for Himmelmann’s hypothesis [H1], with more pronominal demonstratives than adnominal ones.

### 4.2.5 Pacuvius

All of Pacuvius’ fragments are from the tragic genre, and the distribution of his demonstrative use among these tragic fragments aligns well with the distribution from tragic fragments in the corpus as a whole. Pacuvius’ demonstrative distribution is described in Table 25.
### Table 25

**Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Fragments of Pacuvius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hic</td>
<td>14 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (12.5%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
<td>30 (53.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ille</td>
<td>14 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>17 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iste</td>
<td>6 (10.7%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34 (60.7%)</td>
<td>11 (19.6%)</td>
<td>11 (19.6%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, Pacuvius shows an equal number of adnominal and adverbial demonstratives, though both are substantially less frequent than pronominal demonstratives. Himmelmann’s theory [H1] is therefore not supported within the fragments of Pacuvius. Fruyt’s theory [F1], however, is supported, with forms of *hic* and *ille* being more frequent than forms of *iste*. Similar to the overall distribution for tragic fragments in the corpus as a whole, Pacuvius used an equal number of pronominal forms of *hic* and *ille* but relies much more often on forms of *hic* for adnominal and adverbial demonstratives. In fact, for these latter two syntactic categories, Pacuvius relies equally on forms of *iste* and *ille*. Despite this, it seems that his distribution of demonstrative does support Fruyt’s claim, does not support Himmelmann’s claim, and overall aligns well with the overarching distribution for the tragic genre.

#### 4.2.6 Livius Andronicus.

While Livius Andronicus provided tragic, comic, and non-dramatic fragments, only four demonstratives remain from his entire portion of the corpus. This limited number means that no conclusions can be drawn from his distribution of demonstrative use. It is still worth noting, however, that his fragments contain only forms of *hic* and *ille*, with three fourths of these demonstratives serving as pronominals.

#### 4.2.7 Summary.

An analysis of the individual authors in the corpus reveals no substantial departures from the overall distribution of demonstratives in the corpus among any of the
individual authors. This suggests that the overarching distribution is fairly robust and that even where it is heavily influenced by a singular author (as is the case for the non-dramatic distribution, which contains predominately demonstratives from the fragments of Ennius), it is still representative of each author. Analysis of these individual authors also indicated that each one demonstrated support for Fruyt’s hypothesis [F1], with forms of *hic* and *ille* being more common than forms of *iste*, and did not demonstrate support for Himmelmann’s hypothesis [H1], with pronominal forms proving more frequent than adnominal forms. This further supports the conclusions drawn from analysis of the corpus as a whole, which likewise demonstrated support for Fruyt’s hypothesis and did not support Himmelmann’s.

4.3 Personal Pronouns

I will next examine the co-occurrence of personal pronouns with demonstratives within our corpus, or how frequently a fragment contains both a demonstrative and a personal pronoun. These data were gathered by identifying all demonstratives and personal pronouns in each fragment and noting the form and type of demonstrative and whether the personal pronoun was first, second, or third person. For the purposes of this study, the demonstrative and personal pronoun did not have to exhibit any particular relationship within the fragment; that is, they did not need to occur in the same noun phrase or some restricted set of possible locations, but rather it was enough for them to exist within the same clause of the fragment.

Demonstrative and personal pronoun co-occurrence is examined within this corpus based on the claim made by multiple authors that we should find a high rate of co-occurrence between the second person pronoun and the demonstrative *iste*. Both Bach (1888) and Meader (1901) suggested that we should find a high correlation between *iste* and the second person pronoun, though Bach explains the inclusion of the personal pronoun as a way of highlighting the
deuterotritonic force, while Meader suggests that the force behind *iste* was weakening and needed the support of a pronoun. While Bach and Meader explicitly discuss how the second person demonstrative *iste* co-occurs with its corresponding personal pronoun, Keller (1946) claimed that we should find little evidence of this with *iste* or of a similar co-occurrence between *hic* and the first person pronoun as well as *ille* with the third person. Keller emphasized that the demonstratives primarily fulfill a deictic role and take on these personal meanings only secondarily, and as a result, any correlation they show to the personal pronouns should be limited. Our analysis speaks directly to this debate.

The distribution of demonstrative and personal pronoun co-occurrence is shown in Table 26.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence, Including Those Without Co-Occurrence</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>No Co-Occurrence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>43 (20.2%)</td>
<td>24 (11.3%)</td>
<td>14 (6.6%)</td>
<td>132 (62.0%)</td>
<td>213 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>17 (18.7%)</td>
<td>9 (9.9%)</td>
<td>5 (5.5%)</td>
<td>60 (65.9%)</td>
<td>91 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>9 (26.5%)</td>
<td>11 (32.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.9%)</td>
<td>13 (38.2%)</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69 (20.4%)</td>
<td>44 (13.0%)</td>
<td>20 (5.9%)</td>
<td>205 (60.7%)</td>
<td>338 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each demonstrative form appears most frequently without any personal pronoun, suggesting that either demonstratives appear frequently without the expected personal force or that co-occurrence with a personal pronoun is not by itself a sufficient metric for identifying personal force. However, since Keller (1946) and Meader (1901) identified co-occurrence with personal pronouns as a specific metric for identifying personal force, the rest of this analysis will focus on the distribution among the three personal forces for only those cases when the demonstrative does co-occur with a personal pronoun. This distribution is presented in Table 27.
Given an instance of *hic* that occurs with some personal pronoun, then, it is most likely to occur with the expected first person pronoun (53.1% of the time). It is also more likely to appear with a second person pronoun (29.6% of the time) than a third person pronoun (17.3%). These data are interesting in that they provide some evidence to support Keller’s claim [K3] by showing that *hic* does co-occur with all three personal pronouns but also some evidence to support Bach’s claim [B1] by showing that *hic* does most often co-occur with the first person pronoun.

However, a comparable distribution among the personal pronouns is found for *ille* as well. An instance of *ille* that occurs with some personal pronoun occurs with the first person pronoun 54.8% of the time, a second person pronoun 29.0%, and with the expected third person pronoun only 16.1% of the time. This distribution does not support Bach’s hypothesis [B1], showing both that *ille* is least likely to appear with his predicted third person pronoun and that *hic* and *ille* share a similar distribution between the personal pronouns, indicating that demonstrative form has little impact on personal force in this case. If anything, *hic* has a slightly higher rate of third person co-occurrence than *ille*, and *ille* has a slightly higher rate of first person co-occurrence than *hic* though the differences are perhaps too small to be significant. The similarity between the distributions for these two demonstrative forms, however, indicates that
even though *hic* did co-occur most frequently with the expected first person pronoun, the
evidence suggests that this is the typical distribution for demonstrative forms. There is, then, no
real evidence that *hic* is inherently more closely coupled with the first person pronoun than *ille*. 
While this does not support Bach’s hypothesis, it does seem to provide further support for 
Keller’s hypothesis [K3], showing that *ille* can co-occur with any personal pronoun.

The distribution for *iste* indicates that this demonstrative co-occurs most frequently with 
the expected second person pronoun (52.4% of the time) when it occurs with any personal 
pronoun. This demonstrative form does co-occur with the other two personal pronouns, 42.9% of
the time with the first person pronoun and 0.5% of the time with the third person pronoun and,
therefore, provides support for Keller’s hypothesis [K3]. However, the increased co-occurrence
with the second person pronoun shows that *iste* is weighted toward this pronoun, differing
substantially from the distribution of co-occurrence found for both *hic* and *ille*. This provides the
first real evidence within the corpus of the co-occurrence between a demonstrative form and
personal pronoun, supporting Meader’s hypothesis [M4] and Bach’s hypothesis [B1] that such a
correlation should be evident.

Examining each genre individually, however, shows that evidence for or against these
hypotheses varies slightly. Table 28 shows the distribution of demonstrative and personal
pronoun co-occurrence in the non-dramatic fragments. While the distribution for *hic* within the
non-dramatic fragments is similar to the overall statistics seen in the corpus as a whole, *ille*
shows a higher rate of co-occurrence with the third person pronoun than with the second person
pronoun, diverging slightly. Additionally, the only instances of *iste* co-occurring with personal
pronouns within the non-dramatic fragments are found with first person pronouns, weighting this
profile away from the second person pronoun expected by the hypotheses as well as the
overarching statistics. In general, then, the non-dramatic fragments alone provide no evidence to support Bach’s [B1] and Meader’s [M4] hypotheses. However, there are only two instances of *iste* co-occurring with a personal pronoun, and only six of *ille*, providing only a small sample size from which to draw statistics. Nevertheless, the non-dramatic fragments provide further evidence in favor of Keller’s hypothesis [K3], with forms of *hic* and *ille* occurring with all personal pronouns and forms of *iste* co-occurring not with the expected second personal pronoun.

Table 28

**Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Non-Dramatic Fragments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Non-Dramatic Fragments</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>8 (47.1%)</td>
<td>5 (29.4%)</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 (52.0%)</td>
<td>6 (24.0%)</td>
<td>6 (24.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of demonstrative and personal pronoun co-occurrence within the tragic fragments mirrors the distribution for the corpus as a whole, as shown in Table 29.

Table 29

**Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Tragic Fragments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Tragedy Fragments</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>24 (58.5%)</td>
<td>14 (34.1%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>41 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>10 (55.6%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>9 (60.0%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39 (52.7%)</td>
<td>28 (38.5%)</td>
<td>7 (9.5%)</td>
<td>74 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both *hic* and *ille* show a comparable distribution, with the most frequent co-occurrence with the first person pronoun. Additionally, *iste* appears most frequently correlated with the second person pronoun. These statistics are similar to the overarching distribution found for the corpus as a whole and, therefore, provide little evidence of co-occurrence between demonstratives and personal pronouns except in the case of *iste*, which is weighted toward the second person pronoun. There is little support, then, for Bach’s hypothesis [B1]—the only support coming from the distribution of *iste*—while Meader’s hypothesis [M4] explicitly concerning *iste* does seem to be supported. Moreover, Keller’s hypothesis [K3] that each demonstrative may co-occur with each personal pronoun is fully supported among the tragedy fragments.

The distribution of demonstrative and personal pronoun co-occurrence within the comedic fragments is described in Table 30.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Comic Fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the non-dramatic fragments, there are very few instances of co-occurrence between forms of *ille* and *iste* and the personal pronouns. Those that do occur show no co-occurrence between *ille* and the expected third person pronoun and an equal co-occurrence between *iste* and both the first and second person pronouns. The comedic fragments, therefore, though consistent with Meader’s hypothesis [M4] regarding the co-occurrence of *iste* with the second person
pronoun, do not provide the same level of support as the tragic fragments. They also provide no
evidence of Bach’s expected co-occurrence between ille and the third person pronoun, while hic
seems to be the demonstrative form that is least associated with the expected first person
pronoun. Keller’s hypothesis [K3], however, does seem to be supported by these comedic
fragments, with forms of ille and iste being associated with both the first and second person
pronouns and forms of hic being associated with all personal pronouns.

   Altogether, the individual genres all show similar support for Keller’s hypothesis [K3],
similar to that shown by the corpus as a whole. The only real evidence of disproportionate co-
occurrence between a demonstrative form and its supposedly corresponding personal pronoun
occurs for the demonstrative iste, though this relationship is strongest among the tragic fragments
and weakest among the non-dramatic fragments. This suggests that there is some evidence to
support Meader’s hypothesis [M4] that iste is correlated with the second person pronoun. Bach’s
hypothesis [B1], however, that each demonstrative form should co-occur with its correlated
personal pronoun is not supported within any genre nor the corpus as a whole, except relative to
iste. Examination of the distribution of demonstrative form and personal pronoun co-occurrence
among each individual author will provide further information on these trends.

   4.3.1 Ennius. The fragments from Ennius contain 39 co-occurrences of demonstratives
with personal pronouns, including 18 in the tragic fragments and 21 in the non-dramatic
fragments. Overall, his use of co-occurring demonstratives and personal pronouns appears in the
distribution shown in Table 31. While hic is most frequently associated with the first person
pronoun, it is only slightly less often associated with the second person pronoun. Moreover, ille
is also most frequently correlated with the first person pronoun, as expected from the
overarching data, though it does at least show a much higher frequency of co-occurrence with the
third person pronoun than with the second. Additionally, the demonstrative *iste* is equally associated with both the first and second person pronouns, though there are so few co-occurrences with *iste* that this analysis should bear relatively little weight on its own. Overall, however, Ennius’ use of demonstratives and co-occurrence shows some support for Meader’s hypothesis [M4] regarding *iste*, little support for Bach’s hypothesis [B1] regarding the co-occurrence of each demonstrative form with its correlated personal pronoun, and much greater support for Keller’s theory that each demonstrative form may correlate with any personal pronoun.

Table 31

*Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Ennius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Naevius</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>11 (42.3%)</td>
<td>10 (38.5%)</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>26 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (46.2%)</td>
<td>12 (30.8%)</td>
<td>9 (23.1%)</td>
<td>39 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Naevius. The Naevian fragments contain 10 instances of demonstratives co-occurring with personal pronouns, of which eight are from comic fragments and the other two from non-dramatic ones. These instances occur in the distribution in Table 32. Within the Naevian fragments, both *hic* and *ille* co-occur most frequently with the first person pronoun, matching the overall co-occurrence distribution. The only co-occurrence with the demonstrative *iste* is with a second person pronoun, the correlation predicted by both Bach and Meader. In this sense, Naevius’ *iste* usage could be said to support Meader’s hypothesis [M4]; however, it should be noted that this is only one singular co-occurrence, and one data point does not provide
a great deal of support for our authors’ claims. Overall, the fragments of Naevius provide some weak support for Meader’s hypothesis in the association between *iste* with the second person pronoun, though the high co-occurrence between *ille* and the first person pronoun provides evidence against Bach’s hypothesis [B1]. However, the high co-occurrence between *hic* and the first person pronoun, much higher than that found in the corpus as a whole, as well as the co-occurrence between *iste* and the second person pronoun does provide some support for Bach’s hypothesis. Overall, therefore, Naevius’ fragments provide some support for Bach’s hypothesis. They also provide some support for Keller’s hypothesis [K3], however, with *hic* co-occurring with the third person pronoun and *ille* with the first person pronoun, though this support is weaker than was found in the corpus as a whole.

Table 32

**Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Naevius**

| Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Naevius |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
|                                                | 1st Person | 2nd Person | 3rd Person | Total     |
| *hic*                                          | 4 (80.0%)  | 0 (0.0%)   | 1 (20.0%)  | 5 (100.0%)|
| *ille*                                         | 3 (75.5%)  | 1 (25.0%)  | 0 (0.0%)   | 4 (100.0%)|
| *iste*                                         | 0 (0.0%)   | 1 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%)   | 1 (100.0%)|
| **Total**                                      | 7 (70.0%)  | 2 (20.0%)  | 1 (10.0%)  | **10 (100.0%)** |

4.3.3 Pacuvius. All 26 of Pacuvius’ use of co-occurring demonstratives and personal pronouns come from tragedies and occur in the distribution described in Table 33. Pacuvius’ use of these co-occurring demonstratives and personal pronouns differs somewhat substantially from the overall statistics. For instance, he uses both *hic* and *ille* most frequently in correlation with the second person pronoun, while Bach suggested these should be correlated with the first and third person pronouns, respectively, and in the overarching data, they were most frequently
correlated with the first person pronoun. Interestingly, however, the second person pronoun is not quite the most frequent personal pronoun used in co-occurrence with the demonstrative *iste*, as was explicitly expected by Meader and Bach. The co-occurrence of demonstratives and personal pronouns in the fragments of Pacuvius does not agree with the predictions made by Bach [B1] and Meader [M4]. However, as each demonstrative form does co-occur with each personal pronoun, the demonstratives from Pacuvius’ fragments do support Keller’s hypothesis [K3].

4.3.4 Accius. The Accius fragments include 31 co-occurrences of demonstratives with personal pronouns. Thirty of these come from comedy, while the remaining one comes from a non-dramatic fragment. These co-occurrences appear in the distribution described in Table 34.

The Accius fragments show the same high co-occurrence between both *hic* and *ille* with the first person pronoun expected by the statistics for the corpus as a whole. His use of the demonstrative *iste* most frequently co-occurs with the second person pronoun, as predicted by our authors and agreeing with our overall statistics for the corpus. Overall, the fragments of Accius agree with the overall statistics and show support for Meader’s hypothesis [M4] concerning the co-occurrence of *iste* and the second person pronoun as well as Keller’s hypothesis [K3] concerning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Pacuvius</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>6 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>12 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 (40.0%)</td>
<td>13 (52.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the co-occurrence between each demonstrative form and each personal pronoun. While Accius’ use of *hic* is weighted toward the first person pronoun, it does not substantially differ from the distribution of his use of *ille*. In conjunction with the lack of any co-occurrence between *ille* and the expected third person pronoun, these fragments provide little evidence to support Bach’s claim [B1].

Table 34

*Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Accius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Accius</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>15 (83.3%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>4 (80.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (70.0%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Caecilius. All 26 co-occurrences of demonstratives and personal pronouns come from the genre of comedy, and display the distribution described in Table 35.

Table 35

*Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Caecilius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative and Personal Pronoun Co-Occurrence in Fragments of Caecilius</th>
<th>1st Person</th>
<th>2nd Person</th>
<th>3rd Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>8 (42.1%)</td>
<td>5 (26.3%)</td>
<td>6 (31.6%)</td>
<td>19 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (46.2%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8%)</td>
<td>6 (23.1%)</td>
<td>26 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of demonstrative and pronoun co-occurrences in the fragments of Caecilius matches well with the overall data for the corpus as a whole, especially the distribution of *hic*. 86
His use of *ille* shows an equal co-occurrence between the first and second person pronouns and no co-occurrence with the third person pronoun. These data show that *hic* has a higher co-occurrence with the third person pronoun than *ille*, while *ille* has a higher co-occurrence with the first person pronoun. Caecilius’ fragments, therefore, provide no evidence to support Bach’s hypothesis [B1] among these demonstrative forms. Moreover, within his fragments *iste* co-occurs more with the first person pronoun (twice) than the second person pronoun (once), providing no support for Meader’s hypothesis [M4] and further evidence against Bach’s hypothesis [B1]. However, there are very few instances of either *ille* or *iste* in the fragments of Caecilius, indicating that we shouldn’t make too much of this difference. The co-occurrence of forms of *hic* with all personal pronouns and of *ille* and *iste* with both first and second person pronouns indicates that these fragments do support Keller’s hypothesis [K3].

**4.3.6 Livius Andronicus.** The fragments of Livius Andronicus contain only one co-occurrence formed with the demonstrative *ille* and the first person pronoun. This co-occurrence is in line with the expectations from the corpus as a whole, even if it does not support Bach’s theory.

**4.3.7 Summary.** Overall, the statistical data on the co-occurrence of demonstratives with personal pronouns for each individual author is in moderate agreement with the overall distribution for the entire corpus. In general, the corpus provides no evidence for Bach’s hypothesis [B1] that forms of *hic* should co-occur most often with first person pronouns and forms of *ille* with third person pronouns, but it does support his claim and Meader’s [M4] that forms of *iste* should co-occur most often with second person pronouns. Keller’s hypothesis [K3] that each demonstrative may appear with each personal pronoun is fully supported within the corpus as a whole and within each author individually.
4.4 Affective Force

The data available from the Early Latin corpus also provide information on the pejorative or derogatory force associated with the Latin demonstratives. Traditionally, the demonstrative *iste* is introduced to Latin students as a demonstrative that indicates derogatory force and can be translated as “that awful” (Wheelock, 2005) or “that damned” (Moreland & Fleischer, 1990). Keller (1946) suggested that, contrary to what is often presented in beginning Latin textbooks, we should find all three demonstratives occurring with pejorative force at times [K1] and that we should find this force in all genres [K2]. I determined the presence of any pejorative force by going through the individual demonstratives as well as their standard translations as provided by Loeb and my own interpretations. I identified if demonstratives were used derogatorily or neutrally but also determined whether they were serving a laudatory role as has been suggested of *ille* (Allen et al., 2001). The breakdown of derogatory, neutral, and laudatory demonstratives for the entire corpus is described in Table 36.

Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Force of Demonstratives in the Entire Corpus</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>34 (12.6%)</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
<td>10 (13.7%)</td>
<td>24 (12.2%)</td>
<td>37 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>224 (83.0%)</td>
<td>56 (83.6%)</td>
<td>59 (80.8%)</td>
<td>165 (83.8%)</td>
<td>280 (83.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>12 (4.4%)</td>
<td>8 (11.9%)</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4.1%)</td>
<td>20 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270 (100.0%)</td>
<td>67 (100.0%)</td>
<td>73 (100.0%)</td>
<td>197 (100.0%)</td>
<td>337 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data support Keller’s hypothesis that all genres make use of demonstratives with derogatory force and further show that all genres also make use of demonstratives with laudatory force. This distribution also identifies some trends in the use of affective force within each genre.
For instance, comedy contains the highest use of derogatory force, more than three times as high as contained in the non-dramatic fragments. However, the non-dramatic fragments use more than twice the amount of laudatory demonstratives than does comedy or tragedy.

We can further examine whether all three types of the demonstrative can similarly appear with all three forces in Table 37.

Table 37

### Affective Force in Forms of the Demonstrative for the Entire Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective Force in the Corpus as a Whole by Demonstrative Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>19 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>185 (87.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>8 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>212 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in this table we can see that all three demonstratives can be used with all three forces, further supporting Keller’s hypothesis [K1]. However, some patterns in derogatory and laudatory force do start to emerge. For instance, the demonstrative *hic* occurs in derogation more than twice as often as in praise, and the demonstrative *ille* occurs with both forces almost equally. *Iste* itself is seven times more likely to be used for derogation than praise.

It is also worthwhile to examine the distribution of affective force among each author in the corpus individually to determine whether they demonstrate similar use of affective force. This allows the trends in genre and demonstrative form to be evaluated for each author, in order to determine how robust these trends are.

### 4.4.1 Naevius

The fragments of Naevius contain 27 uses of demonstratives, including 17 neutral, 6 derogatory, and 4 laudatory, divided among all the demonstrative forms. The following
lines from the Naevian fragments show the wide range of uses of the demonstrative *ille*. In Example 17a this demonstrative is used for the object of a curse with a clearly derogatory context, while Example 17b demonstrates *ille* used in praise of a subject and Example 17c shows a neutral use of this demonstrative.

(17) a. *Ut illum di perdant...*
Well *that-SG.ACC.MASC god-PL.NOM ruin-3PL.PRES.SUBJ*
Well, may the gods ruin him…
(Naevius *Appellia*, lines 18-19)

b. *Sin illos deserant fortissimos*
But if *that-PL.ACC.MASC forsake-3PL.PRES.SUBJ brave-PL.ACC.MASC.SUPERL virorum...*
man-PL.GEN.MASC
“But if they should forsake those bravest of men…”
(Naevius *Bellum Poenicum*, line 61)

c. *...meos equos sinam ego illos esse?*
mine-PL.ACC.MASC. horse-PL.ACC.MASC. let-1SG.PRES.SUBJ I-SG.NOM illos be-INF
“…can I let these horses be mine?”
(Naevius *Agitatoria*, line 11)

A similar phenomenon is visible with *hic* in the Naevian fragments, where this demonstrative can serve both derogatorily (Example 18a) as well in praise (Example 18b):

(18) a. *Ut videam... opera haec...*
That see-1SG.PRES.SUBJ work-PL.ACC.NEUT *this-PL.ACC.NEUT Flammis fieri flora*
blaze-PL.ABL.FEM become-INF flower-SG.PREDNOM.FEM
“...That I may see…these works become a flower in blazing fires.”
(Naevius *Lycurgus*, line 50)

b. *Haec... praefica est, This-SG.NOM.FEM keener-SG.NOM.FEM be-3SG.PRES.IND Nam mortuum collaudat for dead-SG.ACC.MASC praise-3SG.PRES.IND*
“This woman is a keener, for she sings in praise of the dead.”
(Naevius Unassigned Fragments, line 11)
Example 2a shows the demonstrative *hic* used to describe items that the speaker wishes to see consumed by flame (Warmington, 1936, p. 132), giving this demonstrative a derogatory force. In example 18b, the woman holding the valued role of keener is referred to with the demonstrative *hic*, and the sentence further discusses her role as one who praises, such that the established Loeb translation reads “That woman, by god, is a leader of keeners” (Warmington, 1936), assigning praise to the woman through the use of the demonstrative. This fragment shows that Naevius uses *hic* in a laudatory manner himself, in contrast to derogatory force found in example 18a.

Among the Naevian fragments there are only two uses of the demonstrative *iste*. One (Example 19a) seems to demonstrate derogation, while the other (Example 19b) seems relatively neutral:

(19) a. \[\textit{Ubi isti duo adulescentes habent} \]
\[\text{Where that-PL.NOM.MASC two young-PL.NOM live-3PL.PRES.IND} \]
\[\text{Qui hic…prodigunt?} \]
\[\text{who-PL.NOM.MASC here squander-3PL.PRES.IND} \]
“Where do those two young men live who squander…here?”
(Naevius *Tarentilla*, lines 80-81)

b. \[\textit{Quid istud vero te advertisti tam cito?} \]
\[\text{Why that-SG.ACC.NEUT truly you-SG.ACC turn-2SG.PRF.IND so speedily} \]
“Why did you turn yourself so suddenly at that?”
(Naevius *Corollaria*, line 43)

Naevius seems willing, therefore, to use *iste* with varying affective force and does not limit it to derogation.

Overall, Naevius provides good support for Keller’s theory that all forms of the demonstrative may be used with any force, as Examples 17–19 demonstrate. Additionally, Naevius used varying affective force within his comic, tragic, and non-dramatic fragments. In his comic fragments, derogatory, laudatory, and neutral demonstratives can be found, while only derogatory and neutral demonstratives are included in his tragic fragments and only laudatory demonstratives are found in his non-dramatic fragments. This provides some evidence for
Keller’s theory that all affective forces should be found in each genre [K2], though Naevius’ tragic and especially non-dramatic fragments do seem to be somewhat limited in what affective force is used. However, the narrower range of affective force exhibited in these genres could be due to the smaller number of Naevian demonstratives among them.

**4.4.2 Livius Andronicus.** Though we have only four examples of demonstrative in the fragments of Livius Andronicus, we nevertheless find instances of *hic* used for derogation (Example 20a) as well as neutrally (Example 20b):

(20) a.  *templo -que hanc deducitis?*  
Temple-SG.ABL.NEUT and this-SG.ACC.FEM lead-PERF.PASS.PART.PL.ABL  
“And lead this woman out of the temple?”  
(Livius Andronicus *Aegisthus*, line 13)

b.  *Quae haec daps est?*  
What-SG.NOM.FEM this-SG.NOM.FEM banquet-SG.NOM.FEM be-3SG.PRES.INDIC  
“What is this banquet?”  
(Livius Andronicus *The Odyssey*, line 8)

In Example 20a, the speaker Aegisthus is demanding that his step-daughter Electra be not brought out but rather dragged from her refuge, referring to her not by name but rather by a form of the demonstrative *hic*. However, Example 20b shows a simple inquiry, demonstrating neither praise nor derogation. The lone instance of *ille* found in the fragments of Livius Andronicus seems to contain some derogation, as seen in Example (21).

(21)  *
...cum illo soror mea  
With that-SG.ABL.MASC sister-SG.NOM.FEM my-SG.ABL.FEM  
volutate numquam limavit caput.  
will-SG.ABL.FEM never besmirch-3SG.PERF.IND head-SG.ACC.NEUT  
“... never with my own will did my sister besmirch her head with that man”  
(Livius Andronicus *Tereus*, line 26)

In the fragments of Livius Andronicus, demonstratives are thus divided between derogatory and neutral force. Even within the small sample of demonstratives from Livius Andronicus, there is evidence of the demonstrative *hic* used with both forces and evidence of the demonstrative *ille*
serving with derogatory force, providing support for Keller’s claim that derogation may be found in all forms of the demonstrative [K1].

4.4.3 Ennius. The remaining fragments from Ennius contain the demonstrative ille used in derogation (Example 22a) and praise (Example 22b).

(22) a. \( \text{Ille traversa mente} \)

That-SG.NOM.MASC twist-PERF.PASS.PART.SG.ABL.FEM soul-SG.ABL.FEM

mi hodie tradidit repagula

me-SG.DAT today hand over-3SG.PERF.INDIC barrier-PL.ACC.NEUT

“That man with the twisted soul handed over the barriers to me today”
(Ennius Medea, line 278)

b. \( \text{Ille vir haud magna cum} \)

That-SG.NOM.MASC man-SG.NOM.MASC not great-SG.ABL.FEM with

re sed plenus fidei

ting-SG.ABL.FEM but full-SG.NOM.MASC trust-SG.GEN.FEM

“That is a man not with great wealth but full of trust”
(Ennius Annales, line 330)

He also uses hic for derogation (Example 23a) and praise (Example 23b).

(23) a. \( \ldots \text{inspice hoc facinus priusquam} \)

Look on-2SG.IMP this-SG.ACC.NEUT deed-SG.ACC.NEUT before

fient...

be done-3SG.PRES.INDIC

“…look on this deed before ‘tis done’…”
(Ennius Medea, line 293)

b. \( \text{Nam ita mihi Telamonis patris gratia} \)

For thus me-DAT.SG Telamon-SG.GEN father-SG.GEN.MASC favor-SG.NOM.FEM

ea est atque hoc

she-SG.NOM.FEM be-3SG.PRES.ACT and this-SG.NOM.NEUT

lumen candidum claret

light-SG.NOM.NEUT bright-SG.NOM.NEUT shine-3SG.PRES.ACT

mihi

me-SG.DAT

“For this is the favor of Telamon my father, and this bright light shines on me”
(Ennius Telamo, line 325)

In Example 23a, scholars (Warmington, 1936) translate hoc facinus as “this dread deed,” making explicit the derogation added through the use of the demonstrative hoc.
Most instances of *iste* in the fragments of Ennius seem to be neutral, though at least one (Example 24) seems to indicate praise of the subject matter.

(24) *Istic est is Jupiter*

That-SG.NOM.MASC be-3SG.PRES.INDIC. he-SG.NOM.MASC Jupiter-SG.NOM.MASC quem dico... qua mortalis

who-SG.ACC.MASC speak-1SG.PRES.IND for mortal-PL.ACC.FEM

atque urbes beluas -que omnis

and city-PL.ACC.FEM beast-PL.ACC.FEM and all-PL.ACC.FEM

iuvat.

help-3SG.PRES.ACT

“He is that Jupiter whom I speak about...for he helps mortals and all the cities and beasts.”

(Ennius *Epicharmus*, lines 10 and 14)

Here *istic*, representing the god Jupiter and the subject of the rest of the passage, is not used for derogation. In fact, the passage seems almost in praise of Jupiter, who helps men like the speaker as well as all the rest of the creatures. This is particularly interesting as it represents the only laudatory occurrence of *iste* within the corpus as a whole. Coupled with the neutral tone of the remaining instances of *iste* within the Ennian fragments, there is little evidence to suggest a solely derogatory usage of this demonstrative, further supporting Keller’s theory [K1].

Additionally, Ennius uses all three forces for demonstratives in both his tragic and non-dramatic fragments and uses both derogatory and neutral force for his comedic fragments. While there are only a few examples of his comedic demonstrative use, creating a small sample size from which to draw conclusions, his use of all three affective forces in his writing in the other two genres lends credence to Keller’s theory that all genres may use all three forces [K2].

4.4.4 Accius. The fragments of Accius also show a similar use of affective force among the different demonstrative forms. The demonstrative *hic* is used to express derogation, as in Example 25.

(25) *...ne haec aspernabilem taetitudo*

Lest this-SG.NOM.FEM contemptible-SG.ACC loathsomeness-SG.NOM.FEM
mea inculta faxisit.
my-SG.NOM.FEM uncultivated-SG.NOM.FEM make-3SG.PRES.INDIC
“Allow not this my uncared-for hideousness to make of me a thing to scorn.”
(Accius Philoctecta, line 559-560)

While Accius does not use any form of iste in praise, he does appear to use it both
derogatorily (Example 26a) as well as neutrally (Example 26b):

(26) a. Proinde istaec tu aufer
Hence that-PL.ACC.NEUT you-SG.NOM remove-2SG.PRES.IMP.ACT
terricula atque animum iratum
fright-PL.ACC.NEUT and mind-SG.ACC.MASC angry-SG.ACC.MASC
conprime.
restrain-2SG.PRES.IMP.ACT
“Hence you, remove those frights and restrain your angry mind!”
(Accius Telephus, line 622)

b. Nostris -que itidem -st mos
Our-PL.DAT and in the same way be-3SG.PRES.ACT custom-SG.NOM.MASC
traditus illinc iste
tradition-SG.NOM.MASC from that place that-SG.MASC.NOM
“And that custom from that place is in the same way a tradition for us”
(Accius Annales, line 6-7)

In addition to the derogatory use of ille above (Example 27), he also uses this demonstrative
neutrally:

(27) Vox illius est?
Voice-SG.NOM.FEM that-SG.GEN be-3SG.PRES.INDIC
“Is it his voice?”
(Accius Chrysippus, line 233)

In one interesting case, shown in Example 28), there are two correlated demonstratives, one a
form of hic and the other a form of ille, where each demonstrative has a different force behind it.

(28) Haec fortis sequitur illam
This-PL.ACC.NEUT steadfast-SG.NOM.MASC attend-3SG.PRES.INDIC that-SG.ACC.FEM
Indocti possident
unlearned-PL.NOM.MASC possess-3PL.PRES.INDIC
“The steadfast man attends these things, the unlearned men possess that one.”
(Accius Mymidones, line 456)
In Example 12, *hic* is used for the things associated with the steadfast man, at worst a neutral force, though I suspect that its association with steadfastness lends it an air of praise. The *ille* in the second clause, however, describes those things associated with unlearned men, giving it an air of derogation especially when compared to the steadfast man in the previous clause.

Though Accius uses no laudatory forms of *iste*, the distribution of force among the remaining demonstrative forms provides support for Keller’s theory [K1]. Additionally, only one of ten uses of the demonstrative *iste* demonstrates derogative force, suggesting that *iste* does not necessarily bear pejorative force for Accius and that this demonstrative may, therefore, be used with any affective force. Within the different genres in which he wrote, Accius seems to favor derogatory demonstratives in his tragedies, while he eschews this force in his non-dramatic fragments. Additionally, there is only one instance of a laudatory demonstrative in each genre. This genre distribution provides some weak support for Keller’s theory [K2] in that all three forces appear in Accius’ tragic fragments, though laudatory force is rare, while the non-dramatic fragments contain predominately neutral force demonstratives with only one laudatory instance. While this does indicate that the genres may contain demonstratives with different affective force, it is certainly not the best evidence of this contained within the corpus.

### 4.4.5 Caecilius

Within his fragments, Caecilius uses the demonstrative *hic* to express derogation (Example 29a), neutrality (Example 29b), and praise (Example 29c):

(29)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th><em>Tum in senectute hoc deuto</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Then in old age-SG.ABL.FEM this-SG.ACC.NEUT consider-1SG.PRES.ACT miserrimum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>most wretched-SG.ACC.NEUT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Then I consider that this is the most wretched thing in old age…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Caecilius <em>Ephesio</em>, line 25-26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. | *Iam hoc vide;* |
|    | *Now this-SG.ACC.NEUT see-2SG.IMP.ACT* |
|    | “Now see this” |
c. *Hos singulatim sapere, nos minus arbitrator.*

“*I think that those ones, taken one by one, are wise, and we are not*”

(Caecilius *Hypobolimaeus*, line 83)

In Example 29c, the laudatory force of *hos* in the initial clause is heightened by placing the *nos* in the second clause in contrast—not only are these ones wise, but in fact, in comparison we surely are not.

Caecilius also uses *ille* in a similar distribution:

(30) a. *Ab hinc tu, stolide; vis*

From here you-SG.NOM, stupid-SG.VOC.MASC; want-2SG.PRES.ACT

*ille ut tibi sit*

*that-SG.NOM.MASC that you-SG.DAT be-3SG.PRES.SUBJ.ACT*

*father-SG.NOM.MASC*

“You get away from here, stupid; You want that that one is a father to you.”

(Caecilius *Hypobolimaeus*, line 75)

b. *Immo collus, non res, nam ille*

Indeed neck-SG.NOM.MASC, not thing-SG.FEM, for *that-SG.NOM.MASC argentum habet.*

silver-SG.ACC.NEUT has-3SG.PRES.ACT.

“Oh indeed the neck, not the thing, for that man has the silver.”

(Caecilius *Synephebi*, line 205)

c. *Quid illud est pulchritatis!*

*Who-SG.NOM.NEUT that-SG.NOM.NEUT be-3SG.PRES.ACT beauty-SG.GEN.FEM*

“What of beauty is that!”

(Caecilius *Harpazomene*, line 50)

Example 30a establishes the derogatory nature in the first clause, referring to the addressee as “blockhead,” before using the demonstrative *ille* in the second clause to denote the object of the foolish addressee’s desire. Example 30b contains no additional context for the demonstrative *ille* to indicate whether having the silver would be good or bad. As it stands, this demonstrative
indicates only neutral force. Example 30c uses the demonstrative *ille* in praise of some beauty, showing the laudatory force this demonstrative can bear.

While Caecilius provides no uses of *iste* used for praise, we do find examples of both derogatory (Example 31a) and neutral (Example 31b) force:

(31) a. Cur in vicinitatem *istam* meretriciam
    Why into neighbourhood-SG.ACC.FEM *that*-SG.ACC.FEM *whorish*-SG.ACC.FEM
    te contulisti?
    you-SG.ACC gather-2SG.PERF.ACT
    “Why did you betake yourself to that whorish neighbourhood?”
    (Caecilius unassigned fragments, lines 228-229)

b. *Egon* vitam *meam* Atticam
    I-SG.NOM life-SG.ACC.FEM *my*-SG.ACC.FEM Attic-SG.ACC.FEM compare-
    Contendam cum istac rusticana
    1SG.FUT.INDIC.with *that*-SG.ABL.FEM rustic-SG.ABL.FEM
    Syra?
    Syrian-SG.ABL.FEM
    “What, am I to compare my Attic life with that countrified Syrian life of yours?”
    (Caecilius *Titthe*, lines 109-110)

Example 31b is particularly interesting and a phenomenon somewhat unique to the nature of this corpus. While the use of the demonstrative in the second phrase to contrast the personal pronoun in the first phrase, suggests something strong about the “Syrian life of yours,” without context it is unclear whether it is strongly laudatory or derogatory. Without additional contextual information, therefore, this demonstrative cannot be claimed to be used either in praise or in derogation, and is therefore counted as neutral in force.

As can be seen in these examples, Caecilius uses a wide variety of force with all forms of the demonstrative. Both *hic* and *ille* appear with each force, while *iste* appears with both derogatory and neutral force. In this way, his fragments provide good evidence for Keller’s hypothesis [K1]. However, because he wrote only within the genre of comedy, his fragments provide no evidence to support or in contrast to Keller’s cross-genre hypothesis [K2].
4.4.6 Pacuvius. The fragments of Pacuvius contain the fewest number of demonstratives showing any sort of force other than neutral. Only three demonstratives seem to indicate derogation, one form of *hic* (Example 32a) and two of *iste* (Example 32b), while only two indicate praise, one form of *hic* (Example 33a) and one of *ille* (Example 33b). Despite the relatively small number of demonstratives displaying these forces, it is worthwhile to note that there is still a wide distribution of force among the three forms of the demonstrative. Example 32 demonstrates multiple demonstrative forms showing derogation.

(32) a. *quamquam annis -que et aetate hoc*

Though *year-Pl.Abl.Masc. even and age-Sg.Abl.Fem this-Sg.Nom.Neut corpus putret.*

body-Sg.Nom.Neut is rotten-*3SG.Pres.Act*

“Though yet this body is rotting with years and age.”

(Pacuvius *Teucer*, line 376)

b. *Istaec cluentur hospitum*


unfaithful-*Superl.Pl.Nom.Fem*

“Those ones are called the most unfaithful of hosts”

(Pacuvius *Iliona*, line 202)

Example 33 shows multiple demonstrative forms with laudatory force.

(33) a. *Quidquid est hoc, omnia animat format alit auget creat...*


“Whatever this thing is, it quickens, makes, forms, nourishes, increases....”

(Pacuvius *Chryses*, line 112)

b. *Illum Amor quem dederat...*


“That one whom Love had given...”

(Pacuvius *Medus*, line 260)
Despite the limited number of laudatory or derogatory demonstratives among his fragments, Pacuvius still provides some evidence to support Keller’s hypothesis [K1]. Forms of *hic* assume all three affective forces, while forms of *ille* appear with laudatory and neutral force and forms of *iste* appear with derogatory and neutral force. Pacuvius’ fragments are all from tragic dramas and, therefore, only represent one genre. Thus, these fragments alone cannot provide support for Keller’s hypothesis [K2].

**4.4.7 Summary.** Each of the authors within the corpus demonstrates a variety of affective force appearing with each of the demonstrative forms. In this way they each provide some support for Keller’s hypothesis that each demonstrative form may appear with any type of affective force [K1]. Similar support for this hypothesis was provided by the distribution of force among the demonstrative forms in the corpus as a whole. Additionally, among those authors who wrote in multiple genres there was support for Keller’s hypothesis that all types of affective force may be found in every genre [K2]. This hypothesis was similarly supported by analysis of the affective force of demonstratives in genres of the corpus as a whole.

While Keller’s hypotheses seem to be supported by the corpus, my analysis has also identified certain trends in affective force. In the overall corpus, *iste* was used for derogation six times more often than for praise, a trend that was visible within the fragments of Caecilius, Accius, Naevius, and Pacuvius but less so among the fragments of Ennius. Additionally, Ennius and Naevius did not demonstrate the overall trend in the corpus whereby derogatory and laudatory demonstratives were almost equal for forms of *ille*. It is also worth noting that among the three demonstrative forms, *ille* had the lowest ratio of derogatory to laudatory uses in the corpus, at less than half the ratio for *hic* and less than one-sixth the ratio for *iste*. 
4.5 Multimembral Sets

We find sentences containing multiple demonstratives in all authors except Livius Andronicus (who made the smallest contribution to the corpus overall). Within the comedic fragments, there are ten of these multi-demonstrative sentences from Accius and Caecilius, yet only one true multimembral set in the fragments of Accius. These sentences contain 21 demonstratives (28.8% of all comedic demonstratives) in the distribution described in Table 38.

Table 38

**Demonstrative Distribution in Multimembral Sets in Comic Fragments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hic</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>17 (81.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ille</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iste</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (42.9%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>21 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten multi-demonstrative sentences found in the comedy portion of the corpus come from a total of 74 sentences, therefore representing about 13.5% of the sentences in the comedy corpus as a whole. The lone true multimembral set found in this portion of the corpus accounts for only 1.4% of all comedic sentences.

Among the tragic fragments, there are 20 sentences containing multiple demonstratives, of which eight are multimembral sets. These sentences contain 42 demonstratives (21.3% of all tragic demonstratives) in the distribution described in
Table 39.
Table 39

Demonstrative Distribution in Multimembral Sets in Tragic Fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Distribution in Multi-Demonstrative Sentences in Tragedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tragedy portion of the corpus as a whole contains 197 sentences, with these multi-demonstrative sentences accounting for only 20, or about 10.2% of the sentences in the tragic corpus—slightly less than the 13.5% occurrence for multi-demonstrative sentences found in the comedy portion of the corpus. However, the eight true multimembral sets account for 4.1% of the tragic sentences, four times higher than the occurrence of true multimembral sets found in the comedy portion of the corpus.

There are also four sentences from the non-dramatic fragments from Accius and Ennius that contain multiple demonstratives, two of which are true bimembral sets. These contain eight demonstratives (11.9% of all non-dramatic demonstratives), including three pronominal *hics*, two pronominal *illes*, two adverbial *illes*, and one adnominal *iste*. With a total of 65 sentences in the non-dramatic portion of the corpus, these four multi-demonstrative sets account for only 6.2%, substantially less than the rate of multi-demonstrative sentence occurrence found in either the tragic or the comedy portions of the corpus. However, with half of these multi-demonstrative sentences being true multimembral sets, this means that 3.1% of the non-dramatic sentences contain multimembral sets. This is still lower than the 4.1% rate found in the tragic fragments,
though not by such a substantial amount, but is in fact more than double the rate of true multimembral set occurrence found in the comedic fragments.

From these data it can be seen that in this corpus comedy contains more multi-demonstrative sentences than tragedy, while drama contains more than non-drama. However, tragedy showed the highest percentage of true multimembral sets as opposed to merely multi-demonstrative sentences, while comedy had the fewest of these. These data provide support for Meader’s claim that more multimembral sets should be found outside of comedy [M1]—in fact, the comedy corpus had both the fewest number of true multimembral sets as well as the lowest relative occurrence. However, Meader’s claim that multimembral sets should be found more frequently outside of drama altogether [M2] is not supported among this corpus. The tragic fragments had the highest rate of occurrence of multimembral sets, both absolutely and relatively, providing counterevidence for Meader’s claim. While these data do indicate that comedy has the lowest rate of occurrence of true multimembral sets, Meader’s claim that this should lead to a reduced overall occurrence of demonstratives [M3] is not supported. In fact, this study has already indicated that comedy has the highest rate of occurrence of demonstratives of all the genres included within this corpus. This may be affected by the high number of multi-demonstrative sentences, if not multimembral sets, included within the comedic genre.

The comedy fragments seem much more likely to make use of forms of hic in multi-demonstrative sentences than any other Latin demonstrative, while there is not a strong preference between demonstrative categories. In the tragic fragments, authors seem as likely to use forms of ille as they are forms of hic in multi-demonstrative sentences, though are substantially more likely to use pronominal demonstratives than any other category. More important than these trends in demonstrative form and syntactic category for multi-demonstrative
sentences in each genre, however, is whether the rate of multi-demonstrative sentence use in each genre is visible in the individual authors. I therefore examine multi-demonstrative sentences within each author from the corpus, paying attention to genre-related trends.

**4.5.1 Naevius.** In the fragments of Naevius, we find four sentences containing more than one demonstrative. Of these, only one set of demonstratives seems to act like a true multimembral set:

(34) *Hac sibi prospica, hac despica.*

*Here himself-SG.DAT looking forward-SG.NOM.FEM, here looking down-SG.NOM.FEM*  
“Here she was looking ahead for herself, here she was looking down.”  
(Naevius Uncertain Comedies, line 103)

Even though the same demonstrative form was used in each case, in fact even the same oblique form, these words are set against each other to show a contrast in the actions of the verbs *prospica* and *despica*. The remaining sets of demonstratives do not show this same contrast and cannot therefore be thought of multimembral sets. In total, one third of the demonstratives that appear in the Naevian fragments occur in sentences containing more than one demonstrative. All of these multi-demonstrative sets occur in his comedic fragments and seven are forms of the demonstrative *hic*, consistent with the distribution for the corpus as a whole. His use of multi-demonstrative sentences is therefore also in agreement with the trends identified for the comedic genre, with a higher relative frequency of multi-demonstrative sentences compared with tragedy or non-dramatic fragments and a high reliance on forms of *hic*.

**4.5.2 Ennius.** Ennius includes 12 sentences among his fragments that contain multiple demonstratives, 6 of which contain demonstratives in bimembral pairs. Two of these are rather unique pairs in that each sentence does contain two demonstratives, but these demonstratives serve in contrast to personal pronouns rather than each other:
In both of these sentences the demonstrative, illos in Example 35a and illi in Example 35b, do not contrast with each other but rather with the personal pronouns med, me, and mihi. In this way, they still work to form contrastive bimembral sets of demonstratives, though not in the traditional manner.

Ennius also employs more standard bimembral sets where two demonstrative contrast with each other. Unlike Naevius, whose only example of this relied on the same repeated demonstrative, Ennius’ use of these sets is less constrained. In Example 36a we see a set using two different demonstratives from two different categories. In Example 36b we see two different demonstratives representing a former/latter distinction rather than some other distinction. In Example 36c we see a tri-membral set that uses one repeated demonstrative and a second additional form.

(36)  

a. Hos pestis necuit, pars  
      occidit illa duellis  
      fall-3sg.Perf.Indic that-Sg.Nom.Fem war-Pl.Dat.Neut  
      “These men a plague killed, the other part fell in wars.”  
      (Ennius Annales, line 476)
b. **Gaudebant ergo illi et huic**

Be glad-3PL.IMPERF.INDIC thus that-PL.NOM.MASC and this-SG.DAT

imperio eius libenter obsequabantur et

command-SG.DAT.NEUT he-SG.GEN. freely yield-3PL.IMPERF.INDIC and

nominis sui gratia ritus

name-SG.GEN.NEUT himself-PL.GEN sake-SG.ABL.FEM rite-PL.ACC.MASC

annuos et festa

yearly-PL.ACC.MASC and festival-PL.ACC.NEUT

celebrabant.

celebrate-3PL.IMPERF.INDIC

“Thus they were glad, and willingly obeyed this authority of his and celebrated yearly rites and holidays for their name’s sake.”

(Ennius *Euhemerus*, line 108-111)

c. **His erat in ore Bromius,**

This-PL.DAT be-3SG.IMP.INDIC in mouth-SG.ABL.NEUT Bromius-SG.NOM.MASC,

his Bacchus pater;

this-PL.DAT Bacchus-SG.NOM.MASC father-SG.NOM.MASC, that-PL.DAT

Lyaeus vitis inventor

Lyaeus-SG.NOM.MASC vine-SG.GEN.FEM discoverer-SG.NOM

sacrae.

sacred-SG.GEN.FEM

“‘God of Noise’ was in the mouth for some, for others ‘Father Bacchus’, for others still ‘The Loostener, Discoverer of the sacred vine’.”

(Ennius *Athamas*, lines 128-129)

Some 22 of the 56 demonstratives that appear in Ennius’ tragic fragments are members of multi-demonstrative sentences, including 12 that form members of multimembral sets. In addition, six of the 55 demonstratives in Ennius’ non-dramatic fragments are members of multi-demonstrative sentences, four of which form bimembral pairs. Ennius makes use of an almost equal number of forms of *hic* and *ille* in these sets and in half the cases uses two different forms of the demonstrative within the same sentence. If we look within the non-dramatic fragments alone, however, we see that Ennius always uses one form of *hic* and one form of *ille* in each sentence with multiple demonstratives and in all but one instance these demonstratives were pronominals. The forms are much more varied in his tragic fragments, and we find no examples of multi-demonstrative sets in his comic fragments. While Meader’s hypothesis suggests that an
even higher use of these multi-demonstrative sets would be expected in his comedic fragments, the relatively small number of these fragments (only three comedic ones compared to 56 tragic and 55 non-dramatic ones) means that little weight should be assigned to the absence of such multi-demonstrative sets in this particular genre. Ennius’ higher use of multi-demonstrative sentences in his tragic fragments compared to his non-dramatic fragments, however, is in agreement with the overall statistics for each genre. Additionally, his widespread use of different demonstrative forms in his tragic fragments, as well as his heavy reliance on pronominal roles within the tragic fragments (54.5% of the demonstratives) further agrees with the overall statistics of the tragic genre.

4.5.3 Pacuvius. In the fragments of Pacuvius there are four sentences containing multiple demonstratives. Of these four, only one is a true bimembral set:

(37) Nam canis, quando est
For dog-SG.FEM.MASC, when be-3SG.PRES.INDIC
percussa lapide, non tam
strike-PERF.PASS.PART.SG.NOM.FEM stone-SG.ABL.MASC, not so much
illum adpetit qui
that-SG.ACC.MASC aim-3SG.PRES.ACT who-SG.NOM.MASC
sese icti, quam illum
himself-SG.ACC.MASC hit-3SG.PERF.INDIC as that-SG.ACC.MASC
eumpse lapidem, qui ipsa
self-SG.ACC.MASC stone-SG.ACC.MASC, who-SG.NOM.MASC self-SG.NOM.FEM
icta est, petit.
strike-PERF.PASS.PART.SG.NOM.FEM be-3SG.PRES.INDIC aim-3SG.PRES.INDIC
“For when a dog is struck by a stone, it attacks not so much that one who struck it as that same stone itself by which it itself was struck.”
(Pacuvius Armorum Iudicium, lines 47-48)

Here the demonstrative illum refers first to the person who struck the dog and then to the stone which struck it, providing a contrast for how the dog responds. In the remaining multi-demonstrative sentences among the fragments of Pacuvius we find three uses of forms of hic and three of ille, all of which are used as pronominals. The four multi-demonstrative sets represent
7.1% of the 56 remaining fragments of Pacuvius that contain demonstratives. This is slightly higher than the 4.1% found on average for the tragedy portion of the corpus as a whole but still much less than the 13.5% found in comedy. While his multi-demonstrative sentences use only forms of *hic* and *ille*, these forms occur roughly evenly, and all but one demonstrative are pronominals. Pacuvius’ use of multi-demonstrative sentences is therefore slightly higher than expected but appears in roughly the expected distribution; therefore, they are consistent with the overall statistics.

4.5.4 Accius. Accius includes eight sentences in his fragments containing multiple demonstratives, seven among his tragedies and one among his non-dramatic fragments. Of these, only three are bimembral sets, all of which come from his tragic fragments. Example 38 shows one of these bimembral sets that contrasts the demonstrative *haec* against *illum*.

(38)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haec</th>
<th>fortis</th>
<th>sequitur</th>
<th>illum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This-PL.ACC.NEUT</td>
<td>steadfast-SG.NOM.MASC</td>
<td>attend-3SG.PRES.INDIC</td>
<td>that-SG.ACC.FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indocti</td>
<td>possident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlearned-PL.NOM.MASC</td>
<td>possess-3PL.PRES.INDIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The steadfast man attends these things, the unlearned men possess that one.”

( Accius *Mymidones*, line 456)

In his other bimembral sets, Accius makes use of contrasting *haec* with *huius* as well as adnominal forms with pronominal forms. Altogether, his multi-demonstrative sentences contain 7 forms of *hic*, 8 of *ille*, and 1 of *iste*, which take the form of 12 pronominals, 2 adnominals, and 2 adverbials. The relatively equal use of forms of *hic* and *ille* and heavy reliance pronominal forms closely matches the statistics of the tragedy fragments as a whole. His seven multi-demonstrative fragments constitute 9.3% of his 75 tragic fragments, however, a rate much higher than the 4.1% expected from the tragic portion of the corpus as a whole and much closer to the 13.5% found in comedy.
4.5.5 Caecilius. Among the fragments of Caecilius are six sentences with multiple demonstratives, though none are true bimembral sets. Instead, we find sentences like Example 39, which uses two forms of *hic* to refer to a person and an unrelated location:

(39)  
\[ \text{Hic dum abit, huc concessero.} \]
\[ \text{This-SG.NOM.MASC while go away-3SG.PRES.INDIC, here withdraw-1SG.FUT PERF.INDIC} \]
\[ \text{“While this one goes away, I’ll withdraw just here.”} \]
\[ \text{(Caecilius Titthe, line 217)} \]

These six sentences, however, represent 11.5% of the 52 total fragments from Caecilius, near the 13.5% rate found in the comedy portion of the corpus as a whole. In addition, Caecilius makes use of ten forms of *hic* and two of *ille*, as well as eight pronominals, two adnominals, and two adverbials in these multi-demonstrative sentences, mirroring the distribution of the comedy corpus as a whole.

4.5.6 Summary. Each of the authors within the corpus supports, in general, the overarching distribution of multimembral sets. They therefore provide good evidence the statistics gathered on multimembral set occurrence are robust for this corpus. In general, these authors provide support for Meader’s claim [M1] and demonstrate that the comedy fragments contain the fewest true multimembral sets, though they do contain the highest number of multi-demonstrative sentences. They do not support Meader’s claim that drama as a whole should have a lower number of multimembral sets than non-dramatic fragments [M2], as the tragedy portion of the corpus contains the highest amount of these sets. Further, when combined with the overall analysis of the distribution of demonstratives by genre, it is evident that there is no support for Meader’s hypothesis that comedy should use fewer demonstratives because it has fewer multimembral sets [M3]. In fact, comedy has the highest number of demonstratives of any genre within this corpus.
4.6 Conclusions

Analysis of the corpus has provided us with statistics on demonstrative use along a number of dimensions. Initially, our analysis has provided statistics supporting the claim made by Karakasis that we would find more demonstratives in comedy than in other genres. In fact, demonstratives appear in the comedy fragments of our corpus more than two and a half times as often as they do in the non-dramatic fragments, and nearly one and a half times as often as they do in tragedy. This was bolstered through examination of the individual authors, with each author that wrote in multiple genres reflecting the same pattern.

In order to determine what aspects of demonstrative use might have contributed to this increase in demonstrative use within the comedy fragments, I also looked at statistical evidence for hypotheses proposed by scholars in the field. First, I examined the distribution of demonstrative forms and syntactic categories. These data supported hypothesis [F1], showing that forms of *hic* and *ille* were more common than forms of *iste* for all authors within the corpus. These data did not support [H1], however, and instead showed that pronominal uses of demonstratives were more common than Himmelmann's predicted adnominal uses.

Next, we looked at the co-occurrence of demonstratives with their correlated personal pronouns to test the hypotheses [B1], [M4], and [K3] regarding the personal force of demonstratives. This analysis indicated some support for [M4] and the correlation between *iste* and the second person pronoun but supported [B1] only for the second person pronoun. None of the data indicated that the demonstrative forms uniquely co-occurred with their correlated personal pronouns, however, as expected by [M4] and [B1]. The overall corpus supported [K3], and no author presented substantial counterevidence against it, suggesting that a demonstrative form can co-occur with any person.
I then examined whether any genre made greater use of the pejorative or laudatory force with their demonstratives and whether any demonstrative form was closely tied to a particular affective force. Though many beginning Latin textbooks teach the second person demonstrative \textit{iste} as inherently derogatory, hypothesis [K1] expected derogation to be implied by each of the Latin demonstrative forms. This theory was robustly supported within the corpus, which each author supporting the idea that each demonstrative form could be used with each different affective force. Additionally, hypothesis [K2] expected derogatory and laudatory force to be found in demonstratives of every genre. The analysis supported both of these claims among those authors who wrote in multiple genres, showing laudatory, derogatory and neutral force in comedy, drama, and non-dramatic fragments. In addition, although each demonstrative appeared with each force, \textit{iste} is the most often derogatory of the three, and \textit{ille} has the lowest ratio of derogatory to laudatory uses.

Finally, I examined the presence of fragments with sentences containing multimembral sets of demonstratives and multiple instances of demonstratives. Hypothesis [M1] predicted that comedy would have the lowest occurrence of multimembral sets, which these data supported. However, hypothesis [M2] predicted that drama, in general, would use fewer multimembral sets than non-dramatic texts. This analysis indicated that the tragic portion of the corpus used the most multimembral sets, contrasting with hypothesis [M2]. Additionally, even though comedy used the fewest multimembral sets, this genre had the highest use of demonstratives overall, contrasting with hypothesis [M3]. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 40.

This analysis provides the information necessary for our in-depth discussion of the role of demonstratives in Early Latin in Chapter Five. This chapter has laid the groundwork by
determining the patterns of use and identifying which of the hypotheses presented in Chapter Two are supported.

Table 40

Support for Hypotheses on Demonstrative Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Overarching Claim</strong>: Comedy will contain more demonstratives than tragedy <strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>B2</strong>: Drama should contain more demonstratives than non-dramatic works due to their service as stage directions. <strong>Supported (though it’s unclear whether the use of demonstratives as stage directions is the reason drama contains more of them)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>B3</strong>: Tragedy and Comedy should contain a similar number of demonstratives because both use stage directions. <strong>Unsupported</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Demonstrative Form and Syntactic Role |
| 3. **F1**: *Iste* should be less frequent than either *ille* or *hic*. **Supported** |
| 4. **H1**: Adnominal demonstratives should be more frequent than pronominal demonstratives throughout the whole corpus. **Unsupported** |

| Personal Pronoun Correlation |
| 4. **B1**: Personal possessive pronouns should occur with their correlating demonstratives (i.e., *hic* with the first person, *iste* with the second person, and *ille* with the third person) due to their personal force. **Unsupported (except in the case of iste)** |
| 5. **K3**: The demonstratives should appear co-occurring with all personal pronouns and are not limited to co-occurring only with their correlated personal pronoun. **Supported** |
| 6. **M4**: Use of *iste* should be correlated with the second person pronoun. **Partially Supported** |

| Affective Force |
| 3. **K1**: All three demonstratives should appear with pejorative force at some point. **Supported** |
| 4. **K2**: Pejorative force should be found in all genres. **Supported** |

| Multimembral Sets |
| 4. **M1**: Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of comedy. **Supported** |
| 5. **M2**: Multimembral series should appear more frequently outside of drama. **Unsupported** |
| 6. **M3**: Comedy (and drama) may contain fewer demonstratives than non-dramatic texts due to the reduced occurrence of multimembral series of demonstratives. **Unsupported** |
Chapter Five: General Discussion

Chapter Four demonstrated that the distribution of demonstratives in the Early Latin corpus supported the hypothesis that demonstratives are more frequent in comedy. It also provided a quantitative analysis of the various claims regarding demonstrative use. In this chapter, I present a discussion of why comedy may contain more demonstratives, and what the presence or lack of support for each of the additional claims may mean. I will begin by discussing the details of the effect of genre on demonstrative use attempting to explain why there may be more demonstratives in comedy by examining the concepts of shared deictic space and colloquial language. I will then examine the impact that demonstrative form and category had on patterns of demonstrative use. Following this, I will examine the impact of personal pronoun and demonstrative co-occurrence based on the claims of Bach, Meader, and Keller, including which claims are supported within this corpus and how personal pronoun co-occurrence might impact overall demonstrative use. I next examine the affective force of demonstratives, addressing why so many exhibit neutral force, the standard translations of *iste*, and why *hic* and *iste* are used more frequently for derogation than in praise. I then discuss the occurrence of demonstratives in multimembral sets and address reasons why comedy may have fewer multi-demonstrative sentences but a higher overall demonstrative count. Finally, I will propose additional factors which are beyond the scope of this thesis but might have impacted demonstrative use.

5.1 Genre

Analysis of demonstrative use in the corpus indicated that the comedic fragments of Early Latin do indeed use demonstratives more frequently than either tragedies or non-dramatic fragments. Additionally, both types of drama contained more demonstrative than their non-dramatic counterparts. Within the comedy portion of the corpus, 2.9% of the words were
demonstratives, compared to the 2.0% found in the tragedy portion and the 1.2% found in the non-dramatic portion of the corpus. These data support the initial hypothesis from Karakasis (2014) that demonstrative use should be more frequent in works of comedy. In individual analysis of each author contained within the corpus, no single author’s distribution was found to counter this hypothesis. Since this hypothesis has been demonstrated to hold for fragments of Early Latin, it is important to examine why this might be the case.

This may not be a simple question to answer, and the rest of the claims regarding demonstrative use presented in Chapter Two are included in order to provide more data in order to attempt to answer this question. While these claims will each be discussed on their own, and their role in contributing to the overall difference in demonstrative use in genres of Early Latin will be evaluated, there are certainly other aspects of Latin, demonstratives, and comedic language that may contribute.

5.1.1 Shared deictic space. One explanation for the higher number of demonstratives found within drama may be the ability of this genre to establish the shared deictic space on which demonstratives rely. Exophoric demonstratives work to establish connections between speech and the outside, physical world. In so doing, they create a linguistic space shared between speaker and listener, a shared deictic space. As Hausendorf (2003) observed, “…the meaning of deictic expressions is bound to the actual speech situation in which they are orally produced” (p. 249), further indicating the importance of this shared physical space for understanding and using demonstratives. Drama, as a physical act performed by the speaker and observed by the audience in a space shared by the different actors in the dialogue, operates in a similar shared linguistic space and provides the environment necessary for interpreting deictic demonstratives. The findings of my analysis are consistent with this fact, showing more demonstratives used in drama.
than in the non-dramatic fragments. The difference in demonstrative use between drama and non-drama can at least partially be explained, then, by the presence of a shared, physical linguistic space.

Demonstratives can also serve, however, to indicate a shared common ground between speech participants, thereby creating a non-physical shared space. Lakoff (1974) wrote that demonstratives are used to “establish emotional closeness between speaker and hearer” (p. 351). Acton and Potts (2014) supported this, writing that “demonstratives can be used to enhance discourse participants’ sense of shared perspective and common ground” (p. 4). As characters within dramas often share bonds of friendship or familial relationship, it is likely that characters within drama share an emotional connection (even if it is fictional) that is missing between the non-dramatic writer and their readership. As such, the increased use of demonstratives within the dialogue of a drama may arise from the non-physical common ground shared by the participants. There is reason, then, to suggest that the shared deictic space available to characters within dramatic works, instantiated both physically and mentally, allows for the increased use of demonstratives observed within the dramatic works of the corpus.

An additional aspect to consider is the impact that exophora may have on demonstrative use within genres. While the fragmentary Early Latin corpus was not able to provide quantitative data on the relative amounts of exophora and endophora, this demonstrative function is still likely to have impacted overall demonstrative use. For example, drama provides ample opportunity for actors to reference objects in the external world because these objects can be present on stage with them. The performative nature of drama, therefore, is conducive to exophora in general. On the other hand, non-dramatic texts that are designed to be read afford less opportunity for exophora. Perhaps the increase in demonstrative use found in both tragedy
and comedy when compared with the non-dramatic fragments is due, at least in part, to the availability and frequency of exophoric reference.

5.1.2 Colloquial language. If the distinction between drama and non-drama can be accounted for largely in terms of shared space, how can the difference in demonstrative use within the sub-genres of drama be explained? The data indicate that the comedic fragments have an appreciably increased use of demonstratives compared to the tragic fragments, 2.9% compared to 2.0%, but both forms of drama work to create a shared mental and physical space between the speaker and addressee. One difference that may account for the difference in use between tragedy and comedy is the type of language employed within each genre.

One key distinction often drawn between tragic and comedic language, or between drama and rhetoric, is the use of colloquial language. Colloquial language has long been accepted as a characteristic of Latin comedic language and notably absent in Latin tragic language. Halla-aho and Kruschwitz (2010) claimed that “Tragedy did not generally try to give an illusion of conversational language, as comedy often did...” (p. 136), while De Melo (2010) observed that such colloquialisms are much rarer in the language of tragedy (p. 85), indicating that there should be more occurrences of colloquial language within comedy. Moreover, Palmer (1975) claimed that “colloquial speech makes much freer use of the personal and demonstrative pronouns than does written Latin” (p. 75).

If demonstrative use is indeed a characteristic of colloquial language, then, all other things being equal, it would not be surprising to find a difference in demonstrative use between tragedy and comedy insofar as there is a difference in colloquial language use between the genres. Indeed, other scholars have suggested that demonstrative use is characteristic of colloquial language more generally. Acton and Potts (2014) described how the previously
discussed shared common ground reinforced by use of the demonstrative aligns with the necessary familiarity between speakers that allows for informal language:

...[T]he use of demonstratives both presumes and, when welcome, reinforces a sense of shared perspective between interlocutors. It is this dynamic...that explains why linguists and lexicographers alike have characterized certain uses of demonstratives as ‘colloquial’ (Lakoff 1974) or ‘informal’—just like taboo words, certain phonetic features, terms of address, etc., affective uses of demonstratives require a degree of familiarity and fellowship between speaker and addressee to be licensed. (p. 27-28)

This theory would be bolstered by the identification of other colloquialisms within the comedic fragments in the corpus and a correlated lack of other colloquialisms within the tragic and non-dramatic fragments. Scholars have established certain characteristics of Latin colloquial language, including the use of diminutives, vulgar or jargon metaphors, parenthetical expressions, and elliptic expressions, and the use of transitional phrases (Ferri & Probert, 2010, pp. 37-38), as well as repetition, emphasis on second person pronouns, double comparatives, and reinforced negatives (Palmer, 1988, p. 75). Unfortunately, none of these characteristics are found in the comedic fragments of the corpus and therefore cannot be used to bolster this claim. This may be due to the fragmentary nature of the corpus, as no colloquial characteristics found in the other genres were included within the corpus. Furthermore, it should be noted that the relationship between the comedy genre and colloquial language may be somewhat complicated—authors have suggested that the expectation that comedy will contain colloquialisms may influence the decision as to what constructions are viewed as colloquial.

“The use of hic in reference to the first person is attested in comedy and thought to be colloquial,” wrote Halla-aho and Kruschwitz (2010), “...we find this use of hic not especially
colloquial. More probably it is an affective expression typical of dramatic language” (p. 143). Continuing investigations into this, especially those based on full-text rather than fragments, may provide more information on the relationship between comedy and colloquial language. In any case, if indeed, as many scholars claim, comedy did generally have more colloquial language than tragedy, such a difference may well help explain the higher rate of demonstratives in comedy than in tragedy attested in this corpus.

5.2 Demonstrative Forms

In addition to examining the difference in demonstrative use between genres, my analysis in Chapter Four also looked at the distribution of demonstrative use between the three Latin forms—*hic*, *ille*, and *iste*—and the three syntactic categories—pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial. Fruyt (2010) claimed that *iste* had limited uses compared to *hic* and *ille* and should therefore appear less frequently within the corpus [F1]. The corpus data supported Fruyt’s theory, identifying *iste* as the least frequent demonstrative in the corpus. Overall, 10.4% of the demonstratives within the corpus were forms of *iste*, while 27.0% were forms of *ille* and the majority, with 62.6%, were forms of *hic*. This was also supported through analysis of the individual authors, who each used *iste* least frequently of all three demonstrative forms.

The corpus data also indicated that *iste* was more frequent in comedy than in any of the other genres and more frequent in drama overall than in non-dramatic writing. This demonstrative form accounted for 12.3% of the demonstratives in the comedy portion of the corpus, 11.2% in the tragedy portion of the corpus, and only 6.0% in the non-drama portion of the corpus. It is likely that the nature of dramatic texts allowed for this difference, with the dialogue-based comic and tragic texts providing more occasions to invoke second person forms. Additionally, the colloquial nature of drama, and especially comedy, may be more conducive to
the affective force that *iste* may bear, further helping to contribute to this difference. The ability of *iste* to carry a second person force is discussed more in section 5.3, and its ability to bear affective force is discussed in section 5.4.

Fruyt (2010) proposed this theory, however, because he thought that both *hic* and *ille* were used for endophoric references while *iste* was not ([F2] and [F3]). This secondary role for *hic* and *ille* meant that they would be used more frequently. The fragmented nature of the corpus does not allow us to verify Fruyt’s theories on the use of *hic* and *ille* for endophora. This is not to say that his proposed reasoning is invalid nor his claims untrue, but given that they remain unverified, it is worth considering what other causes may be responsible the increased use of *iste*.

In addition to examining the distribution of forms of the Latin demonstratives, my analysis also gathered statistics on the use of demonstratives in each of the three relevant syntactic categories. Himmelmann (1996) suggested that there should be a high frequency of occurrence for adnominal forms of demonstratives because fewer contexts allow for the pronominal or adverbial forms (p. 206). The corpus did not support this claim, however, instead indicating that pronominal forms were most frequent. Adnominal forms accounted for 21.3% of the demonstratives within the corpus, only slightly more than the 18.1% that were adverbial forms and much less than the 60.5% that were pronominal forms. While overall adnominals were the second most frequent demonstrative category, this was not true for all authors. For instance, 29.6% of the demonstratives found in the fragments of Naevius were adverbial forms while only 18.5% were adnominals. Pacuvius made equal use of both adnominals and adverbials, with each representing 19.6% of the demonstratives in his fragments. So why are there not more uses of adnominal demonstratives as expected by Himmelmann?
Himmelmann’s claim was based on analysis of multiple languages, not just Latin, and specifically on non-conversational discourse. The focus of this study on only one language, and the inclusion within the corpus of conversation-filled drama fragments may account for the lack of support for Himmelmann’s theories. Because drama is almost entirely conversational discourse, this might provide a reason for the lower frequency of adnominal forms when compared to pronominal ones. It is interesting to note, in that vein, that the non-dramatic portion of the corpus contains if not a larger portion of ad nominals than pronominals at least the largest portion of ad nominals of any of the genres. Twenty three point nine percent of the demonstratives in the non-dramatic fragments are ad nominals, compared to the 23.3% found in comedy and the 20.3% found in tragedy. At the same time, these differences aren’t especially large. The largest difference between the genres is actually found in the adverbial forms, where only 13.4% of non-dramatic demonstratives are ad nominals, while 15.1% of the comedic ones serve this syntactic role and 20.8% of tragic ones do.

In brief, the corpus presents counterevidence to Himmelmann’s claim but provides evidence in favor of Fruyt’s quantitative claim. At the same time, however, Fruyt’s hypotheses concerning the reason for lower rates of iste relative to hic and ille are untestable given the fragmented nature of the corpus, which makes it too difficult to reliably and consistently determine whether a demonstrative is endophoric or exophoric. Despite the inability to test the reason behind Fruyt’s claim, her hypothesis is still supported by this corpus.

As for the effect of syntactic category on the rate of demonstrative use in the three genres, all three syntactic types were more frequent in the dramatic portions of the corpus than in the non-dramatic portions, controlling for the size of each portion (and the same goes for comedic versus tragic portions). Adverbial demonstratives are the most overrepresented syntactic type in
the drama portions, followed by pronominals, followed by adnominals. Thus, no one syntactic category accounts for the higher rates of demonstratives in drama, but adverbials and pronominals are especially highly represented in drama. This could have to do with the fact that adverbials and pronominals stand without an accompanying noun, thereby requiring more shared common ground for interpretation. If, as suggested above, the participants in dramatic discourse have more common ground in virtue of their shared deictic space than participants in non-dramatic discourse, this would help explain the particularly large genre differences for adverbials and pronominals.

5.3 Personal Pronouns

I will now turn to a discussion of the correlation between demonstratives and personal pronouns. Recall that in his overview of demonstrative forms, Diessel (1999) referred to a personal division of demonstratives, where one demonstrative form is frequently associated with the first person, another with the second. Other authors have claimed that this standard division holds true for Latin as well (Meader, 1901; Bach, 1888). Bach (1888) and Meader (1901) suggested that these associations are visible in the co-occurrence of demonstratives with a personal pronoun correlating to this personal force, that is *hic* with a first person pronoun, *iste* with a second person pronoun, and *ille* with a third person pronoun. The analysis of the co-occurrence of personal pronouns with demonstratives suggested little evidence for associating the demonstratives with their correlated person. Overall, the distributions of demonstratives of *hic* and *ille* among the three personal pronouns was relatively similar, with *hic* co-occurring slightly less frequently with the first person pronoun than *ille* (53.1% compared to 54.8%) and *ille* co-occurring slightly less frequently with the third person pronoun (16.1% compared to 17.3%). This indicates very little support for Bach’s hypothesis. However, *iste* most frequently
co-occurs with the second person pronoun expected by Bach’s theory and explicitly by Meader’s, with 52.4% of all instances of iste that occur with some pronoun occurring with the second person pronoun. Despite this support, iste does still co-occur with both other personal pronouns and is not limited to only the second person pronoun, meaning that this provides only partial support for Meader’s claim and further weakens the support for Bach’s hypothesis. The fact that all three demonstrative forms co-occur with each personal pronoun provides substantial support for Keller’s (1946) hypothesis that any such co-occurrence is acceptable. Moreover, the same evidence can be seen in each of the individual genres and in all included authors, with few authors providing any counterevidence for any claim. With little difference in the distribution of personal pronoun and demonstrative correlation among the components of the corpus, the findings in support of Keller’s hypothesis [K3], partial support of Meader’s hypothesis [M4], and not supporting Bach’s hypothesis [B1] seem fairly robust.

While Bach suggested that the use of the personal pronoun co-occurring with the demonstrative served to highlight the force of the demonstrative, Meader suggested that it was necessary due to a weakening in the force of the demonstrative. The strength of the association between iste and the second person pronoun in the data is noticeable but is not strong enough to support a claim that the inclusion of the personal pronoun was necessary. The co-occurrence of the other demonstrative forms with the second person pronoun as well as the co-occurrence of iste with non-second person pronouns supports this.

It is worth considering some of the shortcomings of this particular analysis of the personal force of the demonstrative. The quantitative evaluation relied on the co-occurrence of demonstratives with personal pronouns, which, while established by scholars as a common occurrence, is not a necessity for indicating personal force. While Keller (1946) and Meader
(1901) specifically stated that the personal force of the demonstrative can be seen in its co-occurrence with personal pronouns, it is still possible that this is not the only metric for identifying personal force. Further studies should investigate other methods of identifying the personal force of demonstratives, which may require more context than is available from the Early Latin fragments used within this corpus.

This analysis has provided evidence to help better understand the role of personal force in demonstrative use. The support found within this corpus for Keller’s hypothesis means that demonstratives are not limited to co-occurring with their correlated personal pronoun. It is therefore unlikely that any differences in the personal force found in any genre dramatically impacted the overall demonstrative count found within. The rate of *hic*, *ille*, and *iste* as a percent of all words was greater for comedy than for tragedy, and greater for tragedy than for non-drama in every case, so no one form drove the differences on its own. It is worth noting, however, that the biggest differences were for *iste*. This makes sense on the theory *iste* has second person force since drama, being based in dialogue, likely calls for more second person forms than non-drama. At the same time, though, there was a smaller difference for *hic* than for *ille*, which one might argue is unexpected if drama likewise calls for more first person forms than non-drama.

### 5.4 Affectivity

This analysis also included an examination of the affective force of demonstratives in Early Latin. Analysis of the use of the demonstrative to supply derogative force indicated that all three Latin demonstratives can be used with derogatory, neutral, and laudatory force. None of the six authors within the corpus presented any counterevidence to this claim. While I was able to identify all three forces within the corpus, the most predominant one was certainly the neutral force. This likely indicates that the unmarked state of the demonstrative simply bears a neutral
force, but it may also result from the fragmented nature of the corpus itself—without any context to rely upon, fully identifying the affective force associated with the demonstrative can be difficult.

5.4.1 Why are so many demonstratives neutral in force? It is possible, and maybe likely, that the unmarked Latin demonstrative is neutral in force—that is, the initial assumption when translating a demonstrative is to apply no force, either derogatory or laudatory. In fact, Jacobson (2011) supported this, saying “Each of the demonstratives has what we may consider a normal or ‘unmarked’ usage” (p. 8). Additionally, the presence of any of the other factors examined in this analysis may work to prevent an inherent affective force of a demonstrative from surfacing. For instance, if *iste* really were inherently derogatory but also served as the second person demonstrative, a Latin speaker that wanted to use *iste* to refer to a second person object but with praise would not be able to. The pressure from different personal, spatial, and deictic forces may work to prevent any one demonstrative form from developing too strong an affective force.

It is also worth considering, however, the effect that the fragmented nature of the corpus might have had on the interpretation of the affective force of the demonstratives contained therein. While all of the demonstratives I identified as showing pejoration or praise did so within the limited context of the sentence in which they appeared, it is possible that some I identified as showing a neutral force may actually, within the greater context of a full paragraph or their full-text, have exhibited something stronger. Example 40 shows instances where the derogatory and laudatory force were easy to determine within the context of the fragment alone:

(40) a. *Cur in vicinitatem istam meretriciam* te contulisti?
    Why into neighbourhood-SG.ACC.FEM that-SG.ACC.FEM whorish-SG.ACC.FEM you-SG.ACC gather-2SG.PERF.ACT
“Why did you betake yourself to that whorish neighbourhood?”
(Caecilius unassigned fragments, lines 228-229)

b. Sin illos deserant fortissimos
   But if that-PL.ACC.MASC forsake-3PL.PRES.SUBJ brave-PL.ACC.MASC.SUPERL
   virorum...
   man-PL.GEN.MASC
   “But if they should forsake those bravest of men…”
   Naevius Bellum Poenicum (Line 61)

In Example 40a, the demonstrative istam is used to describe a “whorish neighbourhood,”
exhibiting a fairly clear example of derogatory force. Example 40b uses the demonstrative illos
to describe the “bravest of men,” presenting an easily identifiable example of laudatory force.

Example 41, on the other, shows an instance where the affective force of the demonstrative is
difficult to determine:

(41) Egon vitam meam Atticam contendam
   I-SG.NOM life-SG.ACC.FEM my-SG.ACC.FEM Attic-SG.ACC.FEM compare-1SG.FUT.INDIC.
   cum istac rusticana Syra?
   with that-SG.ABL.FEM rustic-SG.ABL.FEM Syrian-SG.ABL.FEM
   “What, am I to compare my Attic life with that countrified Syrian life of yours?”
   (Caecilius Titthe, lines 109-110)

Example 41 indicates a sentence where the speaker is comparing his life in Attica with the
Syrian life of his addressee, yet this sentence does not contain enough information to indicate
whether this is in derogation or praise of Syria. The addition of the demonstrative in the second
phrase contrasts with the personal pronoun in the first phrase, suggesting something strong about
the “Syrian life of yours,” though it is unclear whether it is strongly negative or positive. Further
context would undoubtedly allow us to determine the greater force behind this sentence, yet with
the limited context available to us currently, it cannot be considered either derogatory or
laudatory. If there were more contextual information and it were possible to assign derogatory or
laudatory force to some of those demonstratives currently identified as neutral, these data would
still support Keller’s theories. The difference would be an increase in demonstratives exhibiting
the stronger force or pejoration or praise, and fewer neutral demonstratives. Still, as noted above, there is good reason to believe that very many instances of demonstratives in the corpus were indeed relatively affectively neutral.

5.4.2 Should *iste* still be taught as inherently pejorative? The fact that all three demonstrative forms demonstrate derogatory force in the corpus of Early Latin suggests two possible conclusions regarding the long-standing treatment of *iste* as the sole pejorative demonstrative. The evidence from the quantitative analysis indicates that within Early Latin this demonstrative was still able to bear laudatory and neutral affective force. While my analysis indicated that *iste* did have the highest rate of pejorative uses of all forms (17.1% of all uses of *iste* were pejorative, compared to 13.3% of forms of *ille* an 9.0% of forms of *hic*), *iste* also demonstrated the second highest rate of neutral uses (80.0% of all uses of *iste* were neutral, compared to the 74.4% of forms of *ille*) and was even found with laudatory force in one case. It is possible that *iste* developed into an inherently derogatory demonstrative but not until well after the Early Latin period. If this were the case, there would be a drastically different distribution in force exhibited in a corpus of Latin from the Republican, Late, or Medieval periods. There are a number of studies (e.g., Himmelmann, 1996; Diessel, 1999; Diessel, 2003; Diessel, 2006) that discuss the grammaticalization of the Latin demonstrative, especially *ille*, and its transition into the article in a number of child languages (e.g., French, Spanish, Italian; Carlier & De Mulder, 2010). There is further evidence for the shifting force and meaning of *iste* in the analysis of its co-occurrence with the second person pronoun, providing, perhaps, further evidence that this demonstrative did indeed undergo a significant shift in its use and meaning. It can therefore be said with a degree of certainty that eventually the Latin demonstrative did undergo a transition in its meaning; and it could be that part of that transition involved pejorative force eventually
becoming associated predominately with forms of *iste*. This would be an interesting subject for continuing investigations that look at the affective force of *iste* and other demonstrative forms over time.

It is also possible that *iste* never developed as the sole pejorative demonstrative form in Latin, and the fact that there is no such unique usage among the Early Latin fragments is indicative of its use across all periods of the Latin language. If this is the case, then it is unclear how the spurious assessment of *iste* as the sole pejorative demonstrative, as taught in beginning Latin textbooks (Allen et al., 2001; Wheelock, 2005), has developed. Perhaps initial studies of the force of demonstratives were limited to certain genres or prominent authors, who relied heavily on this one demonstrative in a way not exemplary of the language as a whole. This would certainly also be an interesting area of focus for additional research.

5.4.3 Why is *iste* still interpreted pejoratively? Another possible conclusion is that the derogatory force of *iste* became a somewhat self-fulfilling role for this demonstrative. Perhaps there is nothing inherently derogatory about uses of *iste*, but instead the derogatory force assigned to *iste* may have been overdone and then exaggerated by translators over time. This can be seen in action already with the standard translations of the fragments within the corpus. In the following example, there is a relatively neutral use of the demonstrative *iste* with a standard translation that seems to indicate that this demonstrative contains some derogatory or negative force:

(42)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal translation: “What is this? What sadness binds the face?”</th>
<th>Loeb translation: “What trouble’s there? What sadness knits your brows?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Quid istuc est? Vultum alligat quae tristitas?</em></td>
<td><em>What trouble’s there? What sadness knits your brows?”</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pacuvius *Atalanta*, line 60)
Where a literal translation provides only the demonstrative *this*, the Loeb translator has added in the noun *trouble*, interpreting this use of the demonstrative as negative and assigning to it extra derogatory force. The Loeb translator may not be wrong in his interpretation of this demonstrative, yet the literal translation does not indicate that such force must necessarily be inferred from *istuc*. It may be the case, therefore, that the original translation of this fragment is influenced by the idea that *iste* must be translated with a sort of derogatory force. Similar influence may be responsible for standard interpretations of many uses of this demonstrative and, thus, may have influenced the continuing interpretation of *iste* as a derogatory demonstrative when in reality it can serve with any desired force.

**5.4.4 Why are *hic* and *iste* used more frequently for derogation?** While all three demonstratives are used in derogation within this corpus, it is true that these authors were more likely to lean on forms of *hic* and *iste* for such force rather than forms of *ille*. In fact, forms of *iste* seem seven times as likely to indicate derogation as praise, while forms of *hic* are twice as likely and forms of *ille* occur equally as often in derogation as in praise. This suggests that *iste* has the strongest derogatory force of the Latin demonstrative forms. If all three demonstratives could serve to indicate this force, why do these authors seem to favor *hic* and *iste*? I believe that this is a result of the medial and proximal roles that these demonstratives serve, respectively, and their related association with speech in the first and second person.

Earlier analysis discussed the spatial role of the demonstrative. Just as *hic* has been traditionally associated with the first person, it has also been spatially associated with items located physically close to the speaker. Similarly, *iste* has been associated both with the second person and with items at a middle distance from the speaker, while *ille* has been associated both with the third person and items at a far distance from the speaker. It seems likely to me that the
strong language of derogation would be more likely applied to objects at proximal or medial
distance from the speaker; that is near or at a middle distance. The closer objects are to the
speaker the more likely they are to elicit strong emotion, while those object no longer tied
physically to the sphere of discourse or emotionally to the shared deictic space, those objects
associated with the third person demonstrative ille, become overshadowed by items immediately
available to the speaker and addressee. I believe that the strength of invective should increase as
distance from the subject decreases.

The analysis of the affective force of demonstratives has demonstrated that the comedic
fragments show a slightly higher reliance on demonstratives with non-neutral force, with 80.8%
of all demonstratives showing neutral force compared to the 83.6% found in the non-dramatic
fragments and the 83.8% found in the tragic ones. This suggests that one of the factors
contributing to the higher overall use of demonstratives within comedy is the affective force they
bear. However, the difference between non-neutral force in comedy and the other genres is small,
and tragedy, which was found to have the second highest overall demonstrative use, has the
lowest use of non-neutral affective force. Perhaps a more likely contributor to the overall
demonstrative use between genres is the use of demonstratives with derogatory force, with
13.7% of the demonstratives in the comedic portion of the corpus used for derogation, 12.2% of
the tragic corpus used for derogation, and only 4.5% of the non-dramatic portion of the corpus
used for derogation. This distribution is in line with the overall statistics, suggesting that the
more frequent use of derogatory force found in drama, and especially comedy, may also lead to a
higher overall use of demonstratives.
5.5 Multimembral Sets

I shall now discuss the findings from the examination of multimembral sets in the corpus. Meader (1901) suggested that these sets are characteristic of formal language and should thus be found most frequently in non-dramatic works and least frequently in comedy, which relies on informal, colloquial language. This examination identified multimembral sets in every genre, though it found them to be nearly three times as frequent in the tragic fragments as they were in the comedic ones and more than twice as frequent in the non-dramatic fragments as they were in the comedic ones. Overall, about 1.4% of the comedic sentences contained multimembral sets, while the tragedy portion contained 4.1% multimembral sets and the non-dramatic portion contained 3.1%.

Meader (1901) suggested that tragedy contains more multimembral demonstrative sets because these constructs are inherently more formal and, therefore, more natural in the non-colloquial language of tragedy. Not only does this lend credence to the suggestion that the colloquial nature of comedic language is at least partially responsible for the increased use of demonstratives found within that genre, but it also provides an interesting explanation for why more of these sets are found within tragedy. I have previously discussed how non-dramatic language tends to be less colloquial and more formal and have established evidence for that portion of Meader’s claim. In addition, the statistical analysis in Chapter Four indicates that more multimembral demonstrative sets are indeed found within tragedy. It may very well be the case, therefore, that the reason for the high occurrence of multimembral demonstrative sets in non-dramatic and tragic texts is the more formal language that allows for these planned constructions, while the colloquial language of comedy cannot sustain them.
Meader (1901) also suggested that bimembral or multimembral demonstrative series would be more frequent outside of comedy because these constructions are used for “description and narration” (p. 95) and not the dialogue and colloquial language found within comedy. This may help to explain the high number of multimembral sets found within tragedy, which Meader posited relies more on description and narration (p. 95), while comedy often accomplishes the same thing through conversational dialogue. Similarly, the non-dramatic texts likely also eschew colloquial and conversational language in favor of the description and narration that provides the correct environment for multimembral sets. While the difference in reliance on narration may not wholly account for the different rates of multimembral demonstrative sets, it does align with the quantitative data gathered in Chapter Four.

The high use of multi-demonstrative sentences within non-dramatic and tragic fragments has interesting implications for the overall demonstrative use within these genres. If these genres contain more multi-demonstrative sets, it would seem likely that they should also contain a higher overall demonstrative count. This is unsupported within the corpus, however, which shows that comedy, with the fewest multi-demonstrative sentences, contains the most demonstratives overall. This suggests that something aside from occurrence in multimembral sets is contributing to the high rate of demonstrative use found in comedy.

5.6 Summary

The fragments of which the corpus is comprised provide a significant amount of information regarding the usage of demonstratives in Early Latin. Though there is context-dependent information that is certainly lacking, specifically regarding endophoric and exophoric usage, they still greatly enrich our understanding of how demonstratives were used in Latin comedy, tragedy, and non-dramatic works.
This study has indicated that there is indeed a correlation between genre and demonstrative frequency, with comedies showing the highest rate of use while non-dramatic texts show the lowest. This may serve as a valuable forensic tool, given that there are so many fragments of Early Latin currently unassigned to a genre or sometimes even an author, and new fragments may yet be found that would need classification. In addition, this analysis identified the most frequent demonstrative forms and syntactic roles within each genre, showing high use of *iste* within comedy but low use of pronominal forms of *iste*, accounting for its overall low rate of occurrence. The personal force of the demonstrative forms was also examined, providing evidence that *hic* is not especially highly correlated with the first person pronoun and *ille* is not especially highly correlated with the third person pronoun. While *iste* was weighted toward co-occurring with the second person pronoun, it also co-occurred with the two other personal pronouns. All of this suggests that the personal force of demonstratives as seen through co-occurrence with personal pronouns is limited and likely had little impact on the overall demonstrative use among the differing genres. This study further examined the affective force of the demonstrative, identifying a higher occurrence of the derogatory force within comedy and drama as a whole than in the non-dramatic fragments. It is possible, therefore, that the use of affective force within comedy contributed to the overall higher use of demonstratives. However, each demonstrative form was found to be able to bear derogatory, laudatory, and neutral force, making it unlikely that any demonstrative form is inherently derogatory or laudatory. Finally, this analysis examined the occurrence of demonstratives in multimembral sets. Tragedy contained the highest frequency of these sets while comedy contained the lowest. The high occurrence of multi-demonstrative sentences within tragedy and the non-dramatic fragments when compared with comedy suggests that a higher overall number of demonstratives should be found in these
genres, which is not supported within the corpus, indicating that something aside from multimembral sets is contributing to the higher rate of demonstrative use found within comedy.

Even though a full analysis of the demonstratives used within these fragments cannot be achieved due to the missing contextual information, it is clear that they do provide enough information to be useful in translation, identification, and categorization; thus, it may be concluded that even if a full-text is desirable, it is not necessary for the study of demonstratives.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

This research set out to examine demonstrative use in Early Latin literature. I started from the initial claim that these words were more common in comedy than in tragedy and moved into other claims regarding the use of demonstratives within Latin, examining their deictic, personal, affective, and contrastive uses. In order to evaluate these claims, I compiled a corpus of fragments from Early Latin containing comedy, tragedy, and non-dramatic writing. In Chapter Three, I described the composition of this corpus and provided background detail on the included authors. This included discussion of the reasoning behind focusing on Early Latin and the exclusion of the comic authors Plautus and Terence from the corpus. I then provided an analysis of the statistics and data gathered from the corpus. These data indicated that comedy did in fact contain more demonstratives, supporting Karakasis’ hypothesis. I was also able to evaluate a number of additional hypotheses regarding the distribution of demonstrative forms and syntactic categories, the correlation with personal pronouns, affective force, and occurrence of multimembral sets across the genres.

In addition to providing a richer picture of how demonstratives were used in Early Latin, this work shows that fragments can be a valuable resource for linguistic and classical research. Understanding the use of demonstratives in the context of a single fragment rather than in the context of a whole text or even an author’s entire body of work may allow us to better interpret, identify, and classify newly discovered fragments. This work may be used as a step toward developing ways to identify and categorize fragments, potentially serving as a forensic linguistic tool. Moreover, by focusing on using fragments of Early Latin in this study of demonstratives, I have been able to examine the language of some of the most prominent Latin dramatists, a feat which had been avoided until now due to the conception that full texts were needed. These
fragments have shown themselves to be valuable tools for understanding demonstrative use in Early Latin. While I may not be able to provide any certainty regarding exophora use in Caecilius, I have provided basic conclusions regarding overarching demonstrative use among the Early Latin dramatists. Such information can be used in conjunction with prior full-text studies on the likes of Terence (Laidlaw, 1936; Wayenberg, 2011) to develop a fuller understanding of demonstratives in Early Latin and Latin literature and serve as a model for studies of other facets of Latin.

The difficulties encountered in this analysis have highlighted some areas for additional study, which could follow numerous available paths. This study focused on fragments of Early Latin for the fairly pragmatic reason that almost all remaining Latin comedies come from this period. However, this work has noted that other genres display characteristic demonstrative use as well, indicating that it would certainly be interesting and worthwhile to continue this examination into classical, Latin, or even Medieval Latin works. Additionally, some of the claims examined in this study indicated that the meanings of demonstratives may have shifted over time, accounting for the (eventual) derogatory force of *iste* and laudatory force of *ille*. Continuing this study over multiple periods of time would not only help us understand this change, but it would bolster understanding of demonstrative use within Latin.

Additionally, I briefly mentioned the impact that native language and language fluency might have had on the authors included within the corpus, but I made no study of the Greek origins for many of the works created by these authors. One characteristic of Latin comedy, especially Early Latin comedy, is that they tended to be retellings of Greek originals, and many complete comedic plays that still exist have recognizable Greek counterparts. While primarily the Latin remakes of these comedies borrowed only the storylines, it is possible that the very
language itself influenced the Latin authors. Could demonstrative use in the Greek originals have any effect on the resulting demonstrative use in the Latin versions? Additional research on this would aid in furthering our understanding of demonstrative use in Early Latin literature.

One aspect that may affect demonstrative use within the corpus is the native language of the author. Two of the authors included in this corpus, namely Accius and Naevius, may be said to be native Latin speakers with little outside influence. Accius was born in the inland province of Umbria, while Naevius in the southern coastal province of Campania, both established Roman territories. In contrast, Livius Andronicus is said to be Greco-Roman, indicating understanding of and influence by the Greek language. Ennius, too, boasts of Greek influence on his language, though his Rudian origins establish him as from Oscan heritage. Thus Ennius’ writing is influenced by the Oscan, Greek, and Latin languages. Pacuvius was also a speaker of Oscan alongside his Latin, while Caecilius was a Gallic Roman, with influence from both Gaulish and Latin languages (Adams, 2013; Adams, 2008; Conte, 1987). Given this wide range of language influence, in future work it is worth investigating whether this had any impact on the use of demonstratives in the works of these authors.

Another interesting aspect of the Latin demonstrative to consider is specific to its adnominal role. Though there is a standard word order in Latin, the role that a word plays within a sentence is not determined by its position but rather by its ending. Because of this, words that modify each other may stand next to each other or may occur far apart within the sentence, and their associated meaning is still understood due to their shared endings. The separation of two associated words is called hyperbaton, and it is frequently used “for signaling or reinforcing the end of syntactical and semantic units” (Markovic, 2006, p. 127). When a Latin demonstrative is used adnominally and co-occurs with a noun, this set may occur in four different arrangements:
Either the demonstrative precedes or follows the noun, and in either case the set may occur right next to each other, as an adnominal demonstrative and noun would appear in English, or they may be separated by any amount of other words. An analysis of the order of demonstrative-noun pairs, with special attention to occurrences of hyperbaton, would provide new information on the impact of word order and placement on demonstrative use within Early Latin. Very few studies have been performed that take such information into account (see Wayenberg, 2011), and no study has been carried out as a comparison between genres.

Perhaps the most interesting continuing study, to my mind at least, would be the application of the results of this analysis on demonstrative use in various genres of other languages. Do English comedies make freer use of the demonstrative than English tragedies? Do we find similar distribution among demonstrative forms in child languages of Latin? How do languages with more or fewer demonstrative forms compare in their usage distribution to the data acquired from this study? Given how universal demonstratives as a word class are, extending this analysis to include other languages would provide better information on overall demonstrative characteristics. If findings from other languages are comparable to my findings in this study, it may suggest something universal about the nature of demonstrative forms and use, improving fundamental understanding of this important word class. It may also suggest something universal about the genres involved in the investigation—if comedies are found to all rely on increased frequency of demonstrative use, then conclusions might be drawn on the universal relation between demonstratives and comedy. If findings are different in other languages, such an analysis may help highlight unique and characteristic aspects of the languages involved. The ubiquity of demonstratives allows for such an analysis across language families, allowing for a widespread, cross-cultural study that could provide a wealth of information.
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Appendix A: Ancillary Demonstrative Distributions

The distribution of demonstrative form and syntactic roles within various genres of the fragments of Naevius.

Table 41

Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Comedic Fragments of Naevius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hic</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ille</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iste</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 (55.6%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42

Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Tragic Fragments of Naevius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hic</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ille</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iste</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of demonstrative form and syntactic roles within various genres of the fragments of Ennius.
Table 43

*Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Tragic Fragments of Ennius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>15 (26.8%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
<td>7 (12.5%)</td>
<td>31 (55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>16 (28.6%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
<td>21 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
<td>4 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32 (57.1%)</td>
<td>11 (19.6%)</td>
<td>13 (23.2%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44

*Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Non-Dramatic Fragments of Ennius*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td>24 (43.6%)</td>
<td>10 (18.2%)</td>
<td>7 (12.7%)</td>
<td>41 (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td>9 (16.4%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>11 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>3 (5.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (65.5%)</td>
<td>12 (21.8%)</td>
<td>7 (12.7%)</td>
<td>55 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of demonstrative form and syntactic roles within various genres of the fragments of Accius.
Table 45

**Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Tragic Fragments of Accius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>hic</strong></td>
<td>19 (25.3%)</td>
<td>14 (18.7%)</td>
<td>13 (17.3%)</td>
<td>46 (61.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ille</strong></td>
<td>19 (25.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>20 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iste</strong></td>
<td>8 (10.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46 (61.3%)</td>
<td>16 (21.3%)</td>
<td>13 (17.3%)</td>
<td>75 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46

**Demonstrative Use by Type and Category in Non-Dramatic Fragments of Accius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>hic</strong></td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ille</strong></td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iste</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of affective force within various genres of the fragments of Naevius.

Table 47

**Affective Force of Demonstratives in Genres of Fragments of Naevius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derogatory</strong></td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laudatory</strong></td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>17 (63.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>27 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48

**Affective Force of Demonstrative Forms in Fragments of Naevius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>2 (11.8%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>2 (11.8%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13 (76.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>17 (63.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>27 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of affective force within various genres of the fragments of Ennius.

Table 49

**Affective Force of Demonstratives in Genres of Fragments of Ennius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>8 (14.3%)</td>
<td>3 (5.5%)</td>
<td>12 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>0 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (8.9%)</td>
<td>4 (7.3%)</td>
<td>9 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>43 (76.8%)</td>
<td>48 (87.3%)</td>
<td>93 (81.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>55 (100.0%)</td>
<td>114 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50

**Affective Force of Demonstratives Forms in Fragments of Ennius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>8 (11.0%)</td>
<td>4 (11.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>12 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>7 (20.6%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>9 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>64 (87.7%)</td>
<td>23 (67.6%)</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>93 (81.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73 (100.0%)</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>114 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of affective force within various genres of the fragments of Accius.
Table 51

**Affective Force of Demonstratives in Genres of Fragments of Accius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Tragedy</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (12.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>65 (86.7%)</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>71 (86.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>75 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>82 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52

**Affective Force of Demonstratives Forms in Fragments of Accius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>5 (9.8%)</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>8 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>45 (88.2%)</td>
<td>18 (85.7%)</td>
<td>9 (90.0%)</td>
<td>72 (87.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51 (100.0%)</td>
<td>21 (100.0%)</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>82 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of affective force within the fragments of Caecilius.

Table 53

**Affective Force of Demonstratives Forms in Fragments of Caecilius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>5 (9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33 (91.7%)</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>45 (86.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (100.0%)</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>52 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of affective force within the fragments of Pacuvius.
Table 54

Affective Force of Demonstratives Forms in Fragments of Pacuvius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hic</th>
<th>ille</th>
<th>iste</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28 (93.3%)</td>
<td>16 (94.1%)</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
<td>51 (91.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudatory</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>