

RUBIO, L. (19893) *Introduccion _ la svntaxis estructural del latin*, Ariel, Barcelona.

SEGURA B. (1979-80) *Notas sobre el orden de palabras con especial referencia al Latin*, HABIS 10-11, 119-130.

STEELE R.B. (1891) *Chiasmus in Sallust. Caesar. Tacitus and Justinus*, Dissert. inaug. of the J. Hopkins University, Northfield, Minn.

---- (1901) *Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy*, JAPhA XXXII, 154-185.

VRIES, L. DE (1985) *Topic and focus in Wambon discourse*, in A.M. Bolkestein-C. de Groot-J.L. Mackenzie (eds.), Syntax and Pragmatics in Funtional Grammar, Foris Publications, DordrechtHolland/Cinnaminso-U.S.A. 155-180.

TOVAR A. (1979) *Orden de Palabras y Tipologia: Una nota sobre el Latin*, *Euphrosvne*, IX (nova série), 161-172.

WELCH J.W. (1981) *Chiasmus in ancient Greek and Latin literatures*, in J.W. Welch (ed.), *Chiasmus in Antiquity*, Gerstenberg Verlag, Hildesheim.

TEMA

TECHNIQUES ET MÉTHODOLOGIES MODERNES APPLIQUÉES À L'ANTIQUITÉ

TOME 1 - 1994

REVUE PUBLIÉE PAR LE LABORATOIRE LITALA
LINGUISTIQUE ET TRAITEMENT AUTOMATIQUE
DES LANGUES ANCIENNES
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 7

LATIN WORD ORDER AND CHIASTIC ARRANGEMENTS

Marco A.Gutierrez

Université Basque

LATIN WORD ORDER CHIASTIC ARRANGEMENTS¹.

1. The position of the Adjective.

First of all let us present a descriptive analysis of the statistical data (absolute numbers and %) with regard to the place of the adjective when it qualifies or determines a noun².

Total of occurrences: 1,109 instances: 658:A(djective)N(oun) (59.3%); 451 NA (40.6%). From a merely historic point of view these data show an intermediate stage between Caesar (*B.G.* 1st book) (AN:78%, NA:21%) and Cicero (*Pro Milone*), (AN:73%, NA:26%) (Panchon, 1986:220-21), on the one hand, and Petronius (AN:62.64%, NA:37.46%) (Hinojo, 1985:252) and the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (AN:32%, NA:68%) (Hinojo, 1986:85), on the other hand.

As we can see, statistics reveal such a change in the placing of adjectives that the numbers of the *Peregrinatio* are almost the opposite of those of Caesar or Cicero. It is important to point out that, although statistical numbers may vary a little from one author to another of the same age, or even from one work to another of the same author, nevertheless, the tendency to change the so-called SOV word order to the SVO is parallel to that of the adjective. In fact, statistics tell us that, although the very often at the end of the clause in Caesar

1 For the sake of time and space we only give samples taken from the monography *De coniuratione Catilinae* written by Sallust; this choice is due to the fact that, as point out Steele (1891: 13): "He (sc. Sallust) freely uses chiasmus"; thus, to some extent, the choice of the corpus partly determines the conclusions which might be drawn from the survey.

2 We have excluded any kind of predicative adjectives (e.g.: *omnia venalia habere*, *Cat.*10.4). When two or more appear coordinated we only consider them as one occurrence.

and Sallust (80-90%), it appears at this position in Seneca and Petronius only half as frequently (50-60%), and rarely in the Peregrinario (30-40%) (Segura, 1979-80:122).

The first consideration we have to take into account is how the position of the adjective is 'sensitive' to the so frequent position of the verb at the end of the clause. In our opinion, the most important relation between both these parts of speech, adjectives and verbs, takes place in the participle, which can function as an adjective with respect to the noun, and as a verb with regard to its possible complements. If we think that every noun, no matter what its function is (subject, complement, etc.), may be accompanied by a participle with its complements, and that these are normally in the same case as if they were connected to the predicate. As a logical consequence of all these previous considerations, the word order will always assume the task of avoiding any possible risk of syntactic ambiguity.

We will compare now the frequency of the position of participle-adjectives with and without complements. Here are the results:

i) Participles without complements.

The occurrences of gerundives are 18: AN:11 (57.8%), NA:8 (42.1%); for the ablative absolutes the number of examples is 61: AN:36 (59%), NA:25 (40.9%); other participles without complements sum up to 34: AN:22 (64.7%), NA:12 (35.2%).

The final result of these 114 occurrences is the following: AN:69 (60.5%), NA:45 (39.4%).

ii) Participles with complements.

This kind of participle sums up to 59 occurrences: AN:18 (30.5%), NA:41 (69.4%).

Now, if we compare the results of the first and the second group, we can see that the frequencies of the first one are more or less the same as given by general statistics for the adjectives; on the other

hand, the numbers for the participle-adjectives with complements show that here the tendency is very different.

We could say, in conclusion, that SOV word order creates an implicit nested super structure³ which influences adjectives in two different ways: directly, if they are participles and have complements; indirectly, if they function as mere adjectives. It is important to point out that these two tendencies are contradictory.

In the following, we are going to examine some curious exceptions of the participle-adjectives preceding their complements:

(1) *quae, tametsi animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium* (Cat. 3.4).

First of all, in this sentence the verb is not at the end; secondly, could we say from a pragmatic (and psychological) point of view that «*insolens malarum artium*» represents the most salient information because at this point Sallust justifies himself? We are not completely sure, but it seems probable.

Another example:

(2) *interea plebs, coniuratione patefacta, quae primo cupida rerum novarum nimis bello favebat* (Cat. 48.1).

But we can also read:

(3) *interea Manlius in Etruria plebem sollicitare, egestate simul ac dolore iniuriae novarum rerum cupidam* (Cat. 28.4).

See also the following examples:

(4) *tum Iunius Silanus primus sententiam rogatus* (Cat. 49.4);

(5) *at M. Porcius Cato rogatus sententiam huiusmodi orationem habuit* (Cat. 52.1).

In (3), as in (2), the participle with its complements occurs after the verb. In none of these four sentences does a real risk of syntactic ambiguity exist, which appears only in a very few cases, generally due to artistic purposes, as in this example:

(6) *cui cum ad occasum ab ortu solis omnia domita armis parerent* (Cat. 36.4).

³ The most important nesting element is the V(erb), which creates a virtual sequence of d(eterminer)/D(etermined) elements on all syntactic levels.

where one would have expected «ab ortu solis ad occasum» and «armis domita».

At this point of the discussion only the mutual influence between simple adjectives and participle-adjectives could explain this problem, especially if we consider that patterns in which an adjective appears with its complement are not rare, as in:

(7) *animus in consulendo liber* (Cat. 53.21).

1.1 Nouns with two adjectives (not coordinated).

A particular aspect directly connected with the position of the adjectives, but not often taken into account, is their position when both of them are joined to a noun.

All these elements can be combined in three different ways: AA'N, ANA' and NAA'. Statistics showing their frequency are: 14 occurrences for AA'N (38.8%); 16 for ANA' (44.4%), and 6 for NAA' (16.6%).

If we reduce those numbers to a binary system the final results are as follows:

i) AN: $14+14+8 = 36$ (64.2%)

ii) NA: $8+12 = 20$ (35.7%).

From a quantitative point of view this percentage is more or less the same as the one we have given for the total sum of the adjectives at the beginning of section I; nevertheless, we will analyze these results in more detail.

It is true that the NAA' scheme, which was the least expected, is the least used; however, its percentage is a little higher than one would imagine. In the following lines we will try to find some explanations for this problem.

The six Noun Phrases with the so-called NAA' scheme are:

(8) *imperia saeva multa* (Cat. 19.5)

(9) *neque res neque spes bona ulla* (Cat. 21.1);

(10) *aes alienum grande* (Cat. 24.3);

(11) *homines adulescentes ...summam potentiam nacti* (Cat. 38.1);

(12) *libertos suos lectos et exercitados* (Cat. 50.2);

(13) *bellis Punicis omnibus* (Cat. 51.6).

If we accept that in two of these six examples there exists a participle («nacti» and «lectos-exercitados»), and in another two a (more or less) fixed word order («aes alienum» and «bellis Punicis»), it is easy to conclude that the 'unexpected' deviation of that frequency is surely due to the length of the corpus.

Lastly, only 9⁴ adjectives (participles excluded) from a total of 79 which have three or more occurrences appear always (or very often) with the pattern NA. The sum total of these 9 adjectives preceded by a noun is 100; if we take into account that «res publica» appears 54 times and «(equites) Romani» 17, we must conclude that the adjective, on many occasions, precede their governing noun, especially when they are not participles and function freely.

2. The position of the Genitive⁵.

The total sum concerning the placing of the genitives is the following: from 444 occurrences 189 (42.5%) have the GN pattern and 255 (57.4%) the NG one. In our opinion, these numbers show that the usual order of the genitive cannot be compared with that of the adjective, although global statistics are not very different, as we will try to demonstrate.

First of all, we must remember that the adjective normally precedes its governing noun, excepted for some fixed order structures and the participles. A similar situation, on the contrary, does not occur with the genitive. Another factor which is of importance for this qualitative analysis is that we can find almost every genitive preceding as well as following its noun. For instance, «animi» appears 11 times, 4 of them before and 7 after a noun; we have found 14 occurrences of "Catilinae", 8 times with the GN pattern, and 6 with the

4 These are: *capitalis-e. familiaris-e. Februarius-a-um (Ianuarius-a-um, etc.), ferox-cis, immortalis-e, Romanus-a-um, publicus-a-um, ullus-a-um, vester-tra-trum*; we have excluded of this list some adjectives which only are used by Sallust in fixed syntagms, like (*Patres*) *conscripti, (consul) designatus* and (*res*) *gestas*.

5 We have excluded genitives governed by finite verbal forms.

NG one, etc. It seems that often those mere quantitative differences of order are due to "contextual factors"⁶, like prose rhythm (*clausulae*).

To sum up, what is more important and decisive for us in the study of the genitive word order is if it is 'sensitive' to the influence of the verb (like the adjectives) or not; in other words, the question might be: are genitive Noun Phrases usually nested?

Previous data seems to give us a negative answer, however, we will consider another two situations. The first is connected with the placing of genitives when two of them appear joined (but not coordinated) to a governing noun. We have found the following 6 examples:

- (14) *regum atque imperatorum animi virtus* (Cat. 2.3);
- (15) *atrocitate sceleris eorum* (Cat. 22.3);
- (16) *insolentiae Curi causa cognita* (Cat. 23.4);
- (17) *nullius earum rerum consuli ius est* (Cat. 29.3);
- (18) *cuiusque modi genus hominum* (Cat. 39.6);
- (19) *sceleris eorum oblitus* (Cat. 51.15).

The patterns used are ("g"= genitive governed by another genitive ("G")): gGN (lex.), NGg (1ex.), GgN (2ex.), gNG (1ex.), GgN (1 ex.). The most important conclusions of this analysis are, on the one hand, the variety of patterns, and, on the other, the fact that only one example presents the more nested pattern (gGN).

Finally, from a logical point of view, if the placing of genitive is influenced by that of the verb, we would never (or seldom) expect both elements to be contiguous at the end of the the sentence, or the genitive itself to be the last element of its sentence; however, we can say that the genitive sometimes occupies one of those positions⁷.

⁶ Even more, sometimes one would say that only 'personal preferences' could explain word order in some context, as for instance in that couple of samples: *consilia Catilinae sibi proderet* (Cat. 26.4); but, *Catilinae consilia execrari* (Cat. 48.1).

⁷ We have found more than 20 instances of genitive in such a final positions, especially preceding a verb; viz.: *in nonas Februarias conilium caedis transtulerunt* (Cat. 18.6); or this one at the end of the sentence: *prohibent angustiae loci* (Cat. 48.20).

In conclusion, we agree with Adams (1976:77) when he says about relative frequency of GN and NG that "the determinants of genitive position are so many that the statistical proportion depends on the nature of the subject matter"; however, we strongly disagree with this author when he concludes that these statistics "are of little interest" and that "the statistical approach must be abandoned", because that 'ambiguity' is important for a word order analysis as well.

3. Nouns with both Adjective and Genitive.

In this section we are going to analyze all the different word order positions for a Noun Phrase composed of an adjective and a genitive depending on a noun. Here are the frequencies of their possible patterns: AGN:16 (21.9%), ANG:25 (34.2%), GNA:9. If we put these data into a binary system the numbers are the following: AN:53 (72.6%), NA:20 (27.3%~; GN:37 (50.6%), NG:36 (49.3%).

Statistics⁸ also corroborate at this point what we have already suggested in previous sections about the word order of adjectives and genitives. We would find a similar situation if we were to try to interpret these facts from a qualitative perspective. In effect, the least frequent patterns are those in which an adjective occurs after the noun, that is, GNA, NGA and NAG. On the other hand, the most employed patterns are ANG and AGN, that is, those in which an adjective precedes the noun. Lastly, we will point out a remarkable difference between the AA'N and AGN patterns: while AA'N is almost so frequent as ANA' (14:16), ANG is much less used than AGN (16:25), which means that on the word order level AGN =/ AA'N.

If we had to synthesize our general conclusions from a typological point of view we could say with Elerick (1991: 315), firstly, that "Latin

⁸ One could argue against our conclusions that they are based on data taken from a too small a corpus, however we want to say that, for the most important tendencies, our statistics agree with the results obtained from other authors of the same epoch (Panchon, 1986; Elerick, 1991).

has 'free' or 'fluid' word order", and, secondly, that Friederch classification GN/NG AN/(NA) is also confirmed in Sallust.

In the following chapter we will try to analyze from a pragmatic perspective the consequences of previous results using for our purposes what we will name 'The Chi-test'.

4. The Chiastic-test.

In this chapter we are going to analyze those syntagms composed of an adjective or/and a genitive plus a noun which present a symmetrical chiastic order (xXX'x' or Xxx'X'). As we have already said, we will distinguish between a mere chiastic arrangement and a proper chiasmus, that is, a conscious figure of diction. Samples of different kinds of chiasmus are:

(20) *domum alius, alius agros* (Cat. 11.4);

(21) *satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum* (Cat. 5.4);

(22) *citus modo, modo tardus* (Cat. 15.5).

This study is divided into three sections according to the class of word which modifies the noun: i) AN-N'A' and NA-A'N'; ii) GN-N'A' and NG-G'N'.

There exist more than these symmetrical patterns of chiastic arrangements, however they are very rare and very often have one or more elements with a (quasi-)fixed word order, as in the following example:

(23) *quorum victoria Sullae parentes* (Cat. 37.9).

4.1 Chiastic arrangements with adjectives.

4.1.1 The AN-N'A' Pattern.

We have documented 8 instances with this pattern:

(24) *praeclari facinoris / aut artis bonae (famam)* (Cat. 2.9).

(25) *magna vi (et animi et corporis), / sed ingenio malo pravoque* (Cat. 5.1).

(26) *in struendo mari / et montibus coaequandis* (Cat. 20.11).

(27) *mala res, / spes multo asperior* (Cat. 20.13).

(28) *plurimos homines (...), / mulieres etiam aliquot (quae (...))* (Cat. 24.3).

(29) *demisso voltu, / voce supplici* (Cat. 31.7).

(30) *(ne (...)) quam vestra dignitas / (neu magis) irae vestrae* (Cat. 51.7).

(31) *magnum imperium, (exercitum,) / bellum novum (exoptabat)* (Cat. 54.4)

As we can see, in every example the second part of the chiasmus intensifies what is said in the first one. The ways to express this emphasis are various: simple contrast (24); strong contrast (26), (30); contrast and redundancy (25); simple intensification (29); strong intensification (27), (28). If we think that Ernout (1941: 116) is right when he comments about (31): par 'guerre nouvelle', il faut entendre une guerre à laquelle d'autres généraux n'eussent encore participé, et dont on ne pût lui contester, en cas de succès, (...), we could consider (31) an example of «intensification», as in (29).

The special emphasis detected in the second part of the chiasmus is caused by the «surprise» resulting from the contiguous contraposition of the two word order: AN/N'A', where the appearance of the A' term is the least expected. Moreover, all the contents of the chiasmus were already salient information; that is the reason why we could consider that the second part of these eight chiasmus is a particular type of re-focalization; in other words, a focus built from other focus. This fact brings two some consequences about, as we will see.

Firstly, relations between focus and what we will name «superfocus» are not simple or symmetric, but scalar, that is, the information given by the superfocus is so important that focus (and often themal must be reinterpreted starting from the second part of the chiasmus. For example, we had to understand (24) as follows: «ars (narrandi)» is more (or, at least, not less) important than no matter what «facinus (belli)»; in fact, Sallust anticipates what he will say explicitly in (32), when he use another chiasmus (this time on the sentence level): .lsl

(32) *Pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae, / etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est* (Cat. 3.1).

See also that in (31) the syntactic subject is: «is (...), qui (...) praeclari ... (quaerit)», but the virtual-pragmatic one is «ego», that is, Sallust. In other words, the syntactic subject with a pragmatic function of *thema* is, to a certain extent, focalized «*humilitatis causa*».

Lastly, a syntactic note: scalar relation between focus and super-focus does not allow conjunctions like «*que*» or «*-ve*», which mean 'equivalence' (Rubio, 1982: 370-83).

Very similar thing could be said for the other examples, but we have no space.

It is possible to find other kinds of chiasmic arrangements, but they are not perfectly symmetric and previous considerations cannot be applied, even when semantic contrast is obvious (and probably conscious), as it occurs in (33):

(33) *(omnia) mala exempla / ex rebus bonis (orta sunt)* (Cat. 51.27).

4.1.2 The NA-A'N' pattern.

We have found the following instances with this pattern:

(34) *non locus ullus (asper aut arduus erat), / non armatus hostis (formidulosus)* (Cat. 7.5).

(35) *loca amoena, voluptaria (facile in otio) / feroces (militum) animos (molliverant)* (Cat. 11.5).

(36) *opes suas, / imparatam rem publicam, magna praemia (coniurationis)* (Cat. 17.1).

(37) *homines egentes, / malis moribus, maxima spe* (Cat. 37.2)

(38) *his rebus ita actis, / constituta nocte* (Cat. 45.1).

(39) *hominem nobilem, / maximis divitiis, summa potentia* (Cat. 48.5).

(40) *memoria mea / ingenti virtute, diversis moribus* (Cat. 58.18)

(41) *(cum) facta vestra (aestimo) i magna (me) spes (victoriae tenet)* (Cat. 58.18).

In (35), in which both syntagms are not contiguous and do not belong to the same clause, the existing emphasis is not due (in our opinion) to the chiasmic arrangement but to the semantic contrast between «*facile*» and «*feroces*» (see also the alliterative succession

of these two words beginning by «*f-*»). It is difficult to find a particular kind of emphasis in (34), (36) and (38). We have to take into account that in all these instances it occurs one or more participle.

In (40), in which both syntagms are perfectly symmetric, however, their chiasmic arrangements seem to be incidental. One could ask whether these samples argue against the principles in which are based our theories. If we analyze in more detail (38) and (40) we will verify that these examples do not destroy our opinion, on the contrary, they confirm it to a large extent.

In (38) both nouns are qualified not by mere adjectives, but by participles; the first one is accompanied by an adverb and occurs after the noun; the second one has not any complement and precedes its governing noun: as we have seen in section one those two word orders are perfectly normal. With respect to (40), one could give a similar explanation according to the following figures: neither meus-mea-meum nor ingens-ingentis has a preferred word order (4:4 and 2:2, respectively); in our opinion, memoria mea might be used humilitatis causa, because mea memoria could seem a little arrogant; moreover, if Sallust had wanted a conscious chiasmic arrangement at this point, he would probably have changed the order of next syntagm, that is, «*diversis moribus*», which provides not only a sharp contrast in meaning, but also an artistic adequacy between form and sense.

It seems also very probable a incidental chiasmic arrangement in (41) if we take into account that vester-vestra-vestrum normally occurs after and magnus-magna-magnum before in Sallust, and that both syntagms are not contiguous, have not the same syntactic function and do not depend on the same verb.

To sum up, parallel chiasmic arrangements in which two authentic adjectives (not participles) are completely contiguous are very rare; therefore, it is very difficult to find any chiasmus with this pattern. Moreover, Steele (1901:169-70) had already observed a very similar thing in Livy: "The passages in which the adjectives are placed together are like those quoted in last section, though they are not usually formally contrasted".

In some examples, as in (37), (39), though there does not exist a symmetrical chiasmic arrangement, it seems that word order brings corresponding thoughts closer together. In effect, the second part of the chiasmic arrangement specifies the content of the first one; to some extent we could say that redundancy takes place, that is, it exists any kind of emphasis. That fact creates a curious pragmatic situation because in (37) «homines egentes» is the syntactic subject of the sentence, with a pragmatic function of *thema*, and in (39) «hominem nobilem» is an apposition of «Crassum» (with pragmatic function of *focus*). In a few words, this phenomenon could be considered a sub-thematization, whose appearance is compatible not only with *thema*, as in (37), but also with *focus*, as in (39).

This pragmatic function is a kind of counter-focus, which is exactly the contrary of the super-focus. For example, in (39) it is not necessary at all to say that a ¹«hominem nobilem» is provided with «maximis divitiis» and «summa potentia», etc.

4.2 Chiasmic arrangements with genitives.

4.2.1 GN-N'G' pattern.

Examples of this type are not very used, we have only found eight:

(42) *(plebs) aut dominandi studio (permota) / aut superbia magistratuum* (Cat. 33.3).

(43) *legis praesidium, / (quod) iniquitas praetoris (eripuit, restituitis)* (Cat. 33.5).

(44) *(divelli liberos) a parentum complexu, / matres familiarum (pati)* (Cat. 51.9).

(45) *(sint (...) liberales) ex sociorum fortunis, / (sint misericordes) in furibus aerari* (Cat. 52.12).

(46) *fortunae violentiam (tolerauisse. . .) / gloria belli ([...] esse)* (Cat. 53.3).

(47) *huiusmodi orationem (habuit (...)) / orationis imperatori (fieri)* (Cat. 57.6-58.1)

(48) *quantaque animi vis / (fuisset) in exercitu Catilinae* (Cat. 61.1).

(49) *inter hostium cadavera (reperit est (...)) / ferociamque animi (... retinens)* (Cat. 61.4).

As we can see only in two of these eight chiasmic arrangements both Noun Phrases have the same syntactic function, that is, in (42) and (45). In our opinion, (42) is not a proper emphatic chiasmus, but only a formal one; see also that both syntagms are not completely contiguous; moreover, «magistratum» always appears after its noun⁹. In (45), on the contrary, the presence of emphasis is doubtless, not only because of the chiasmus, but also because of the repetition of the same verb «sint», the strong opposition in meaning between «sociorum fortunis» and «furibus aerari», etc. In a few words, that chiasmic arrangement is a very conscious one. From a pragmatic perspective we could say, on the one hand, that both parts of the chiasmus are in the focus in their respective sentences; on the other hand, it is important to underline that their mutual relations are on the same level, that is, they are not scalar. Another interesting question is the fact that positive thought («ex sociorum fortunis») is expressed in an expected word order (GN), while the negative one («in furibus aerari») uses a less habitual word order (N'G'). Certainly a little surprise does it exist here, but in a lower degree than in AN-N'A', as we have already seen. Remember, finally, that in this chiasmus two sentences are concerned.

Only in one more example (in (48)) both syntagms of the chiasmic arrangement depend on the same verb, although they have very different syntactic functions. We are not in doubt about the special emphasis of the sentence, as the adjective «quanta» demonstrates, but, could we say the same for the couple «animi»/ «Catilinae»? Neither «animi» nor «Catilinae» are used with a more or less fixed order (the first one precedes its governing noun 4 times and occurs after 7 times; the latter, 8 and 6, respectively; in conclusion, this couple of Noun Phrases (by the way, they are not contiguous) cannot be considered as proper chiasmus.

⁹ Cf. "de avaritia magistratum" (Cat. 40.3), and "insignia magistratum" (Cat. 51.38).

For the rest of the examples, in which the construction of the corresponding terms (even on the sentence level) is not parallel, we consider that the chiasmic arrangement is completely incidental¹⁰.

4.2.2 NG-G'N' Pattern.

We have found 15 examples of chiasmic arrangements with this pattern:

(50) *(iuventus pleraque, sed) maxime nobilium, / Catilinae inceptis (favebat) (Cat. 17.6).*

(51) *populares coniurationis (concusserat); / neque tamen Catilinae furor (minuebatur) (Cat. 24.1-2).*

(52) *(plebem (...)) dolore iniuriae / novarum rerum cupidam (Cat. 28.4).*

(53) *(quod (...)) statum dignitatis (non obtinebam, / publicam miserorum causam ((...) suscepi) (Cat. 35.3)*

(54) *(tanta) vis morbi / (ac veluti tabes plerosque) civium animos (invaserat) (Cat. 36.5).*

(55) *(percontatus pauca) de statu civitatis / (et quasi dolens) eius casum (Cat. 40.2).*

(56) *filii familiarum / quorum (ex nobilitate maxuma) pars erat (Cat. 43.2).*

(57) *per socitatem periculi / (reliquos) illius potentia (tegeret) (Cat. 48.7)*

(58) *in iudicio pecuniarum repetundarum / propter cuiusdam Transpadani supplicium (iniustum) (Cat. 49.2).*

(59) *(erant) circum aedem Concordiae, / seu periculi magnitudine seu animi mobilitate (impulsi) (Cat. 49.4).*

(60) *(sin) magnitudo sceleris / omnium ingenia (exuperat) (Cat. 51.8).*

(61) *fama atque fortuna eorum (pares sunt); / (...) eorum facta (cuncti mortales novere) (Cat. 51.12).*

(62) *vas aut vestimentum alicuius (concupiverat, dat operam ut is) in proscriptorum numero (esset) (Cat. 51.33).*

(63) *(placet (...) augeri) exercitum Catilinae? / (Minime. (...)) publicandas eorum pecunias (Cat. 51.43)*

(64) *spes rapinarum / aut novarum rerum studium (Cat. 57.1).*

Although this pattern of chiasmic arrangement is more used than the GN-N'G' one, nevertheless, couples of completely symmetric syntagms, that is, those which depend on the same verb, are contiguous and have the same function, are not very frequent here.

A completely symmetrical arrangement only occurs in one example, the number (64). Statistics about the genitives «novarum rerum» and «rapinarum» show that the first one occurs 4 times before and another 4 after its governing noun; the latter, in its turn, only appears twice, one time before and another one after its governing noun. At this point we will mention Steele's opinion (1901:174), who talking about such chiasmic arrangements in Livy says: "Sharp contrast in the meaning of nouns is less frequent than in the parts of speech already considered (that is, adverbs, adjectives, pronouns and nouns)". Among the examples given immediately by this author we can mention some of them close connected with (64), viz.:

(65) *terrorem equitum peditumque vim (Livy, 40.24.6);*

(66) *sed neque commercium linguae nec vestis armorumve habitus eos texit (Livy, 9.17.3).*

In our opinion, in (64) only exists a simple (not scalar) intensification of meaning, which is provided by the simple contiguity of two genitives. We have to take into account that this chiasmus is included in a non-identifying relative clause, that is, we are not dealing with the most salient information of the sentence. (52) is very similar to (64).

In (53) both syntagms have the same syntactic function, however they depend on different verbs and they are not contiguous; it is difficult to find sharp contrast in meaning or a special emphasis, only a weak positive intensification. In (61), where the genitive «eorum» appears twice, it seems that is precisely the repetition of the same word which motivates a particular emphasis, though «fortuna eorum» and «eorum facta» are not the most salient information in their respective sentences.

¹⁰ About the use of -que in (49) it is interesting to take into account what we have said in 4.1.1.

In (50) there does not exist a sharp contrast in meaning, however the chiasmic arrangement brings corresponding thoughts closer together in such a way than we cannot qualify it as completely incidental. However, see that syntactic and pragmatic functions of every part of the chiasmus are completely different.

For the other examples it is a hard task to detect a particular intention which explain the chiasmic arrangements.

In conclusion, it is remarkable that contiguity of such syntagms with genitives does not create in a great number of cases the special emphasis which one might expect from those chiasmic patterns. The fact that we have documented some more examples with stylistic purposes using the NG-G'N' scheme than the GNN'G' one shows only that this one is a little more efficient for that aim, not that genitive have any marked word order.

5. Final considerations.

Although from a quantitative perspective our corpus is not a very long one, however, the application of the Chi-test has been a useful instrument to interpretate and clarify some tendencies which remained ambiguous from a mere typological point of view, on the one hand, and to contrast quantitative data given by statistics with the real qualitative value of their pragmatic uses. We will synthesize our results in the following most important conclusions:

A) Against a common opinion which considers that chiasmic arrangements are normally chiasmus, our Chi-test has tried to demonstrate that this opinion is not valid at all for criss-cross arrangements with nouns and genitives, and that it is good only to some

extent for chiasmic arrangements with nouns and adjectives, where an AN-N'A' chiasmic arrangement can create a strong emphatic and scalar super-focus, and a NA-A'N~ one originate (only in some cases) a emphatic sub-thematisation.

B) According to Greenberg's Universal 4 (1963:78-9), "if a language has dominant SOV order and the genitive follows governing noun, then the adjective likewise follows the noun"; in our opinion that does not occurs at all in Latin. Moreover, the Chiastic-test seems to conclude that in Latin free genitives have not a particular word order. This opinion does not mean at all that word order is completely free, but only that any elements may not have a clear tendency for a marked order.

C) The former theoretical conclusion provides a practical consequence which we might express as follows: the mere couple marked/unmarked qualification word-order is not adequate for describing genitives word order in Latin. It would be necessary, first of all, to determine the most important class (or classes) of words which inform(s) the particular word order in every tongue; secondly, it is important to find a principle which explains all (or the most important part of) the facts connected with word order; last, but not least, we must describe to which extent every class of words is affected by this general and abstract principle. The Chi-test is very be useful to determine to which extent every part of speech is sensitive to such a word order principle, that is, it must be able to establish a pragmatic typology of this sensitivity.

D) A functional analysis may point out in every tongue some internal contradictions between the general word order principle and particular (morphological, syntactical, etc.) facts of this tongue; moreover, these contradictions may occur not only among different parts of speech, but also among particular uses of a word, as we have seen in the case of mere adjectives and participle-adjectives.

E) A linguistic analysis of a word order system ought to explain why do changes appear, in which areas of the system do they begin, etc. To some extent, the facts described in previous sections about genitive

and participle-adjectives help us to understand an evolution in Latin from a SOV pattern to a SVO one.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS J.N. (1976) *A typological approach to Latin word order*, IF 81, 70-99.
- ELERICK, Ch. (1991) *Latin noun/gen./adj. serialization and language universals*, in R. Coleman (ed.), Selected PaPers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Cambridge, April 1987), J. Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, SLCCS, 21, 311-21.
- ERNOUT, A. (1941) Salluste: Catilina. Jugurtha. Fragments des Histoires, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.
- GREENBERG J.H. (1963) *Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements*, in J.H. Greenberg (ed.), Universals of Language, Rep. of a Conference held at Dobbs Ferry, New York, April 13-15, 1961 (2d. ed., 1966), MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- GUTIERREZ M.A. (1990) *El ordo verborum en latin: diferencias entre las teorías de los tratadistas antiguos y modernos*, SZ XI, 227-236.
- HANNAY, M. (1983) *The focus function in functional grammar: questions of contrast and context*, in S.C. Dik (ed.), Advances in functional Grammar. Foris Publications, Dordrecht/Holland/Cinnaminson-USA, 207-23.
- HAWKINS J.A. (1983) *Word Order Univerals*, Academic Press, New York.
- HINOJO A. (1985) *Orden de palabras en el Satiricon*, Veleia 1-2, 245-54.
- (1986) *El orden de palabras en la Peregrinatio Aetherae*, SZ VII, 79-87.
- KROLL, W. (1927) *Die Sprache des Sallust*, Glotta XV, 280-305.
- PANCHON F. (1986) *Orden de palabras en Latin (César, B.G.I; Ciceron Pro Milone)*, SZ VII, 213-29.
- PINKSTER H. (1990) *Latin SYntax and Semantics*, Routledge, London-New York.

RUBIO, L. (19893) *Introduccion _ la svntaxis estructural del latin*, Ariel, Barcelona.

SEGURA B. (1979-80) *Notas sobre el orden de palabras con especial referencia al Latin*, HABIS 10-11, 119-130.

STEELE R.B. (1891) *Chiasmus in Sallust. Caesar. Tacitus and Justinus*, Dissert. inaug. of the J. Hopkins University, Northfield, Minn.

--- (1901) *Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy*, TAPhA XXXII, 154-185.

VRIES, L. DE (1985) *Topic and focus in Wambon discourse*, in A.M. Bolkestein-C. de Groot-J.L. Mackenzie (eds.), Syntax and Pragmatics in Funtional Grammar, Foris Publications, DordrechtHolland/Cinnaminso-U.S.A. 155-180.

TOVAR A. (1979) *Orden de Palabras y Tipologia: Una nota sobre el Latin*, *Euphrosvne*, IX (nova série), 161-172.

WELCH J.W. (1981) *Chiasmus in ancient Greek and Latin literatures*, in J.W. Welch (ed.), *Chiasmus in Antiquity*, Gerstenberg Verlag, Hildesheim.