Latin Morphosyntax Evolution from 200 BC. to 1000 AD: Was Hrotsvitha
Able to Imitate Terence Successfully?

Lidia Cuccia

A Thesis

in

The Special Individualized Program

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Special Individualized Program) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

July 2009

Canada

ABSTRACT

Latin Morphosyntax Evolution from 200 B.C. to 1000 AD: Was Hrotsvitha Able to Imitate Terence Successfully?

Lidia Cuccia

Hrotsvitha von Gandersheim, a German nun who lived at the end of the tenth century, wrote six plays explicitly saying that she was trying to imitate the style of the Roman playwright Terence who lived during the IInd century B.C.

Language evolved dramatically during the twelve centuries that separate the lives of the two writers. In fact, a variety of descendant languages was sprouting up all over Europe as a consequence of the process of fragmentation of the mother tongue into the Romance languages that was already well on its way by 476 A.D.

One of the biggest changes undergone by the language during this process is the restriction of word order which during the Latin era seems to have enjoyed a great degree of freedom but with the time became more restricted in its possibilities. By the end of the VIIIth century, the declension system had collapsed into only two cases (Nominative and Accusative) doubtlessly playing a role in restricting the word order freedom.

In this thesis, I concentrate on Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* and on Terence's *Andria* to explore and compare thoroughly the word order of some elements of the sentence, mainly the possessive adjective-head noun relationship, the *ut* - verb relationship in subordinated clauses, and the patterns used with the infinitives. I take into account the structure of the Romance languages to underline the direction the language was taking and to draw my conclusions. To complete my study I focus on the general organization of plays, the colloquialisms and the adverbial expressions (which are much reduced in Hrotsvitha's *Callimachus*), as a sign of the restrictions that confronted the writers of Medieval Latin when they attempted to imitate the street language of Archaic and Classical times.

Acknowledgements

I also owe my thanks to Ms. Darlene Dubiel, SIP Coordinator from the School of Graduate Studies who patiently encompassed all the vicissitudes of my life with utmost professionalism and discretion.

To all the ones who have taught me
and the ones I have taught
for I have learned a lot from them too.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations

Adj.	Adjective
Adj.Phr.	Adjectival Phrase
Andr.	Andria
Andro.	Andronichus
By.	Byrria, servant
Cali.	Calimachus
Cha.	Charinus
Chr.	Chremes
Cr.	Crito
DO	Direct Object
Dru.	Drusiana
Fr.	French
Inf.	Infinitive
Inter.	Interjection
It.	Italian
My.	Mysis
Neg. Parr	Negative Particle
Neg. V	Negative Verb
N	Noun
N.Phr	Nominal Phrase
Not S-final	Not sentence final
P1	Pattern 1
Pa.	Pamphilus
Perf.Part	Perfect Participle
Port.	Portuguese
Prep.	Preposition
Prep.Phr.	Prepositional Phrase
Pron.	Pronoun
Da.	Davus
S-final	Sentence final
S	Subject

Si.	Simo
So.	Sosia
Sp.	Spanish
V	Verb
V. Phr.	Verbal Phrase
Sb.Conj	Subordinating Conjunction

Chapter 1

Introduction

Hrotsvitha von Gandersheim –also spelled Roswitha, Hrotswitha, Hrosvitha, and Hrotsvit (among other forms) - was probably born between 930 and 940, and died about 1002. She was an extensively trained and highly educated nun at the Monastery of Gandersheim who devoted her life to studying and writing. She was a very productive author; her output included poetry, biographies, history and plays. This thesis is intended to concentrate on Hrotsvitha in her role as a playwright since in the preface to the collection of her six surviving plays, she declares:

> *"I, the strong voice of Gandersheim, have not hesitated to imitate in my writings a poet whose works are so widely read, my object being to glorify, within the limits of my poor talent the laudable chastity of Christian virgins in that self-same form of composition which has been used to describe shameless acts of licentious women.[1]"*

The poet she is referring to is Terence, the elegant literary craft man who arrived in Rome as a slave but soon after was granted freedom by his master, the senator Terentius Lucanus, due to Terence's refinement and wit. He wrote six plays inspired or translated from the plays of the Greek playwright Meanander, the first of which is the object of study in this work. It is entitled *Andria*. Terence was born in Carthage at the end of the II century B.C and was lost at sea at the age of 30[2].

There has been, and still there is, a controversy concerning the question of whether, and to what extent, Hrotsvitha was able to successfully imitate Terence. Although there are authors that find some Terentian elements in her plays, most scholars find very little or

---

[1] Gollancz 1966: xxvi
[2] There is much controversy on the life of the poet: birth date, circumstances in which he arrived in Rome and also about his writing. However, it is not the aim of this thesis to focus on this subject. For more information on this subject see Barsby 2001: 1-6. see also Shipp 2002: 16-24

none[3]. However, the comparative studies undertaken until now concentrate in the content of the stories, the characters, the politics and spirituality, context and identities. A study that focuses on the comparison of the language used by the two authors, specifically on their morphosyntax, is yet to be done. This thesis is meant to start filling in the existing void in the linguistic area by systematically comparing certain aspects of the syntax of Terence's *Andria* to that found in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*.

Latin underwent dramatic changes from Terence's day, when people who spoke the language in the streets were mostly illiterate, to Hrotsvitha's times, when Latin had become the language of the elite –particularly the Christian religious elite. In the writing of Christian authors at this time there appears to be a willful effort to follow the rules of the *De orthographia*, a book written by Alcuin between 796 and 800. This book was meant to cope with all the varieties of descendant languages that were sprouting up all over Europe as a consequence of the process of fragmentation of the mother tongue into the Romance Languages. This process was well on its way by 476 A.D.-the year of the Roman Empire Fall- thus, *De orthographia* helped the students who, by the VIIIth century, where already studying Latin as a foreign language[4].

One of the biggest changes undergone by the language in its transformation and division into the Romance Languages is the restriction of word order (mentioned above) that formerly enjoyed a greater degree of freedom but became restricted in the ways now familiar to use in Romance. In my thesis I compare thoroughly the word order of some elements of the sentence, mainly the possessive adjective-noun relationship, the *ut* clause word order and

---

[3] For further information on this point see Tarr 2004: 55-60, and Talbot 2004: 147-158 both in Brown, McMillin and Wilson 2004. See also Wilson 1987, Giovini 2003 on his discussion about all Hrotsvitha's plays and especially 123-145 on Calimachus; Blom 1966; Haight 1965; and Pascal 1985.

[4] Cf.: Alessio 2007

2

the patterns used with the infinitives, contrasting what we find in these two plays of Terence and Hrotsvitha, and always striving to take into account the structure of the Romance Languages in drawing my conclusions. To complete my study, I focus on the general organization of the two plays, their length, the division into scenes, the colloquialisms and the use of conjunctions and adverbial expressions. In general, there is a reduction in number of the use of these latter elements in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* and, as a consequence, and in sharp contrast to what we find in Terence's *Andria*, the story unfolds unidimensionally, revealing the restrictions that the writers of Medieval Latin faced when trying to imitate the lively street language of Archaic and Classical times. However, there is an overaching question to how much Hrotsvitha's lack of success in imitating Terence is due to changes in the language and how much to her evident shortcomings as a playwright. We must be very careful when considering Hrotsvitha a medieval playwright since she is trying to imitate Early Latin. If we *do* consider her as a representative of 'the writers of Medieval Latin' we must also ask to what extent we should do so. These are questions which cannot be answered in the current work but could be dealt with in future works. In this work I concentrate in the evidence present in the data and draw my conclusions based on my findings.

1.1. Relationship between the Possessive Adjective and its Head Noun

I compare the relationship between the possessive adjective and its head noun, which in the Romance languages normally involve having the possessive immediately followed by its head noun, as in (1), unless there is an adjective that modifies the noun which then may intervene, as in (2).

(1) a. It. *La mia figlia*
     b. Port. *Minha filha*

3

c. Sp. *Mi hija*
d. Fr. *Ma fille*
'My daughter'

(2) a. It. *La mia bella figlia*
b. Port. *Minha bonita filha*
c. Sp. *Mi bella hija*
d. Fr. *Ma belle fille*
'My beautiful daughter'

In Latin we can find a great range of possibilities: the possessive adjective and its head noun can constitute either continuous constituents, as in (3) or discontinuous ones, as in (4), of the possessive nominal phrase. These two types of construction can appear with the possessive adjective either pre-posed to the head noun, as in (3.1), or (4.1), or post-posed, as in (3.2) or (4.2). Either the possessive adjective or the head noun can be placed in sentence final position, or of course, they may occupy some non-final place in the clause[5].

(3.1) *Andr.* 4. 1. 658
Cha. *Scio tu coactu' tua voluntate es.*
Cha. I see. You were compelled of your own free will.

(3.2) *Andr.* 5. 5. 969
Pa. {*Glycerium mea*}{*suos parentes*} *repperit.*
Pa. My Glycerium has found her parents.

(4.1) *Andr.* 2. 2. 347
Cha. *mea {quidem}[6]{ hercle} {certe} {in dubio} vitast.*
Cha. By Hercules[7]! *My* life is at risk for sure.

(4.2) *Andr.* 1. 1. 80
Si. *qui tum illam amabant forte, ita ut fit, filium {perduxere} { illuc secum} {ut una esset} meum.*
Si. It so happened that her lovers of the time, as young men do, took my son along to keep them company.

---

[5] For more on nominal phrase word order see Devine & Stephens 2006: 314-376 and 563-575.
[6] Elements between these brackets {} indicate one constituent.
[7] Barsby 2001 omits the expression but I consider it important so I have translated it.

4

I study all possessive adjectives dividing them into three groups, the first group is MEUS and TUUS; the second part is SUUS, and the last part is constituted by NOSTRI and VESTRI. In all cases, it is clearly stated that Hrotsvitha's use of these syntactic patterns was much closer to the word order which we find in the modern Romance languages than it is to the Archaic Latin of Terence's *Andria*.

1.2. *Ut* Clauses

Ut is a subordinating conjunction that both Terence and Hrotsvitha utilize in their texts. It can introduce a subordinated clause of purpose, comparison, doubt, consequence, reason, indirect command, wish or permission; it can also function as a temporal adverb. Both authors construct sentences with this conjunction and with the variety *ut… ne* for the negative construction. However, in the text of the more archaic playwright we find a variety in word order that is not present in Hrotsvitha. The conjunction stemming from *ut* did not survive in any modern Romance languages known to me, but all the conjunctions that fulfill these functions are in first position and always immediately followed by the subject and the verb; see for example, (5) or only the verb, when the sentence shows pro-drop, as in (6).

(5) Fr. *Nous avons tout fait pour qu'il retourne à la maison.*

(6) a. It. *Habbiamo fatto tutto perche ritornassi a casa.*
    b. Port. *Fizemos tudo para que voltasse para casa.*
    c. Sp. *Hicimos todo para que volviera/volviese[8] a casa.*
       'We did everthing for him to come back home.'

Hrotsvitha constructs all her sentences in the modern Romance fashion, while in Terence we find *ut* clauses with *ut* in first position, but also in second or hidden first position

---

[8] Spanish has two forms of the imperfect tense of the subjunctive mode. They are completely interchangeable.

5

as well as in other positions. We will also have occasion in the discussion below to look into the position of the verb in relation to *ut*.

1.3. Division and Development of Scenes, and Vocabulary

It is perhaps when we try to compare the everyday language of Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* with the use of such language in the presentation and the development of scenes in Terence's *Andria* that we find the most evident difference between the two authors. I choose the word 'evident' because we do not need to make a deep analysis of the language in order to see that the dialogue among characters in *Calimachus* is very straight forward, and that they give us the idea of being in a vacuum. Rarely do we know where the characters are going. It is seldom made clear whether there are other people in the scene, or how much time goes by between one scene and the next one. Hrotsvitha makes her characters speak only what is necessary to permit the audience to follow the main story. There are no greetings or goodbyes, practically no references to what characters are going to do next, so it is very hard to imagine the setting of the scene by reading the play.

On Terence's part, it is evident by the way he divides the scenes that what causes the change of scenes is the change of characters (their arrival or departure). By contrast, in *Calimachus* we can see that this is not the case. The length of the scenes is also very unbalanced: some scenes are incredibly short while another takes up half of the play.

Another interesting aspect to consider is that there are no instances of characters overhearing others, interruptions or cue last words said by characters when they are going to be interrupted –because they are not. Neither do we find the expressions said by a character when another character is approaching, as we find so frequently in Terence's plays. The exclamations used for the expression of self pity or for threats are very different between our

6

two authors, too. There is also difference in the use and meaning for the same words between the authors. I develop these ideas in chapter 4.

1.4. Closed Categories and Infinitives

1.4.1. Closed Categories

Due to the lack of creativity and the unidimensionality in Hrotsvitha's narrative, there is in general an absence of time and space references. Because of this limitation, her text feels like it is missing a great number of time and place markers and exclamations, interjections, indeclinable words, and many of the devices used in colloquial language. The consequence of this frugality of the language is probably one of the most important contributions to the dryness of her style. I discuss it briefly in 5.2.1.

Not surprisingly, it is when we turn our attention to the use of prepositions that we find most of the coincidences between the two authors. Of course, as I explain below, the reason why the nun is, apparently, rather faithful to her model is not because of her determination but because prepositions are probably the most stable particles in the language since Indo-European times. In fact, the difference in usage between Terence and Hrotsvitha are almost the same as between the former and the modern Romance languages. I go over the two plays and present a statistical analysis which compares the data from both texts.

1.4.2. Infinitives

In the modern Romance languages the use of infinitive is mostly reduced to four patterns: it can be part of a verbal phrase preceded by a verb that defines the subject on which it depends, or by both the subject and verb, as in (7); it can be preceded by a preposition within a verbal phrase, in which case the preceding verb, with or without subject,

defines its dependency, as in (8); it can also be used as the subject of the sentence, as in (9);

moreover, it can be found as the verb of a subject within a direct object too, as in (10).

However, in Terence we find 15 different patterns and some other constructions where the

definition of the subject of the infinitive is not so straight forward, or where the subject is

omitted as in (11). Shipp[9], in his commentary of Terence's *Andria* points out the fact that

"(the) omissions of the subject are typical examples of the economy of spoken language."

(7) (S) + (DO) + V + Inf. + (Complement)
    a. It.   *(Lui/Lei) ci ha fatto sofrire molto.*
    b. Sp. *(Ella/El) nos ha hecho sufrir mucho.*
    c. Port. *(Elhi/Elha) muito nos fez sofrer.*
    d. Fr. *(Il/Elle nous a fait beaucoup souffrir.*
        'He/she made us suffer a lot'[10].

(8) (S) + V + Prep. + Inf. + (Complement)
    a. It. *(Io) Ho dimenticato di parlare con Maria.*
    b. Sp. *(Yo) Me olvidé de hablar con María.*
    c. Fr. *J'ai oublié de parler avec Marie.*
    d. Port. *(Eu) Esqueci-me de falar com Maria.*
        'I forgot to talk to Maria.'

(9) Inf. as S of the sentence + V + Complement.
    a. It. *Fumare fa male a la salute.*
    b. Sp. *Fumar es malo para la salud.*
    c. Fr. *Fumer fait mal à la santé.*
    d. Port. *Fumar é mau para a saúde.*
        'Smoking is harmful to your health.'

(10) (S) + DO + V + Inf.
    a. It. *(Io) L'ho visto piangere.*
    b. Sp. *(Yo) Lo he visto llorar.*
    c. Fr. *Je l'ai vi pleurer.*
    d. Port. *Eu o vi chorar.*
        'I have seen him cry.'

---

[9] 2002:120
[10] Please, notice the difference in order of the adverb *muito* in Portuguese and *beaucoup* in French. They are a residue of the much freer Latin word order. In Spanish and Italian it is possible to place the word as the first constituent like in Portuguese.

(11) *Andr.* 2.4.450.
>DA. *ait nimium parce facere sumptum.*
>DA. He says you'r being too tight-fisted.

In the sentence above it is possible to determine the subject, and subsequently make the translation because of the context but the subject is omitted. There are many cases of this type in Terence's *Andria* where the reference to the verb is outside the sentence, and others where it is difficult to define its referent. This contrasts sharply with Hrotsvitha's constructions where the infinitive is always very easily connected to its referent be it a verb or a subject.

Finally, also in Chapter 5, I compare the use of infinitives by the two authors and draw my conclusions, taking into consideration, as always, the relevant information regarding the modern Romance languages that I have mentioned above.

Chapter 6 is devoted to some observations on work that still should be done in the future and to the suggestion on studies to be undertaken in the future based on my findings. My suggestions are based on the evidence of the data and the conclusions drawn.

This thesis is intended as an examination of certain aspects of the diachronic morphosyntactic evolution of the Latin language through the centuries, particularly with respect to the oral language. By comparing the the texts of our two authors it will be shown that by the Xth century the new syntax had influenced Hrotsvitha's writing so much that even consciously trying to imitate the archaic style of her model she was caught in the modern patterns of construction.

The thesis concludes with the bibliography used to build it up.

CHAPTER 2 – Possessive Adjectives

2.1. Introduction

One of the many changes arising in the course of the evolution of Latin morphosyntax concerns the relationship between possessive adjectives and the nouns they modify. It is a fact that Archaic, Early and Classical Latin word order was relatively free and that with the collapse of the declension system much of this freedom disappeared. This collapse, together with the increase of use of prepositional constructions[11], reduced to two (from the classical language's five) the case endings by the eighth century[12]. As regards the possessive adjective-noun relationship, we can say that in most Romance languages both elements are to be found next to each other, the possessive adjective always before its head noun. As an exception to this evolution, in Italian we find vocative expressions such as *'Figlio mio!'*: My son!; *'Dio mio!'*: My God!; *'Mamma mia!'*: My mother!; and in the accusative *'a casa mia'* meaning 'at home', French *'chez moi*[13]. In Spanish, the expressions in the vocative exist but the construction takes the possessive pronoun instead of the adjective: *'¡Madre mía!'*: Mother (of) mine!; *¡Hijo mío!'*: Son (of) mine!; *¡Dios mío!*: God (of) mine!..

In this chapter I compare the use of MEUS and TUUS in Terence's *Andria* and in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*. I also compare the constructions to the Modern Romance languages in an attempt at finding how far (or near) Hrotsvitha was from both earlier and later ways of writing 'Latin'. We know that by the time she was trying to imitate Terence, most of the Romance languages had reached the morphosyntax they have today. We would also like to see how much influence the Modern Latin languages had on her language, if any. It is true,

---

[11] We cannot say at present which one of the two processes contributed to the development of the other. For more details on the subject see. Palmer: 1954; Rosén:1999

[12] According to Palmer (1954:160-6) the reduction of the case system was largely due to faltered phonology, which lead to, among other things, to confusion of case ending vowels (interchange of *u* and *o* and *i* and *e*) and failure to pronounce final consonants- mainly –*m* and -*s*)
[13] Also 'a casa sua' 'a casa loro', meaning 'at his/her home', 'at their home' and in French 'chez toi', 'chez soi', meaning 'at your home' and 'at her/his home'.

her mother tongue was German, but it is also true that the spoken language of the religious institutions of the time, and until many centuries later, was Latin, the language spoken an written in Rome, which was of course itself very heavily influenced by the early Italian of the time.

2.2. Methodology

I concentrate on first and second persons singular from Section 2.3 to 2.4; I dedicate Sections 2.5 to 2.8 to possessive adjectives for the third persons singular and plural, and I go over the analysis of first and second persons plural from Section 2.9 to 2.12. I have chosen to divide up the discussion in this way to check whether the patterns vary or not according to the persons to which they refer.

If we assume that word order was free, we should be able to find the possessive adjective and the noun it modifies both next to one another in the sentence, and separated from one another by other words- that is; possessive phrases should have both continuous and discontinuous elements. We should be able to find both of these two types of construction with, additionally, the possessive adjective both pre-posed and post-posed to the noun it modifies. In addition, we should find both the possessive adjective and the modified noun in sentence final and in non final positions in the sentence. Finally, the last variable I analyze is whether these constructions have *que* 'and' attached to either element.

The chart in the next page illustrates the possible sequences separated according to the variables I have just mentioned:[14]

---

[14] I always use MEUS to make reading easier but this form implies all the cases of MEUS and TUUS.

CONTINUOUS CONSTITUENTS	DISCONTINUOS CONSTITUENTS
Patterns without *que*	
PRE-POSED	
1. (...)MEUS N ## S-final 2. (...)MEUS N....## Not S-final	3. (...)MEUS.........N ## S-final 4. (...)MEUS ...N....## Not S-final
POST-POSED	
5. (...)N MEUS ## S-final 6. (...)N MEUS....## Not S-final	7. (...)N.......MEUS ## S-final 8. (...)N...MEUS... ## Not S-final

Patterns with *que*	
PRE-POSED	
9. (...)MEUS =que N ## S-final 10. (...)MEUS =que N....## Not S-final	13. (...)Meus=que...N## S-final 14. (...)Meus=que...N...## Not S-final
POST-POSED	
11. (...)N=que MEUS ## S-final 12. (...)N=que MEUS....## Not S-final	15. (...) N=que...Meus## S-final 16. (...) N=que...Meus...## Not S-final

In order to make an accurate comparison between the two writers, I not only analyze the structures listed above, but I also consider the grammatical case in which these pairs appear. I analyze the surroundings where they are found as well as the words that separate possessive from noun and vice versa. I consider the words in between the discontinuous constituents by category and quantity as well. I consider any major break in sense or clause structure, such as an editor might indicate with a colon or semicolon, as being the equivalent of the end of the sentence. I use Barsby's translations for the sentences from *Andria*. I translate the sentences from Berschin's edition of *Calimachus*. I will limit the exemplification to one sentence per author for each pattern.

2.3. MEUS-TUUS: The Cases
2.3.1. Nominative Case

The chart in the next page illustrates the frequency of the above predicted patterns in the nominal case found in both authors' plays:

12

Pattern	Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	1	2
2	4	0
3	0	0
4	2	1
5	0	0
6	1	1
7	2	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0
Total	10	4

Pattern 1 {(...)MEUS N # #} is present only once in Terence and twice in Hrotsvitha but

the general environments show no especially close structural similarity:

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. N+P1 # #	2. V+P1 # #
	3. P1 # #

1. *Andr.* 4.1.649-51

> Pa. *(...) ah! nescis quantis in malis uorser miser*
> *quantasque hic suis consiliis mihi conflauit sollicitudines*
> *meu' carnufex.*
> Pa. (...) Ah! You don't realize the torments of misery that I'm suffering and the
> agonies that this despicable slave of mine has contrived for me by his schemes.

2. *Cali.* 6.1.26

> *Calimachus· Pereo nisi me adiuuet tua industria ·*
> Cali. I die if you don't help me through your efforts.

3. *Cali.* 3.1.9

> *Drusiana· Mea pulchritudo?*
> Dru. My beauty?

It is interesting, though, to see that the exchange before the above one, Hrotsvitha

constructs an, apparently, identical phrase but instead of using the possessive adjective she

uses the genitive pronoun.

Cali 3.1.8

> *Drusiana · Tui pulchritudo*
> Dru. Your beauty.

Notice that Hrotsvitha could have written *Tua pulchritudo*, however, she constructs the phrase in a non-agreeing (in case) fashion. This is common practice in *Calimachus* as we will see.

Pattern 2 {(...)MEUS N....##} There is a significant fact to consider regarding this pattern: it is very productive in Terence. In fact, it is the most productive of all patterns in the nominative case; he constructs five sentences out of eleven in this way. Nontheless, there is not a single example of this pattern to be found in Hrotsvitha. As the chart below shows, the environments are varied.

Terence		Hrotsvitha
1.	##P2+Pron.	0
2.	Perf.Part+P2+V	0
3.	Pron.+P2+V	0
4.	Sb.Conj.+P2+N	0

1. *Andr.* 2.2.353-4

> Da. *tuo' pater modo me prehendit: ait tibi uxorem dari*
> *Hodie; item alia multa quae nunc non est narrandi locus.*
> Da. your father stopped me just now. He says that today he will give you a wife, as well as many other things that are not to be told now and here.

It is curious to see that the one pattern that would become the universal pattern in the modern Romance languages was totally avoided by Hrotsvitha when using it as a subject. Why did she not use it? Was its use already as widespread during her time that she avoided using it so as to make her style look older? Was she well aware of what she was doing? If we look at her next sentence we will be more bewildered than before as she builds a structure I

14

have never come across in *Andria*: she keeps the same Pattern 2 but instead of constructing

with a possessive adjective she uses a genitive pronoun which, as in the *tui pulchrito* example

mentioned above, does not coincide in case with the noun it modifies.

Cali. 9.16.21

> *Andronichus. (...). Quis auderet credere? quisve praesumeret sperare· ut hunc · quem criminosis*
> *intentum uitiis mors inuenit · et intentum abstulit · tui* miseratio *ad uitam excitare · ad ueniam*
> *dignaretur reparare?*
> Andro. (...) Who would have believed, who would have presumed to hope that a
> man who intended (such) reproachful vices would raise from death and through your
> mercy would come up to life having the dignity of making amends?

This sentence is not classified into the charts as it does not meet with the

characteristics listed above (since it does not contain a case form of TUUS, *tui* itself being a

case form of *TU* instead). There are other instances of this construction in her work and I

analyze them taking into account the case of the modified noun.

Terence uses **pattern 4** {(...) N MEUS... ##} twice and we find it once in

Hrotsvitha without coincidence in environment.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. ## P2 +N.Phr.	3. ## P4 +Prep. Phr
2. Pron+P4+V	

1. *Andr.* 5.6.969

> *Pa. Glycerium mea suos parentis repperit·*
> Pa. My Glycerium has found her parents.

3. *Cali.* 3.1.21

> *Calimachus · Sermo meus ad te Drusiana, praecordialis amor*
> Cali. My speech (goes) to you Drusiana, love of my heart.

Pattern 6 {(...) MEUS N...##}, as pattern 4 above, is used by both authors without coincidence in environment.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
## MEA+four constituents+N+V	Sb.Conj.+MEA+ {Prep. Phr.} +N+Adv.

Andr. 2. 2.347

> *Pa. Mea {quidem}*[15]*{ hercle} {certe} {in dubio} vitast.*
> Pa. By Hercules, my life is in fact moving two ways.

Cali. 3.1.22

> *Calimachus · Adhuc non repperi occasionem irascendi· quia quid mea in te agat dilectio· forte erubescis fateri·*
> Cali. Until now I have not found a reason to get angry, since you may blush up to confess what my passion causes you.

Terence uses **pattern 7 {(...)N...MEUS # #}** twice in *Andria* but instances of the same pattern are not to be found in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus.*

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. Adj.+ N +V. Phr. + TUA 2. Pron.+ N +V + MEA	0

1. *Andr.* 2.1.306

> *By. Ah! quanto satiust te id dare operam qui istum amorem ex animo amoveas[tuo], quam id loqui quo mage lubido frustra incendatur tua!*
> By. Oh! How much to set about banishing that from your heart than to say things which only inflame your desire to no purpose!

Possibly Hrotsvitha avoided the construction because the spoken Latin of her time had been influenced by developments which were similar to those which appear, from the

---

[15] Elements between these brackets { } indicate one constituent.

16

data of the modern Romance languages, to have been taking place during the development

of those languages. See for instance the two next examples:

It. '...*mentre il tuo desiderio bruccia in vano*'
Sp. '... *mientras tu anhelo se quema en vano*'
    '...while your longing burns in deception'

The two of them are grammatical. However, it would be ungrammatical to say:

It. *'...*mentre il desiderio bruccia in vano tuo*'
Sp. *'... *mientras anhelo se quema en en vano tu*'
    *'...while longing burns in deception your'

Neither of our authors uses patterns 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, or 16 in the plays

we are studying. There is, however, an additional construction in Terence that is not

repeated by Hrotsvitha: the possessive adjective without its head noun.

Andr. 5.4.933

Cha. Certe mea est.
Cha. She must be mine.

Of course, if we look at the line above we know that **mea** is referring to **filiam** since

Chremes is answering to Crito who just said '*fratri filiam*'. Although Hrotsvitha could have

repeated this pattern, she never does in *Calimachus*. This is a point to remember since in the

Romance languages there is exactly the same rule: a possessive must be a pronoun in order

to stand by itself; never an adjective. In French: '*c'est ma fille*': 'It is my daughter' but

'*Certainement c'est la mienne*': 'Certainly it's mine'; never * '*Certainement c'est ma*': * 'Certainly it's

my'. Likewise, in Spanish '*es mi hija*': 'It is my daughter' but '*Ciertamente es (la) mía*: 'Certainly

it's mine' but not * '*Ciertamente es mi*': 'Certainly it's my'. The only difference is found in

Italian where there is no distinction: '*è mia figlia*': 'It is my daughter' and '*Certamente è mia*':

17

'Certainly it's mine', the reason being that in Italian the distinction between possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns can only be made through syntactic analysis.

As we can see by the exposition above Hrotsvitha coincides in the use of some of the patterns with Terence, although the grammar surroundings are not the same in any of the cases. However, she never used pattern 2, the standard pattern of modern languages, nor does she use pattern 7. Both patterns are the most used by Terence.

2.3.2. Accusative Case

The following chart illustrates the frequency of the various structural patterns I introduce in Section 2.2, now for accusative case noun phrases, in both authors. In it we can see that the two patterns Hrotsvitha makes use of are the two most frequent patterns used by Terence.

Pattern	Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	1	0
2	6	2
3	0	0
4	7	5
5	0	0
6	3	0
7	2	0
8	2	0
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0
Total	21	7

Pattern 1 {(...) MEUS N # #} There is only one example of this pattern and it is found in Terence's *Andria*.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Perf. Part.+P1	0

Andr. 4.2.684-5

> *My. iam ubi ubi erit, inuentum tibi curabo et meum adductum*
> *tuom Pamphilum: modo tu, anime mi, noli te macerare.*
> My. Wherever he is, I'll make sure I find your Pamphilus for you and bring him back
> with me. Just don't torment yourself, my darling.

Pattern 2 {(...) MEUS N... ##} in the accusative is to be found seven times in

Terence's play but only twice in Hrotsvitha's. None of the environments where Terence

includes his is reproduced in Hrotsvitha text. She only uses one environment for the two

sentences.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. Prep.+P2+Prep.	6. V+P2+V (2 times)
2. Sb.Conj.+P2+Prep.	
3. ##P2+N	
4. Sb.Conj.+P2+Perf.Part.	
5. Inter+P2+Pro	

2. *Andr.* 4.1.646

> *Cha Heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo spectaui meo!*
> Cha What a fool I was to judge your character by my own!

6. *Cali.* 2.1.4

> *Calimachus· O utinam uoluissetis meam passionem compatiendo meum partiri·*
> Cali. I wish that you would share my pain by suffering with me.

The most peculiar fact I have come across in this case is that even though Hrotsvitha

does not produce many sentences with this pattern she does something similar. However,

instead of using possessive adjective with her accusative noun she uses the nominal adjective

(genitive pronoun), possibly (?) to shape her phrase as close as possible to Terence's

construction.

If we take an impressionistic first look at the following sentences, we will be tempted to classify them with this pattern but as soon as we take a closer look we can see that this is not the case.

Cali. 2.1.25

> *Calimachus · Inde non curo si ipsam ad mei amorem attrahere potero*
> Cali. I don't care if I can attract her to my love.

Cali. 2.3.15

> *Calimachus · Quia mihi vestri auxilium subtrahitis· ispsam adibo eiusque animo mei amorem blandimentis persuadebo*
> Cali. Since you refuse to help me, I will go to her in person and I will persuade her of my love with my charms and feelings.

Cali. 8.1.3

> *Andronichus· Hoc decet tui sanctitatem· ut non obliviscaris in te confidentem*
> Andro. It is proper to your holiness not to forget those who trust you.

Cali. 9.16.15

> *Iohannes· O Christe mundi redemptio et peccatorum propiciatio qualibus laudum praeconiis te talem celebrem ignoro expaveo tui benignam clementiam· et clementem pacientiam qui peccantes nunc paterno more tolerando blandiris, nunc iusta severitate castigando ad poenitentiam cogis·*
> John. Oh Christ! Redemption of the world and buyer of our sins, I don't know which praise I must sing to celebrate you. I fear your good merci and your merciful patience; one moment you protect the sinners and another you condemn them to a punishement of fair severity.

I consider the phrase *'tui benignam clementiam'* as being like pattern 2, except for the use of the genitive of the pronoun, since the adjective does not discontinue the idea but is just qualifying the noun making, consequently, a nominal phrase.

There is not a single construction as these above to be found in Terence's *Andria.* A useful question to investigate in this area would be just what her conception was of the difference between possessive adjectives and pronouns, and why she uses them in the way she does.

20

Pattern 4 {(...) N MEUS ... ##} in the accusative case is used by Hrotsvitha five times, which is a similar frequency to that seen in Terence's *Andria* when we observe that in his text, which is 64% longer than Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*, Terence uses it eight times. However, none of the environments offered by Hrotsvitha for this pattern is the same as those of Terence. Nevertheless, if we look at the patterns closely, we could say that this fact shows the firm determination of the nun to imitate his model: there are three examples of pattern 4 preceded by a coordinating conjunction in Terence and there are two subordinating conjunctions followed by pattern 4 in Hrotsvitha. They are all followed by a preposition. Moreover, there are three examples of pattern 4 preceded by a verb in Terence and there is one in Hrotsvitha.

Compare:

Terence	Hrotsvita
1. C.Conj.+P4+Prep.Phr.	8. Sb.Conj.+4P+ Prep.Phr.
2. Adv.+P4+V	9. ## P4+Adj.
3. Adj.+P4+C.Conj.	10. Sb.Conj.+P4+ Prep.Phr.
4. C.Conj.+P4+Sb.Conj.	11. V+P4+Adj.Phr.
5. C.Conj.+4P+V	12. N+P4+Neg.Part.
6. V+4P+Sb.Conj.	
7. V+P4+N.Phr	

As we can see, sequence 1 is similar to, though not identical with, sequence 8 and 10; the same happens with sequences 7 and 11.

7. *Andr.* 4.1.655

> *Pa. immo etiam, quo tu minu' scis aerumnas meas,*
> *haec nuptiae non adparabantur mihi*
> *nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxorem dare.*
> Pa. On the contrary. You have no idea about my problems. This marriage was not taking place; nobody was asking me to take a wife.

8. *Cali.* 8.1.10

> *Dominus· Propter Drusianae eiusque qui iuxta sepulcrum illius iacet· resuscitationem apparui·*
> *quia nomen meum in his debet gloriari·*

God. I came in sight to resucitate Drusiana and the one who lies next to her grave, because my name must be glorified in them.

Pattern 6 {(...)MEUS ...N... ## }, which Terence uses two times in the same number of different environments, is not present in Hrotsvitha. This is an important feature to be considered when comparing the two authors, since, as we will see, it is in the split patterns where Hrotsvitha has the least productivity.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. Adv. + TUUM + V + N	0
2. Sb.Conj. + TUUM + ut clause + N	

2. *Andr.* 2.3.376-9

Da. si id suscenseat nunc quia non det tibi uxorem Chremes,
ipsu' sibi esse iniuriu' videatur, neque id iniuria,
priu' quam tuom {ut {sese} habeat} animum ad nuptias perspexerit :
Da.If he flew into a rage now at Chremes' refusal to give you his daughter, before having established your attitude towards the wedding, he would feel that he was putting himself in the wrong, and rightly so.

Terence uses **pattern 7{(...)N... MEUS## }** twice. The first construction listed is not very unusual for him since he readily places elements from a single constituent far from each other in the sentence. However, I have never come across such a great separation in any of the constructions of Hrotsvitha.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. V + N + V.phr + ut clause + MEUM	0
2. ## + N + V.phr + MEUM	

1. *Andr.* 1.1.80-1

Si. qui tum illam amabant forte, ita ut fit, filium
{perducere}{ illuc secum} {ut una esset,} meum.
Si. It so happened that her lovers of the time, as young men do, took my son along to keep them company.

22

Pattern 8 {(...)N.... MEUS...##} is found two times in Terence; both times in different a environment. As with the last example involving 'discontinuous constituency', this pattern is also absent in Hrotsvitha.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. ## N + pron + TUAM + V 2. Adv.. + N + V + TUUM + Sb.Conj..	0

1. Andr. 2.1.324

> *By sponsam {hic} tuam amat.*
> By.-He's in love with the woman who's engaged to you.

Neither Terence nor Hrotsvitha use patterns 1, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, or 16. From these results it is easy to conclude that Hrotsvitha must have looked closely to the way Terence wrote and tried to imitate the best she could. However, we must also recognize that in her time the tools she had to study were not very developed, and so, while she may have come to conclusions with the elements she had, those conclusions were not necessarily very accurate. She repeated as much as she could the most frequent patterns in Terence and avoided the ones she did not find in his texts. Nontheless, here, as in the nominative case data, we find a possessive adjective without its noun in Terence; a construction that is not imitated by Hrotsvitha in *Calimachus*.

Andr. 4.1.635

> *Cha (...) quor meam tibi?*
> Cha (...) Why give you my girl?

Besides that, Terence presents a construction I have never come across in Hrotsvitha: the possessive adjective functioning as the subject of the infinitive, which is rather unusual.

> *Da. ego, Pamphile, hoc tibi pro seruitio debeo,*
> *conari manibu' pedibu' noctesque et dies,*
> *capitis periclum adire, dum prosim tibi;*
> *tuom {st, } {si quid} {praeter spem} {euenit, {mi} ignoscere}.*
> Da. It is my duty, Pamphilus, as your slave, to strive with might and main, night and day, and risk my neck in order to serve your interest. In return, if anything goes wrong, it is for yu to forgive me.

If we cast an overall view at his analyses we will see that the constructions we find in *Calimachus* are, if not identical, similar to those of *Andria*, especially those in pattern 4. What is missing in this case is a single construction where the possessive adjective is post-posed, be it as a continuous or discontinuous constituent.

2.3.3. Ablative Case

For the Ablative case we find a striking number of coincidences in the use of patterns between Terence and Hrotsvitha as far as frequency is concerned, but coincidence stops there, as environmental patterns are all different. However, considering the length of each text it is noticeable that Hrotsvitha uses the ablative case with possessive adjective more frequently than Terence. Another fact to be noticed is that Terence places a preposition before these patterns five times out of ten while Hrotsvitha does so only one time out of seven. Moreover, she also uses prepositions twice to make use of the pattern while Terence never makes use of this construction.

The chart on the next page illustrates the frequency in both authors:

24

Pattern	Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	2	0
2	4	3
3	1	1
4	0	0 ·
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	1
11	0	0
12	0	0
Total	10	7

Pattern 1 {(...)MEUS N # # } Terence presents two instances of this pattern, which is, however, absent in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. N+P1 2. Prep+P1	0

1. Andr. 2.2.370

> *Cha liberatu'sum hodie, Dave, tua opera.*
> Cha I'm freed today, Davos, thanks to you.

Pattern 2 {(...)MEUS N....# # } is the pattern used more frequently than some of the others we have seen by both authors –Terence four times and Hrotsvitha three times- but as we can see on the chart, environments in which they are used do not precisely coincide.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. Prep+ P2 + N 2. Prep+ P2 + N 3. Prep+ P2 + V 4. # # P2+ C.Conj.	5. Sb.Conj. + P2+P2 6. P2+P2+prep 7. V+P2+prep

4. Andr. 5.1.843

> Da. *meo praesidio atque hospiti'.*
> Da. You're in good hands, mine and our visitor's.

5. Cali. 9.16.3

> *Calimachus · Ideo ne moreris, ne pigriteris, lapsum erigere, maerentem consolationibus attollere, quo tuo monitu, tuo magisterio, a gentili in christianum, a nugace in castum, transmutatus virum, tuoque ducatu semitam arripiens veritatis, vivam iuxta divinae praeconium promissionis.*
> Cali. Therefore, don't delay, don't be sluggish to straighten the fallen man, lift with consolation him who is grieving; with your teaching and your mastery transform a man who was a pagan into Christian, from a frivolous one into a chaste one, let me take the way of the truth and live by the promise of the Divine Proclamation.

Pattern 3 {(...)N MEUS # # } is found only once in both our authors.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Pron.+ P3	V+ (adj.phr)P3

Andr. 3.2.502

> Da. *quasi tu dicas factum id consilio meo.*
> Da. You are as good as saying it was all my plan.

Cali. 9.13.8

> *Calimachus· Nam nimium confundor cordetenus contristor anxio gemo doleo super gravi impietate mea·*
> Cali. Since I am confused, saddened and repentant, I am anxious, I cry, I feel pain because of my extremely bad impious deed.

In the above sentence it is to be noticed that the adjectival phrase is part of the same pattern since *super gravi* is directly modifying *impietate mea.*

Pattern 5 {(...)MEUS...N # # } Here again, there is one instance for each author but surroundings do not precisely coincide. Moreover, there are three constituents separating the noun from the possessive pronoun in the example from *Andria* and only one constituent separating the noun from the possessive pronoun in the example from *Calimachus.*

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Adv.+MEO+{Pro}{V}{Adv.}+N	N+MEA +{V.Phr.}+N

Andr. 1.1.152-3

> *Si. "(...) prope adest quom alieno more uiuendumst mihi:*
> *sine nunc meo {me} {uiuere} {interea} modo."*
> Si. - The time has almost come when I have to adapt my life to suit another's. In the
> meantime let me live in my own way.

Cali. 4.1.8-9

> *Drusiana· Eh heu domine Iesu Christe· quid prodest castitatis professionem subiisse· cum is amens*
> *mea {deceptus est} spetie?*
> Dru. Oh Lord Jesus Christ what is the benefit of having undergone chastity if this
> man has been deceived by my appearance?

Pattern 6 {(...)MEUS ...N...##} As with the example above, in this pattern we
find that there are several constituents intervening between the noun and the possessive
adjective in the example from Terence, but only one in the example from Hrotsvitha.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Pron+TUO+{Adv.}{N}{Adj.Ph}+N+V	Prep+ MEA +{V.Phr}+N+comp.

Andr. 5.4.921

> *Cr. ego istaec moueo aut curo? non tu tuo {m} {malum} {aequo animo} feres!*
> Cr. Is it any concern to me? It's your problem: can't you handle it without losing
> your temper?

Cali. 7.1.19

> *Calimachus · (...) Nunc in mea {situm est} potestate, quantislibet iniuriis, te uelim lacessere*
> Cali. Now she is let down in my power. I may lacerate you as much as it pleases me.

Pattern 7 {N...MEUS ##} There are no examples of this pattern to be found in
Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*. (It has already been mentioned above that the nun never postposes
a possessive to its head noun and splits the constituent at the same time.) Only one example
is found in *Andria*.

27

Andr. 4.1.646

> *Cha heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo {spectavi} meo!*
> Cha What a fool I was to judge your character by my own!

Pattern 10 {(...)MEUS=que N... # # } is only found in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*. She constructs this pattern twice although the pattern is not once to be found in Terence's *Andria*.

Cali. 3.1.17

> *Calimachus · Mea Drusiana· ne repellas te amantem tuoque amore cordetenus inherentem sed impende amori vicem*
> Cali. My Drusiana, do not reject your lover who is attached to you by his heart but consider his love in exchange.

For the construction of the ablative case Hrotsvitha distinguises herself from Terence. She innovates with this pattern that is not used by Terence even once in his *Andria*.

Also for the ablative case both our authors coincide by not using patterns **4, 8, 9, 11 12, 13, 14, 15, or 16.**

If we turn our attention to the sentence below, we find another innovation from the nun: the nominal adjective instead that a possessive adjective:

*Cali.*3.1.20

> *Drusiana· Lenocinia tua parvi pendo tuique lasciviam fastidio· sed te ipsum penitus sperno*
> Dru. Your dirty and lascivious games move me to aversion; I reject you from my innermost.

Here we are apparently in presence of pattern 14. However, the use of the genitive pronoun instead of the possessive takes this example out of the classification.

Another innovation by Hrotsvitha in the ablative case is really the fact that she uses one noun that is modified both by a possessive and a genitive noun. This pattern is nowhere to be found in Terence's *Andria*.

Iohannes· Non mea,{sed} Christi virtute paruit·

This sentence is to be analyzed as '*Non mea virtute sed Christi virtute*' which means: 'Not by my virtue but by Christ's virtue.' As we can see in Hrotsvitha's construction, she has the word *virtute* modified both by the possessive *mea* and by the name *Christi* in the genitive. In English or any Romance language we can find the equivalent of this construction but with a possessive immediately followed by the noun: 'Not by my virtue but Christ's'. Sp. *No por mi virtud sino la de Cristo.* We can find the construction with a possessive pronoun, though never in first position, but at the end: 'By Christ's virtue, not mine.' Sp. *Por la virtud de Cristo, no la mía.*

If we take an overview of the examples in this case, we can see that there are almost the same number of examples –nine in *Andria* and ten in *Calimachus*; a very high frequency for the nun if we think of the length of her play. However, the intention of Hrotsvitha to be faithful to Terence's style is evident: she uses mostly the patterns he uses and tries to avoid, not always successfully, the ones he does not.

2.3.4. Vocative Case

The vocative case is very simple to analyze; its use is restricted to address a person. Therefore, being just a call, it is placed outside the phrase. Consequently, the surroundings to patterns in this case are not very varied[16]. This restriction explains the reason why the use of this case in both texts can be found almost in the same environment; the only difference worth mentioning is the use of the verb in the indirect speech in the pattern surroundings in Terence. This topic is analyzed in the chapter devoted to colloquial language.

---

[16] cf: Ernout et Thomas: 1964 §7, §8, §9, §30, 31, 32 and §166

There is no need to illustrate the frequency of the use of this case in both plays with a charts since only one example is found in Terence with pattern 2, and only two examples are found in Hrotsvitha with pattern 1.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
## +P2+V	1. ## +P2+V
	2. Pron+P2+V.

Andr. 1.1.133-4

   Si. adcurrit; mediam mulierem complectitur.
   "mea Glycerium," inquit "quid agis? (...)"
   Si. He ran forward, grasped the woman round the waist, and said "My dear
   Glycerium, what are you doing? (...)

2. *Cali.* 9.21.10

   Calimachus· Sospitatis auctori grates· qui te mea Drusiana resurgere dedit in laetitia· quae
   gravi cum tristitia die fungebaris extrema·
   Cali. Thanks to God who protects you, who gave you back to life in happiness after
   you, my Drusiana, had died in extreme sadness.

2.3.5. Genitive Case

The Genitive case is used only once by Terence - **Pattern 5 {(...) MEUS... N##}** while in Hrotsvitha we find it four times. She constructs one sentence with **Pattern 1 {(...) MEUS N##}** two sentences with **pattern 2 {(...) MEUS N...##}**), and one with **pattern 5{(...) MEUS... N##}**).

The chart on the following page illustrates the frequency in both authors:

Pattern	Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	0	1
2	0	2
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	1	1
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0
Total	1	4

Pattern 1 {(...) ME US N# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	N+P1 (twice)

The sentence below repeats the same pattern with the same surroundings twice.

Cali. 9.13.5

Calimachus · Audisti miseriam meae perditionis· noli elongare medelam tuae miserationis·
Cali. You have heard the pain of my perdition: do not delay the remedy of your compassion.

Pattern 2 {(...) ME US N...# # } is represented only Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* by the

following sentence while there are no instances of this pattern in Terence's *Andria.*

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	N+P2 + N

Cali. 9.13.13

Calimachus · O utinam reserarentur secreta meorum viscerum latibula· quo interni amaritudinem quam patior doloris perspiceres· et dolenti condoleres·
Cali. Oh! If only I could open the innermost secrets of my heart so that you could see the bitter pain I am suffering and you could share with me!

Pattern 5 {(...) ME US... N# # } Interestingly enough the surroundings where this pattern is found is almost identical in both plays:

Terence	Hrotsvitha
C.Conj.+TUAE +V+N	Adj.+TUAE +V+N

Andr.- 1.5.296

> *Pa. "(...) bona nostra haec tibi permitto et tuae {mando} fide[i]."*
> Pa. I entrust these possessions of ours to you: I commit them to your faith.

Cali. 2.3.6

> *Amici· Intende frate· ea ipsa quam ardes· sancti Iohannis apostoli doctrinam secuta· totam se devovit deo· in tantum ut nec ad thorum Andronici christianissimi viri· iam dudum potuit revocari· quo minus tuae {consentiet} vanitati·*
> Friends. Understand, brother, she in person for whom you burn has followed the teachings of St. John Apostle; she devoted herself completely to God; in such a great way that not even Andron, the very Christian man, has been able to change her mind until now; event less will she consent to your foolishness.

Probably in this case more than any other we can see that the freedom of order in Hrotsvitha is really confined. Of all the constructions she uses, these are the ones where patterns repeat themselves over and over. Not only does she repeat herself, but also in pattern five the surroundings are almost identical to those of Terence.

2.3.6. Dative Case

The dative case appears only five times in Terence with patterns 2, 3, 4 and 6. Although Hrotsvitha has four instances of the same case, only patterns 1, 4 and 6 are present in *Calimachus*, and their contexts of use are definitely different.

The chart on the next page illustrates the frequency in both authors:

Pattern	Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	0	1
2	2	0
3	1	0
4	1	1
5	0	0
6	1	2
7	0	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0
Total	5	4

Pattern 1 {(...) ME US N# } is found only in Hrotsvitha

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	pron +Pattern 1# #

Cali. 6.1.7

Fortunatus· Si placabis muneribus· dedam illud tuis usibus·
Fortu. If you silence me with money I will give her to your use.

Pattern 2 {(...) ME US N...# # } is only found in Terence

Terence	Hrotsvitha
V + Pattern 2 +Pron V +Pattern 2 + V	0

Andr. 3.3.534-5

Chr. aliquot me adierunt, ex te auditum qui aibant hodie filiam
meam nubere tuo gnato; id viso tune an illi insaniant.
Chr. A number of people have come up to me to say that they've heard from you
that my daughter is marrying your son today. I've come to see whether it is you who
have taken leave of your senses or they.

Andr. 5.4.943-4

Pa. egon huiu' memoriam patiar me ae
voluptati obstare, quom ego possim in hac re medicari mihi?

Pa. Shall I allow my happiness to be spoiled by his forgerfulness, when the remedy is in my own hands?

Pattern 3 {(...) MEUS.... N# } is present in Terence but not in Hrotsvitha.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
N+{ut clause} +TUO	0

Andr. 5.1.828-31

> *Chr. (...) perpulisti me ut homini adulescentulo*
> *in alio occupato amore, abhorrenti ab re uxoria,*
> *filiam ut darem in seditionem atque in incertas nuptias,*
> *eiu' labore atque eiu' dolore gnato {ut medicarer} tuo.*
>
> Chr. You persuaded me to promise my daughter to a young lad involved in another love affair who had no intention of taking a wife, condemning her to squabbling and an unstable marriage, all so that your son could be cured through *her* pain and *her* suffering.

Pattern 4 {(...) N MEUS... # # } is found once in each play.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Pron+P4+V.Phr.	V+P4+V

Andr. 3.5.616-7

> *Pa. (...) viden me consiliis tuis*
> *miserum impeditum esse?*
>
> Pa. Do you realise that your schemes have entangled me in a web of misery?

Cali. 8.1.8

> *Iohannes· Domine Iesu cur iuxta id loci dignatus es servis tuis manifestari?*
>
> John. Lord Jesus, why have you deigned to manifest (yourself) in this place to your servants?

Pattern 6 {(...) MEUS...N... # # } There is one instance in *Andria* and two in

Hrotsvitha. Amazingly enough, Hrotsvitha construction has the same surroundings as

Terence's example. However, the words that separate the components of the patterns do not coincide.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Sb.Conj.+MEO+Sb.Conj.+N+V.Phr.	Pron+TUAE+V+N+Sb.Conj.
	Sb.Conj.+TUIS+V.phr+N+V.phr

Andr. 1.5.260-3

> *Pa. tot me impediunt curae, quae meum animum diuorsae trahunt:*
> *amor, misericordia huiu', nuptiarum sollicitatio,*
> *tum patri' pudor, qui me tam leni passus est animo usque adhuc*
> *quae meo {quomque} animo libitumst facere.*
>
> Pa. There are so many concerns weighing me down and pulling my heart in different directions-love, pity for her, anxiety about this wedding, and on the other side respect for my father, who has up to now has been so generous and allowed me to do whatever took my fancy.

Cali. 3.5.2

> *Drusiana· (...) quo pacto, qua dementia reris me tuae {cedere} nugacitati· quae per multum temporis a legalis thoro uiri me abstinui?*
>
> Dru. (...) by which agreement, by which insanity do you believe that I will give up to your absurdity when I have held back from my legal husband's bed for a long time?

For the dative case, both authors coincide by avoiding constructions with patterns 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

2.4. Conclusion

Taking a panoramic look at both the set of patterns and at the environments in which they appear, it can be clearly seen that the difference between the productions of the two authors is noticeable. It is true, there seems to be the desire on Hrotsvitha's part to imitate the Terentian constructions, but her Latin has probably been heavily colored by Medieval Latin, and as a result of this we find that:

1. She never presents discontinuous possessive phrases with the possessive adjective post-posed while in Terence there are nine out of twenty one examples of this construction.

2. The greatest distance between a possessive and the noun it modifies in *Calimachus* is three words (and that only once) and the words involved are really short ("in te agat"). In addition, these three words make one constituent. In very striking contrast in *Andria* we find complete subordinated clauses in between nominal possessive phrases that have as much as six words, and as many as four constituents.

3. Hrotsvitha uses the **TUOque + N** construction (Pattern 10) that is nowhere to be found in Terence's *Andria*.

4. She never uses the accusative possessive as subject of an infinitive.

5. She uses the nominal possessive (genitive) with nouns non agreeing in case (twice with nominative and four times with accusative) absent in Terence.

6. She uses a noun modified by two possessives: possessive adjective and Genitive Noun.

7. She never uses a possessive without its noun as we find in Terence.

8. Of the 80 examples I compare there is only one case of identical construction in the vocative case. I mentioned above (in other words) that the conventionalization of greeting and calling to a person has led to a limitation of the range of options which explains the similarity in construction between the two authors.

The chart on page 38 illustrates the frequency of the different patterns regardless of the case in both authors. I count the number of occurrences writing the sentence final first and then the not-sentence-final and mark the count of both groups with the number of instances in bold.

As we can see, two of the most frequently used patterns by Hrotsvitha are 1 {(...)MEUS N##} and 2 {(...)MEUS N...##} both of them the standard pattern for the modern Romance languages, even though she seems to have restrained herself from using it with the most common case form, i.e., with the nominative and accusative which, as mentioned above, were the only two extant cases by the VIIIth century.

The other most used pattern by Hrotsvitha is 4 {(...) N MEUS ...##} which interestingly enough she uses to make her characters express their strongest feelings. With the exception of '*servis tuis*' in the dative case, the rest of them are in the accusative. I mention in the introduction that the possessive post-posed to its head noun is used also in Italian in the vocative to express strong emotions: *Figlio mio!*: 'Son of mine!' *Dio mio!*: 'God of mine!'. If we analyze the sentences where this construction is used by Hrotsvitha we can see that the reason why she is using this form is the same: she wants her characters to convey strong emotion. Thus, Drusiana calls Calimachus off starting her sentence by '*Lenocinia tua*'; God appears in front of St. John and Andronicus to tell them that '*nomen meum*' 'my name' must be glorified in them. St. John answers with the same passion and wishes that '*nomen tuum*' 'your name' may be sanctified and blessed for centuries. And finally Andronicus, in total despair and pain, begs St. John to bring back to life his beloved Drusiana, who is still laying dead with the words '*Drusianam meam*'.

Analyzing the circumstances when Terence's characters use this construction we notice that only one time out of the nine are strong feelings implied or expressed. This is when Pamphilus tells how Chrysidis begged him to take care of Glycerium, and for that she calls for '*ingenium tuum*'. All the other occurrences show no strong emotions or feelings.

On the matter of discontinuous constituents and post-posed possessive adjectives, it is evident that Hrotsvitha was aware of the fact that Terence could both separate the possessive adjective from its head noun *and* postpose it to the noun, and so she did both things, but never at the same time. If we take a look at the chart again we can see that the possessive adjective in Hrotsvitha never appears post-posed to and discontinuous from its head noun. For her it was enough to either postpose possessive adjective or move it away from the head noun, as Terence could do. That sufficed, in the mind of the nun, to satisfy her desire to imitate the poet's style. Did she not notice what she was failing to do? Was it a too bold a construction for her to imitate fully, or was she afraid that people of her time would find understanding the Terentian construction impossible?

Pattern			Terence			Hrotsvitha		
	1		4			7		
MEUS N:		2		18	22		7	14
	3		2			0		
MEUS...N		4		9	11 - 33		7	7- 21
	5		2			2		
MEUS...N		6		6	8		4	6
	7		5			0		
N...MEUS		8		2	7 - 15		1	1- 7
	9		0			0		
MEUS=que N		10		0	0		2	2
	11		0			0		
MEUS=que ...N		12		0	0		0	0 - 2
	13		0			0		
N=que MEUS		14		0	0		0	0
	15		0			0		
N=que ...MEUS		16		0	0		0	0
Total					48			32

To finish with a little statistics, let us take a final look at the chart above: *Calimachus* presents 32 instances of possessives, while there are 48 constructions in *Andria*. To this we should add the constructions that I had not anticipated in my hypothesis: Terence constructs a sentence with a possessive adjective functioning as the subject of an infinitive, and another

with a possessive adjective without its head noun while Hrotsvitha constructs a sentence with a noun modified by both a possessive adjective and a noun in the genitive case; she constructs an apparent pattern 14 in the ablative but instead of a possessive adjective she writes a possessive pronoun. She also apparently constructs pattern 2 four times, but she writes genitive pronouns instead of possessive adjectives in one construction with a noun in the ablative case and the two others with the noun in the accusative. With these additions the number of constructions results in 40 in Hrotsvitha's text and 50 for Terence's.

There are 1003 verses in *Andria* and 427 in *Calimachus*; that is 64.5 % more verses in *Andria*. To have the same frequency of possessives in both authors, *Calimachus* should present 21 examples. Nonetheless, there is no reason why we should expect any text to have the same frequency of some element as another. What is important to see is how both authors construct their sentences.

SUUS

2.5. Introduction

In this part of chapter, I continue analyzing the use of possessive adjectives but, as I stated above, I concentrated on the third persons plural and singular. Unlike in the case of the two first persons singular, there is a notable difference between the frequency with which the two authors construct sentences involving third person possessive pronouns. The nun uses the third person possessives only five times, the third person involved is always God/Jesus (with the exception of one reference to the devil), and the only person who utters these sentences is St. John. Moreover, she deviates again from Terence's patterns with two of her constructions. Terence, on the other hand, puts these possessives in the mouth of almost all his characters, and they refer to characters that are not present in the scene. This

will be discussed in chapter 4 where the point will be made that Hrotsvitha does not make reference to facts or characters that have not been shown in the scene. Terence, unlike Hrotsvitha, encourages the audience to use their imagination to envision events off stage. The nun's story does not depend on events that are not presented on the stage. Terence's characters need regular reference to third parties as there is a lot of setting of the scene that the author skillfully manages in order to let the spectators know who the characters are, where they come from, and what their interrelationships and feelings towards one another are. This of course requires a great mastery of the language, involving tenses, subordinating conjunctions, time markers of all kinds that Hrotsvitha did not have mastery over. I use SUUS in the pattern to indicate any of the forms in the paradigm of the third possessive adjective.

2.6. The cases

2.6.1. Nominative Case

Of all the instances of SUUS in Terence's *Andria*, there is only one in nominative case. It is pattern 7 {(...) N...SUUS##} and the surrounding is the following: {(...)V+pattern7##}. There are no occurrences of nominative in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*.

Comparing this number of occurrences with those of MEUS and TUUS we can see that they are drastically reduced: *Andria* presents only one instance in the nominative – there are a total of eleven instances in all the cases for pattern 7-, but there is none in *Calimachus*.

Andr. Prologue. 22

> Cantor. (...) de(h)inc ut quiescant porro moneo et desinant
> maledicere, malefacta {ne}{ noscant} sua.
> Cantor. So I am warning them from now on to hold their tongues and stop their slanders, or they will be forced to acknowledge their own shortcomings.

40

It is worth noticing that the only instance of nominative in Terence's *Andria* for this possessive is to be found in the prologue spoken by the Cantor. No one of the characters makes use of this construction in the whole play. Likewise, it is absent in Hrotsvitha's text.

2.6.2. Accusative Case

There are 9 instances of the use of SUUS in the accusative case in Terence's work and there is only one in Hrotsvitha's. The patterns are as follows:

Pattern 1 {(...) SUUS N# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
V+P1	0

Andria 2.3.392

> *Da. (...) nec tu ea causa minueris*
> *haec quae facis, ne is mutet suam sententiam.*
> Da. But you musn't for that reason alter your present behaviour or he may change his mind.

Pattern 2 {(...) SUUS N...# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. V+P2 + Neg. V	0
2. Pron+P2+V	
3. N+P2+V	
4. Pron+P2+C.Conj.	

1. *Andria* 4.4.773

> *Da. "Chremes si positum puerum ante aedis uiderit,*
> *suam gnatam non dabit":*
> Da. "Chremes won't give his daughter in marriage if he sees a baby lying on the doorstep."

Pattern 4 {(...) N SUUS...# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. V +P4 + prep.phr.	0
2. Pron+P4+N	

2. *Andria* 1. 5. 241

Pa. quid? Chremes, qui denegarat se commissurum mihi
gnatam suam uxorem,(...)?
Pa. And what about Chremes? Having refused to trust me with his daughter's hand
(...)?

Pattern 5 {(...) SUUS... N# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
Pron+SUA +ut clause +N	0

Andria 4. 1. 625

Cha hocinest credibile aut memorabile
tanta vecordia innata quoiquam ut siet
ut malis gaudeant atque ex incommodis
alterius sua {ut comparent} commoda?
Cha It's unbelievable, unimaginable! That a man can be so morally deranged
As to delight in another man's misfortunes
And seek his own gain from another's loss.

Pattern 6 {(...) SUUS ...N.... # # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	Pron+ SUAE +N+N +V

Cali. 9. 24. 4

Iohannes· Sed licet nullum iustum, nullum misericordia inveniret dignum, neminem tamen sprevit·
neminem suae {gratia} pietatis privavi· (...)
John. But although he did not find any just, anyone worth of his mercy, he did not
reject anybody; he deprived no one through the grace of his piousness (...)

42

Pattern 7 {(...) N... SUUS# # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
V+N +ut clause +SUUM	0

Andr. 1. 2. 188

Si dum tempus ad eam rem tulit, sivi animum {ut expleret} suom;
nunc hic dies aliam vitam defert, alios mores postulat.
Si. While the time was appropriate for such things, I allowed him to satisfy his
desires. But today brings another life, demands another way of behaving.

Pattern 13 {(...) SUUS=que....N...# # } Patterns with *que* attached either to the possessive

adjective or the head noun (labeled from 10 to 16 in section 2.2) are Hrotsvitha's patterns. It

has been seen that she even constructs apparently similar patterns using pronouns in the

genitive instead of possessive adjectives. This is worth noticing since Terence, her model,

does not construct a single sentence with these patterns.

Cali. 9. 13. 5

Iohannes· Recedamus· suumque {diabolo} filium relinquamus·
John. Let's go back and let's leave his son to the devil.

None of the authors have any other example within the predicted patterns but they

both construct other ones: Terence constructs a sentence with a possessive adjective without

a noun. However, the reader can easily determine the noun by the context. In her

Calimachus, Hrotsvitha never constructs a sentence with similar characteristics to Terence's

below:

Andr. 5. 4. 932

Chr. (...) suam ne esse aibat?
Chr. Did he say that she was his daughter?

Not to see a similar construction in Hrotsvitha is a somehow surprising, since in the modern Romance languages possessive pronouns can be used by themselves. Moreover, if we turn our attention to Italian syntax, the absence of this construction is even more striking, for in that language the possessive adjectives and the possessive pronouns are identical in form. Thus the only way we can determine the category of a given form is by analyzing the sentence structure, as mentioned above. Given its use in modern Romance languages, particularly Italian, an early version of which presumably influenced medieval Church Latin strongly, one might ask why Hrotsvitha did not use this pattern. Was its use too widespread already? Did she find it too modern for its use to be in keeping with her desire to imitate Terence? We would need to look into other texts of the period and compare their usage to definitively answer these questions.

Hrotsvitha constructs, again, a sentence where she seems to be using pattern 13, but the *que* is now attached to a personal pronoun in the genitive case that modifies a nominal phrase in the accusative, rather than to an agreeing form of the possessive adjective.

Cali. 9. 24. 6

> Iohannes· (...) *sed se ipsum omnibus tradidit· suique dilectam animam pro omnibus posuit·*
> John. (...) but even though everyone let him down he offered his extraordinary soul to everyone.

None of the authors constructs sentences with patterns 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, or 16 in the accusative case. This is the only point in which the two authors coincide.

44

2.6.3. Ablative

There are only two instances of constructions with ablative in *Andria*: they are both examples of pattern 2. Terence presents a third construction in the prologue with an unpredicted pattern: a possessive adjective without a noun to be modified. There is one construction in *Calimachus*. It is pattern 5.

Pattern 2 {(...) SUUS N # # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1. adj +P2+pron 2. Adv.e+P2+V	0

1. *Andr.* 4. 1. - 649

> *Pa. (...) ah nescis quantis in malis torser miser*
> *quantasque hic suis consiliis mihi conflabit sollicitudines*
> *meu' carnufex.*
> Pa. Ah! You don't realise the torments of misery that I'm suffering and the agonies that this despicable slave of mine has contrived for me by his schemes.

Pattern 5 {(...) SUUS.........N # # }

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	Sb.Conj.+SUO+V.phr+N

Cali. 9. 24. 10

> Iohannes· *Ideo in hominum non delectatur perditione quos suo {emptos} {meminit} pretioso sanguine·*
> John. For that reason, he does not rejoice in the perdition of men; since he remembers having bought them with his precious blood.

In the sentence above the only word that is not part of the nominal phrase is the verb *meminit* because *suo pretioso sanguine* is qualified by *emptos* that goes with *quos* just as *pretioso* does. *Pretioso* should also be considered part of the same nominal phrase, since it is modifying the word *sanguine*.

2.6.4. Dative Case

There is only one instance of dative in *Andria* in **pattern 8 {(...)N...SUUS... # # }**

but none of any type in *Calimachus*.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
V + N + N + SUO	0

Andr. 1. 2. 175

> *Da. mirabar hoc si sic abiret et eri semper lenitas*
> *verebar quorsum evaderet.*
> *qui postquam audierat non datum iri filio {uxorem} suo,*
> *numquam quoiquam nostrum verbum fecit, neque id aegre tulit.*
> DA. I was surprised if it could end this way. The master was so calm, and I've been
> afraid all the time where that was leading. Ever since he heard that his son's wedding
> was cancelled, he hasn't said a word to any of us or been at all upset.

2.6.5. Genitive Case

The authors do not coincide in their use of the genitive case.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
C.Conj. + SUI + N + N	0

Andr. 5. 3. 879

> *Si. adeo[n] inpotenti esse animo ut praeter civium*
> *morem atque legem et sui {voluntatem} patris*
> *tamen hanc habere studeat cum summo probro!*
> Si. How can he be so headstrong as to defy social custom and the law and the wishes
> of his own father? He's determined to have this woman whatever the disgrace.

2.7. Unpredicted Constructions

In *Calimachus*, we have a construction that we do not find in *Andria*; it is the

combination of a personal pronoun in the genitive with the head noun in another case. In

the next example the other case is the ablative. As stated before, this pattern cannot be classified according to the scheme we have been using above.

Cali. 9. 31. 14

> Iohannes· *Nam qui superbit invidet· et qui invidet superbit· quia mens invida dum alienam laudem nec patitur audire· et in sui comparatione perfectiores ambit vilescere dedignatur subici dignioribus· et superbe conatur preferri comparibus·*
> John: For he who takes pride envies and who envies takes pride due to his envious disposition while he suffers to hear the glory of others and he vilifies in the comparison of his accomplishments and the ones of others; he scorns and devalues the deserving people and arrogantly ties to place himself before his equals.

2.8. Conclusion

As we can see from the chart below, the coincidence which is more frequent between the two authors are the patterns they do not use: 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16. Hrotsvitha constructs sentences using patterns 5 and 6 just like her model, but the details of the cases in which she does do not coincide with those seen in Terence's: Terence makes use of pattern 7 in the nominative case while Hrotsvitha never does. Terence constructs accusative phrases with patterns 1, 2 (four times), 4 (two times), 5, and 7 while Hrotsvitha only constructs accusative phrases making use of patterns 6 and 13. There are two constructions in the ablative with pattern 2 in *Andria* while for the same case in *Calimachus* we find only one with pattern 5. Hrotsvitha does not present any of the predicted patterns in the dative case or the genitive one while Terence makes use of pattern 8 for the dative and of pattern 6 for the genitive.

Pattern			Terence			Hrotsvitha		
SUUS N:	1	2	1	6	7	0	0	
N SUUS	3	4	0	2	2	0	0	
SUUS...N	5	6	1	1	2	1	1	2
N...SUUS	7	8	1	1	2	0	0	0
SUUS =que N	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
N=que ...SUUS	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUUS =que...N	13	14	0	0	0	1	0	1
N=que ...MEUS	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total					13			3

Summarizing: in Hrotsvitha,

1. We find pattern 13, which is unattested in *Andria*. Exactly as it is the case with the MEUS-TUUS evidence.

2. A pattern similar to pattern 13 is found, which, however, shows a pronoun in the genitive modifying a direct object in the accusative, another use unknown from Terence.

3. There is an apparent pattern 2 which cannot be classified as such because the pronoun is in the genitive and the noun it modifies is in the ablative case.

It is worth mentioning that the constructions Hrotsvitha innovates with combining the genitive pronoun with the noun in a different case could be the seed of what today exists in most modern Romance languages: due to the great productivity of the possessive in the third person, especially in Spanish, where it refers to six possible persons (*su, sus* possessive adjective serves *él, ella, Usted, ellos, ellas, Ustedes*), the possessive *su* can create great confusion. Thus most people use the genitive construction *de usted, de él, de ella, de ustedes, de ellos, de ellas* to avoid it.

Likewise in Italian it is very common to hear *di lui, di lei,* or *di Lei* instead of *suo, sua, suoi* or *sue.* However, it is not usual to find this construction for first and second person since the forms for them are unequivocal (*mi mis* for Spanish and *mia, mie, mio, miei* for Italian).

For French the same alternative construction exists but with preposition *à.* It is used for all persons: *à moi, à toi, à lui, à elle, à vous, à nous,* etc).

Now, if we count the occurrences of this construction in Hrotsvitha with the first and second person and compare to the ones with the third person in this section of the chapter, we can surely asses that the evolution towards this genitive forms was already well under way and Hrotsvitha could not help being influence by it.

It is evident in this part of the analysis that Hrotsvitha did not have the linguistic tools to analyse the language of Terence closely enough. She could only imitate based on conclusions she had drawn as a result of her studies of the language and the readings she must have done.

In the next part of this chapter I analyze the possessives for the first and second persons plural. After that, I will be in a position to state my final conclusions on this aspect of my study.

NOSTER and VESTER

2.9. Introduction

To finish with the series of possessive adjectives, I deal now with the possessive adjectives corresponding to the first and second persons plural. The number of occurrences of these possessives is much smaller than that of the other two groups: there are, in total, only eleven occurrences in Terence and two in Hrotsvitha. Of the eleven examples in *Andria,*

there are two that do not follow any of the patterns we have established, and only one of the two examples in *Calimachus* falls in any of them. Due to the small amount of data existing in these two plays, I will not concentrate on the context in which the patterns since there is not a single sentence that can be compared to any significant degree of detail between the authors. I use NOSTER meaning any case of the possessives adjectives NOSTER and VESTER. When a case is not mentioned it is because there are no instances of it in the texts.

2.10. The Cases

2.10.1. Accusative Case

There are five constructions involving the accusative case. The number of occurrences in this case in patterns 1 and 2 is the same as we found in this case for SUUS. There is one instance of pattern 1 and four of pattern 2 in *Andria*. There is none in *Calimachus*.

Pattern 1 {(...)NOSTER N # #}

Andr. 4. 3. 716
> *My.(...) di vestram fidem!*
> *summum bonum esse erae putauam hunc Pamphilum,*
> *Amicum, amatorem, uirum in quouis loco*
> *paratum; uerum ex eo nunc misera quem capit*
> *laborem!*
> My. Heaven help us! I used to think Pamphilus was the perfect answer for my
> mistress, a friend, a lover, a husband, ready for all occasions. But now look what
> distress he's causing the poor girl!

Pattern 2 {(...)NOSTER N...# #}

Andr. 3. 3. 538
> *Si per te deos oro et nostram amicitiam, Chremes,*

quae incepta a paruis cum aetate adcreuit simul,
perque unicam gnatam tuam et gnatum meum,
quoi(u)s tibi potestas summa seruandi datur,
ut me adiutes in hac re atque ita uti nuptiae
fuerant futurae, fiant.
Si. I beg you in the name of the gods, Chremes, and for our friendship, which began when we were young and has grown stronger with age, and in the name of your only daughter and my son, whose salvation rests entirely in your hands, to support me in this matter and allow the wedding to take place as planned.

2.10.2. Genitive Case

There is only one instance of the genitive case in *Andria*. The **pattern is 5** {(...)N NOSTER # # }

Andr. 4. 3. 737

> *My. ego quid agas nil intelligo; sed si quid est*
> *quod mea opera opus sit uobis,[a] ut tu plus uides,*
> *manebo, ne quod uostrum {remorer} commodum.*
> My. I haven't a clue what you are up to. But, if there's anything in which you people need my help, since you know best, I'll stay. I don't want to impede your progress.

2.10.3. Dative Case

For the dative case there is one instance in *Andria* and one in *Calimachus* the patterns are different.

Pattern 4 {(...) NOSTER ...N... # # } is found in Terence.

Andr. 2. 5. 419

> *By. nunc nostrae {timeo} parti quid hic respondeat.*
> By. I'm dreading his reply on our account.
And in Hrotsvitha we find **pattern 3** {(...) NOSTER...N # # }

Cali. 5. 1. 18

Andronichus· *Marmoreum in proximo sepulchrum habetur in quod funus ponatur servandique ara sepulchr Fortunato nostro {relinquatur} procuratori·*
Andro. There is a marble grave near here; the corps is to be place there and the grave is to be taken care by Fortunatus, our keeper.

Pressumably, Hrotsvitha tries to reproduce Terence's construction in her use of pattern 5 in the genitive and pattern 4 in the dative. Both present the possessive adjective separated from the head noun by a verb.

2.10.4. Vocative Case

There is one occurrence of the vocative case in *Andria* in **Pattern 1** {(...) NOSTER N # # }.

Andr. 5. 2. 846

Da. (...) o noster Chremes!
Da. (...) our friend Chremes!

2.11. Unpredicted Constructions

The constructions listed below cannot be classified within the chart with the patterns we have established. Both authors have instances which do not fall in any of those patterns. The following two constructions by Terence are more examples of what we have seen when discussing MEUS: an adjective without a noun to modify.

Andr. 4. 4. 765

· *My. Vostri.*
My. Your master's.
Da. quoi(u)s nostri?
Da. Which master?

It is interesting to see that the question uttered by Davus expresses the same problem I point out while dealing with third person possessives about the confusion concerning who the possessive is referring to. In this case is not with the third person singular but the first plural. Of course, here Terence probably wrote these lines to amuse the audience, since Davos, the slave, is trying to indirectly inform Chremes that the baby is Pamphilus', but he makes believe he does not want him to know. That's why when Mysis says 'Vostri' meaning 'belonging to your household' he keeps on asking 'Quoius nostri?' He wants Chremes to have no doubts about Pamphilus' fatherhood. Finally, in *Calimachus* we find another instance of Hrotsvitha's oft-repeated construction involving the genitive pronoun combined with a noun in the accusative case.

Cali. 2. 3. 15

> *Calimachus· Quia mihi vestri auxilium subtrahitis· ispsam adibo eiusque animo mei amorem blandimentis persuadebo*
> Cali. Since you refuse to help me, I will go to her in person and I will persuade her of my love with my charms and feelings.

2.12. Conclusion

Taking a quick look at the chart on the next page, we can see that there are not many elements to compare as far as *noster* and *vester* are concerned. The only coincidence in the big picture is the use of one possessive construction in the dative, but patterns do not coincide.

Occurrences of Noster Vester in Terence's *Andria* and Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*

Pattern		Terence			Hrotsvitha		
1 NOSTER N:	2	2	5	7	0	0	
3 NOSTER...N	4	0	1	1	1	0	1
5 N NOSTER	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 N...NOSTER	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 NOSTER=que N	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 NOSTER=que...N	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
13 N=que NOSTER	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
15 N=que...NOSTER	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total				9			1

2.13. Conclusion on all Possessive Adjectives

Of course, if we put together all occurrences of all possessive adjectives in Terence's *Andria* and Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* , we can see that there is a very steady coincidence in the use of certain patterns. It is in the general overview that we can see the coincidence, the determination of the nun to imitate Terence as mentioned above. The chart below illustrates this idea.

We can also see that some constructions Hrotsvitha imitates are very much like the standard construction of Romance languages. This is the nominal phrase with apparently discontinuous constituents, but generally separated by a qualifier of the noun, which means, of course, that the construction is in some sense continuous. She also, apparently, imitates Terence by separating the nominal possessive phrase with a verb (as we have seen above), although we must bear in mind that the patterns do not coincide in the surroundings where they are found.

There are other elements that should not be overlooked. For example, the fact that Hrotsvitha avoids two of the most frequently used patterns in Terence: 1 {(...)MEUS N##} and 2 {(...)MEUS N...##}, in spite of the fact that they are both the standard patterns for the modern Romance languages. She avoids them in the most common cases: nominative and accusative, probably because by her time they were already established as the standard colloquial –and thus 'modern feeling'- patterns. We should not forget that by the eighth century the only two declensions still in use were precisely nominative and accusative. It cannot be a coincidence that they are exactly the ones she avoids, probably, to make her style look older, and thus more like Terence's.

The biggest coincidence between authors is the patterns they avoid using: Terence uses patterns 1 to 8; Hrotsvitha uses 1 to 6. This means they coincide in six patterns, although in general the constexts in which the patterns appear are all different. The only one that coincides is in the vocative case and as pointed above, this case being used to address a person and almost always outside the sentence restricts the possibilities of variety of its surroundings.

As for patterns 7 and 8, it is worth remembering that they are discontinuous constructions with the possessive adjective post-posed. I had pointed out this absence of construction in the previous part of the chapter.

Finally, it has been established that the two authors have constructions of their own that are not within the pre-established patterns and which do not coincide with these constructions in the other author. Terence constructs

1. a phrase where the possessive adjective in the accusative is the subject of an infinitive;

2. phrases where the possessive adjective stands without the noun to be modified.

That is to say that Terence conceives the use of the adjective with the function of a pronoun and, probably here, if we really want to find some similarities between the to authors, is where we could find some coincidence: Looking at Hrotsvitha's construction of a noun modified by both a noun in the genitive and a possessive, probably, some could argue that it is an imitation of Terence's possessive without a noun. Nonetheless, we should wonder if the use of the same form for possessive adjectives and pronouns was already common in the Latin of the Xth century (as it is in modern Italian, where, as mentioned above, the distinction between categories can only be established through the analysis of the structure of the sentence).

Hrotsvitha on the other hand constructs sentences where

- there is a nominal pronoun in the genitive modifying a noun in another case (accusative, nominative, ablative);

- pattern 13 {(...)N=que MEUS...##} is built with a nominal pronoun in the genitive instead of a possessive adjective.

In order to summarize and close this argument, I would like to list the following facts:

1. Hrotsvitha never presents discontinuous possessive phrases with the possessive adjective post-posed while in Terence there are 12 out of 27 examples of these constructions.

2. The greatest distance between a possessive and the noun it modifies in *Calimachus* is three words only once and they are really short "in te agat". All the others involve separation by only one word, generally a qualifier. By constrast, in *Andria* we find complete subordinated clauses that have as many as six words in between the possessive adjective and the head noun.

3. Hrotsvitha uses the construction with *que* attached to the possessive or to the noun before the possessive four times although this construction is nowhere to be found in Terence's *Andria.*

4. She constructs them using a possessive pronoun in the genitive to modify a direct object in the accusative, another unknown use in Terence.

5. She never uses the accusative possessive as subject of an infinitive.

6. She uses the nominal possessive (genitive with nominative, dative or accusative noun) absent in Terence.

7. She uses a noun modified by two possessives: possessive adjective and Genitive Noun.

8. She never uses a possessive without its noun as we find in Terence.

9. Many of the constructions that look Terentian could very well be influenced by the Romance languages.

10. Of the 100 examples I compare there is only one case of identical construction. This involves the vocative case which, as I mentioned above, concerns a formula to address the listener, and thus does not offer many choices as to construction.

As we can see in the chart on the next page, there are more differences than coincidence between the two authors, and most coincidences found in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* are with Modern Romance Languages rather than with Terence.

Occurrences of all possessive adjectives in Terence's *Andria* and

Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*

Pattern		Terence			Hrotsvitha		
MEUS N:	1 2	7	29	36	7	7	14
N MEUS	3 4	2	12	14- 50	1	7	7- 21
MEUS...N	5 6	3	7	10	3	5	8
N...MEUS	7 8	6	3	9 - 19	0	0	8
MEUS=que N	9 10	0	0	0	0	2	2
MEUS=que ...N	11 12	0	0	0	0	0	0 - 2
N=que MEUS	13 14	0	0	0	1	0	1
N=que ...MEUS	15 16	0	0	0	0	0	0 1
Total				69			31

CHAPTER 3 – *Ut* Clauses

3.1. Introduction

Ut is a subordinating conjunction that both Terence and Hrotsvitha utilize in their texts. It can introduce a subordinated clause of time, reason, consequence, indirect command, purpose, comparison, or indirect wish, among other funcions[17]. Both authors construct sentences with this conjunction as well as with the related form *ut... ne* in the negative constructions. However, in the text of the archaic playwright there is a variety of word order that is not present in Hrotsvitha.

The rather universal conjunction which served so many functions in Latin has branched off into different conjunctions that fulfill these functions in the daughter languages. They always take the first position and they are invariably followed immediately by the subject and the verb (5) or only the verb when the language is pro-drop (6).

(5) Fr. *Nous avons tout fait pour qu'il retourne à la maison.*

(6) a. It. *Habbiamo fatto tutto pur che ritornassi a casa.*
     b. Port. *Fizemos tudo para que voltasse para casa.*
     c. Sp. *Hicimos todo para que volviera a casa.*
         We did everthing for him/her to return home.

Hrotsvitha constructs all her sentences in the modern Romance fashion, while in Terence we find *ut* clauses with *ut* in first position, in second or 'hidden' first position, in third and even in fourth position. We will also look into the position of the verb in relation to *ut.* Of the 118 sentences containing *ut* , *ut* (...) *ne* and *ne* clauses that I analyze in Terence's *Andria* there are 71 with *ut* in first position; 30 in second position or first 'hidden'

---

position; 4 in third position; and 3 in fourth position. The 27 clauses analyzed in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* have *ut* exclusively in first position.

3.2. *Ut* Position

In the following lines I illustrate what I have stated in 3.1 with some examples from *Andria*. I have also highlighted the verb in the clause to pave the way for the other aspect of my argument, which follows shortly. The {} indicates grouping into a constituent. I only indicate the ones necessary for my discussion.

3.2.1. First Position

Andr. 1.1.55

> *Si. quod plerique omnes faciunt adulescentuli,*
> *[ut {animum} {ad aliquod studium} adiungant, aut equos*
> *alere aut canes ad venandum aut ad philosophos],*
> *horum ille nil egregie praeter cetera*
> *studebat et tamen omnia haec mediocriter.*
> Si. – he behaved as all young lads tend to do, involving themselves in some pursuit like breeding horses or hounds or studying philosophy. However, he didn't pursue any one of these things in particular but all of them in moderation.

According to this translation this *ut* should be at the beginning of the sentence '*ut quod...*' and should be translated into 'as'

Andr. 2.5.431

> *By. renuntiabo, [ut pro hoc malo mihi det malum].*
> By. I'll report back; bad news for him means bad news for me.

Andr. 1. 1. 135

> *Si.(...) tum illa, [ut consuetum facile amorem cerneres],*
> *reiecit se in eum flens quam familiariter!*
> Si. She fell into his arms and wept. It was such an intimate scene—you could readily see that they were lovers.

3.2.2. Second Position

In the following sentences the *ut* is in all cases in second position if we count constituents, but if we count words, it is in third position. Notice that in all the cases the first position is taken by a prepositional phrase.

Andr. 1.1.35-7

> *Si. ego postquam te emi, [{a parvolo} ut semper tibi*
> *{apud me} { iusta et clemens} fuerit servitus]*
> *scis. feci [{ex servo} ut esses libertus](...)*
> Si. Ever since I bought you, when you were a small child, you know how just and kind I have been to you as a master. You were my slave, but I gave you your freedom (...)

Andr. 3.3.547-9

> *Chr. sed si ex ea re plus malist quam commodi*
> *utrique, id oro te [{in commune} ut consulas],*
> *quasi si illa tua sit Pamphilique ego sim pater.*
> Chr. But if it is going to cause them both more harm than good, I beg you to look to our common interest, as if she were your daughter and Pamphilus my son.

3.2.2.1. Hidden First Position

If we take a closer look at the *ut* clauses with the conjunction in second position that do not fall in any of the categories stated above, we can see that the word preceding *ut* is always in that initial position for emphasis. In other words it has been fronted for focus.

2nd Position: Fronting for focus

Andr. 5. 3. 879

> *Si. adeo[n] inpotenti esse [animo ut praeter civium*
> *morem atque legem et sui voluntatem patris]*
> *tamen hanc habere studeat cum summo probro]!*
> Si. How can he be so headstrong as to defy social custom and the law and the wishes of his own father? He's derermined to have this woman whatever the disgrace.

What can be seen in the sentence above is that *animo* has been placed in first position to place stress on the personal willfulness of the young man, as against collective morality. In modern Romance languages *animo* must have preceded or followed *summo probro*. Probably, this would have been also the order of a phrase without any sort of emphasis in the language of the time.

3.2.3. Third Position

Andr. 1.1.168-70

> *Si nunc tuom·st officium·[{has} {bene} ut adsimules nuptias],*
> *perterrefacias Davom, observes filium*
> *quid agat, quid cum illo consili captet.*
> Si. Now it is your job to maintain the pretence of the marriage, scare Davus off, and keep an eye on my son's doings and on any plan the two of them conceive.

Andr. 2.2.349

> *Da.(...) id paves [ne ducas tu illam]; [{tu} {autem} ut ducas].*
> Da. You are in panic in case you have to marry her, and (to Charinus) *you're* in one in case you can't.

Andr. 2.6.456

> *Si. ego [{istaec} {recte} ut fiant] videro.*
> Si. I will see that it's put right.

3.2.4. Fourth Position

Andr. 1. 1. 157
> *Si. et nunc id operam do, [ut per falsas nuptias*
> *vera obiurgandi causa sit, si deneget]:*
> *simul sceleratu' Davo' siquid consili*
> *habet, [ut consumat nunc quom nil obsint doli];*
> *quem ego credo manibu' pedibu'que obnixe omnia*
> *facturum, [{magis} {id} {adeo mihi} ut incommodet*
> *quam ut obsequatur gnato].*
> Si. And that's my purpose now with this pretended marriage, to create a valid reason for rebuking him if he refuses. At the same time, that rascal Davus will use up whatever scheme he has now when his tricks can do no harm. I'm sure he'll strive with might and main, doing everything he can—and that more to annoy me than to serve my son's interests.

Andr. 4. 2. 705

> *Da. [dies[hic] mi ut sati's it] vereor*
> *ad agendum, ne vacuom esse me nunc ad narrandum credas.*
> Da. I'm afraid it'll take me all day to carry it out, so you needn't think I've the time to explain it.

If we go through all the examples above and focus on the position of the verb in the *ut* clause we can conclude that Terence basically has two ways of placing the verb: when *ut* is in first position or in hidden first position the verb can be separated from the former but if *ut* is in any other position the verb follows *ut* immediately. We can explain this fact more simply as follows:

1st Position   # # *ut* V

2nd Position   # # [$]_{xp}$ *ut* V   (or hidden first position)

Other Position   # # [$]_{xp}$ [$]_{yp}$ ... *ut* V

In Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*, *ut* is to be found only in first position. Some examples follow:

Cali. 6.1.3

> Fortunatus· *Corpus adhuc integrum manet· [ut reor]· quia non languore exesum sed leui [ut experiebare febre est solutum]·*
> Fortu. The body remains intact so far, as I believe, because she has not been consumed by disease but she was taken by light fever.

Cali. 9.2.13

> *Andronichus· Ideo ambo [ut uideo] morte sunt consumpti· ne effectum administrarent sceleri·*
> Andro. So, as I see, both were consumed by death before they executed the heinous crime.

This sentence has the same word order of modern Italian and Spanish.

3.3. *ita ...ut*

Another factor pushes Hrotsvitha further away from her model: in Terence, the main clause occasionally contains *ita* anticipating the *ut* clause as in the examples below while in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus ita* is never found[18].

Andr. 1.1.146-9

> *Si. (...) ego illud sedulo*
> *negare factum ille instat factum denique*
> *ita tum disœdo ab illo, [ut qui se filiam*
> *neget daturum].*
> Si. I strenuously denied that this was the case. He insisted that it was the case. In the end we parted with the understanding that he was withdrawing his consent to his daughter's marriage.

Andr. 5.4.949

> *Pa. o de uxore, ita [ut possedi], nil mutat Chremes?.*
> Pa. As for my wife, given I'm in possession, I presume Chremes has no objection?

3.4. *Ut .. non* Clauses

Andr. 2.3.394

> *DA. (...) patri dic velle, ut, quom velit, tibi iure irasci non queat.*
> DA. (...)Tell your father you're willing, so that he can't rightly be angry at you whenever he chooses.

We find *ut non* only once in *Andria* while in *Calimachus* which is almost half its length, we find four examples.

Cali. 8.1.3
> *Andronichus- Hoc decet tui sanctitatem [ut non obliviscaris in te confidentem]·*
> Andro.- It is suitable to your holiness not to forget the one who trusts you.

---

[18] There are some *ita* constructions in other plays by Hrotsvitha but the particle is always placed immediately before *ut.*

3.5. *Nullus-nulla*

As in the example above, in the next sentence, Hrotsvitha detaches herself from her model constructing sentences which express negation not with *ne*, as in Terence's usual pattern, nor with *non*, which is rare in Terence but is her more common pattern, but rather through the use of *nullus* and *nulla*.

Cali. 9.13.23-4

> *Calimachus· Displicet omne quod feci, in tantum [ut nullus amor, nulla voluptas sit vivendi· nisi renatus in Christo merear in melius transmutari]·*
> Cali.- All I have done displeases me so much, for no love, no pleasure is to be lived if I have not been reborn in Christ, may I deserve change for the best.

3.6. *Ut ... ne* Clauses

There are two purpose clauses introduced by *ut ... ne* in *Andria*.

Andr. 1. 5. 259

> *Pa. (...) aliquid facerem [ut hoc ne facerem].*
> Pa. (...) I would be doing something else so as to avoid doing this.

Andr. 4. 2. 699

> *Pa. si poterit fieri [ut ne pater per me stetisse credat]*
> *quo minus hae fierent nuptiae, volo (...).*
> Pa. If it's possible to convince my father that it's not my fault that the wedding's called off, that's what I wish; (...)

According to Shipp[19] "as sometimes even in Cicero; *ne* was in origin simply a negative particle (...); it became a subordinating conjunction by the reduction of *ut ne* to *ne*.

In *Calimachus* there are two similar constructions to be analyzed of which one follows:

Cali. 1. 1. 17

> *Calimachus· A cedamus in secretiora loca· ne quis superveniens· interrumpat dicenda·*
> Cali. Let's get into a secret place, lest someone coming interrupts what is to be

---

[19] Shipp, G.P.: 144: 2002

said.

The use of *ne* here is the same as in Terence: subjunctive of purpose; the only
difference is the word order which is exactly as the order of Romance languages except of
"*in secretiora loca*" which should be "*in loca secretiora*".

3.7. Different uses of *Ut* in Hrotsvitha

I stated in 3.1 that *ut* introduces subordinated conjunctions of various types. I also
argued that *ut* is always in first position in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*. The following examples
support my argument.

3.7.1. *Ut* – Temporal Subordinating Conjunction

Cali. 2. 1. 1
> Amici· *Aequum est· [ut communicata invicem compassione] patiamur quicquid unicuique
> nostrum utriusque eventu fortunae ingeratur*
> Friends. It is equal, what fortune may hold for one of us alternatively; once it has
> been informed to one another, we may endure the sorrow together.

3.7.2. *Ut* - Subordinating Conjunction Introducing Reason

Cali. 5. 1. 21
> Iohannes· *Decet [ut tumuletur honorifice]·* (...)
> John. It is proper that she should be buried honorably. (...)

3.7.3. *Ut* - Subordinating Conjunction Introducing Consequence

Cali. 6. 1. 2
> *Calimachus· In eo· [ut vel mortuam me facias videre]·*
> Cali. In this: that you make me see the dead.

Cali. 9. 13. 1
> *Calimachus ·* (...) *« Calimache morere [ut vivas]! »*

Cali. (...) "Calimachus, die so that you may live!"

3.7.4. *Ut* - Subordinating Conjunction Introducing Indirect Command

Cali. 9.7.3

Andronicus· Verum age iam beate Johannes, quod acturus es· fac [ut resuscitetur Calimachus· quo soluatur huiusmodi ambiguitatis nodus]·

Andro. Then, blessed John, now do what is to be done: resuscitate Calimachus so that the knot of this ambiguity can be solved.

3.7.5. *Ut* - Subordinating Conjunction Introducing Indirect Purpose

Cali. 9.11.7

Iohannes· Quae dementia· quae insania te decepit· [ut castis praesumeres fragmentis alicuius iniuriam conferre dehonestatis]?

John. What craziness, what insanity made you believe that you could take unfair advantage of the chaste by dishonoring them?

3.7.6. *Ut* - Comparative

Cali. 9.12.12

Iohannes· Num triplici infortunio adeo infelix effectus es· [ut nefas quod uoluisti perficere posses]?

John. Now, were you so unhappy in your triple calamity as to be able to accomplish the crime you wanted to?

3.7.7. *Ut* - Subordinating Conjunction Introducing Indirect Wish

Cali. 9.20.21

Andronichus· (...) Quis auderet credere? quisue praesumeret sperare· [ut hunc, quem criminosis intentum uitiis mors inuenit· et inuentum abstulit· tui miseratio ad uitam excitare· ad ueniam dignaretur reparare]?

Andro. Who would have believe? Who would have presumed to hope that a man who intended reproachful vices would raise from death and through your mercy would come up to life having the dignity of repairing?

3.8. Conclusion

As we can see from all the examples analyzed above, Hrotsvitha was well aware of all the semantic possibilities of the *ut* and the *ut* (...)*ne* subordinating constructions, and in fact

she used it in most possible ways; what she did not dare or was not able to do was to place it with different word order as Terence used to do. There is a possibility, as stated above when discussing possessive adjectives, that she was not able to keep the freedom evident in Terence, but it is also possible that she chose to keep a rather modern order as she wanted her audience to understand her writings easily.

Going through all her sentences, we can see that not a single *ut* clause alters the *ut*-in-first-position-order. We can also see that the verb governed by *ut* enjoys a much freer situation. This should not lead us to believe that Hrotsvitha succeeded in imitating her model, since in most Romance languages even today, and especially in poetry and in refined prose, the order within the subordinated clause is characterized by a greater degree of freedom. Thus, we can affirm that in regard to *ut* clause word order, Hrotsvitha writes with Latin words utilizing Romance language word order. In this, she clearly distinguishes herself from Terence.

Chapter 4- Division and Development of Scenes

4.1. Introduction

It is perhaps when we try to compare Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* with the presentation and the development of scenes with Terence's *Andria* together with the everyday language used by the different characters that we find the most evident difference between the two authors. I choose the word evident because we do not need to make a deep analysis of the language in order to see that the dialogue among characters in *Calimachus* is very straight forward and that they give us the feeling of being in a vacuum. It is only logic that this should be the case as Terence used the street language that was spontaneous, colloquial and varied in idiolects in order to imitate the many characters that represented the different layers of society so that he could create the right atmosphere and the appropriate dramatic effect. By contrast, Hrotsvitha most probably used the Latin spoken and read in the monastery, which was the Latin from the Bible and other religious books of her day, as argued in previous chapters.

The language of Terence was the typical language of *Comedia Togata*, easy to imitate for an artist who must have observed people around him to later create his characters[20]. On the other hand, we know that the religious people in the monasteries spoke Latin until last century, but we must bear in mind that the language had evolved enormously, and by the 10th Century almost every Romance language had already shaped Latin into a form that was closer to the languages we speak today than to Terence's Latin of the II century BC. The Latin of the monasteries was influence by the Romance languages that were spoken in much of Western Europe. Thus, we could say that by Hrotsvitha's time there were already two

---

[20] See Karakasis: 2000

kinds of Latin interacting: the spoken and the written. Of course, we can argue that the latter was strongly influenced by the former.

In addition, we must bear in mind that the playwrights of Classical Rome who wrote in verse and with very sophisticated language, just as the writers of the Greek Tragedy, and later on, the writers of opera lyrics, all had access to natural language resources which were simply not available for Latin in medieval monasteries. In that setting the lexicon, among other things, was largely reduced to vocabulary needed for the treatment of liturgical and religious matters.

In Hrotsvitha's plays it is rarely stated where the characters are, if there are other people in the scene, or how much time has passed between one scene and the next. Hrotsvitha makes her characters speak only what is absolutely necessary enable the audience to follow the main story. Contrary to what we find in Terence's and other Roman plays, there are no greetings or goodbyes, practically no references to what characters are going to do next, so it is very difficult for a reader to imagine the setting of each scene by reading the play[21].

In a way this style could be considered as the first sprouts of modern movie plots, where it is often not explained to the viewer what the characters are about to do, or where they are about to go, but almost always the audience still understands. The difference between the two genres is that when watching a movie, the viewers have lots of visual aids that help them place the scene. They can see the place, all the characters that participate or witness the scene, and the non-verbal communication among characters – all things that in Hrotsvitha are not even indicated[22]. Moreover, the lack of dramatic skill on Hrotsvitha's

---

[21] For more information on stage conventions in Terence time see Barsby 2001:6-12
[22] Much has been said about whether or not Hrotsvitha's plays were produced but that is not a point I will discuss here. However, even if the answer is negative, we must say that the lack of information to the reader is evident.

part is evident by the way she divides the scenes. We know that what causes the change of scenes is the change of characters (their arrival or departure), but in *Calimachus* we can see that this is not the case: the two first scenes should have been one, the third and fourth should be scene 2 and scene 4 should have been two different scenes, one with Drusiana's soliloquy to God and the next one should have been reserved for Andronicus' lament exclusively. The length of the scenes is also very unbalanced: the first scene in Hrotsvitha's has 9 lines, and the second 27, the two first scenes adding up only 36 lines. In these two scenes, we get to know that Calimachus loves Drusiana who is married to Andronicus, and they both keep chaste. In *Andria*, by contrast, the first scene is the longest of the play; it has 205 lines. In these lines Terence tells the audience all it needs to know to get them involved in the story. I will develop this idea somewhat further below.

Another interesting aspect to consider is that there are no instances of characters overhearing others, interruptions or cue –indicating last words said by characters when they are going to be interrupted –because this never happens. Neither do we find the expressions typically uttered by a character when somebody is approaching, as we find so frequently in Terence's plays. The exclamations to express self pity or threats are very different, too. There is also difference between Hrotsvitha and Terence in the use of vocabulary as we will see below.

This uniformity in the way they speak makes the characters impersonal and defaced. They all use the same words; there are no differences in speech between sinners and virtuous, between men and women, between messages directed to celestial beings or those directed to the object of the most abject passion. As a result of this lack of subtlety in the choice of words, together with the absence of character description, the nun's style ends up being as impersonal as that of religious treatises. Her characters are so dry and deprived of

personality that it is impossible for the reader to believe them, or feel any sort of emotion regarding them.

I analyze the different aspects I have just mentioned following the order they are presented in *Calimachus* so as to make the reading easier.

4.2. Scenes, Characters and Language

4.2.1. Scene 1

In the first scene in *Calimachus* it can be seen that there is no signs on which to imagine the background while in *Andria*, with Simo's first exchange in the opening scene Terence gives us the clear idea that they are outside the house and from the dialogue Terence puts in the mouths of his characters we can easily picture the scene: slaves taking things inside, indicated by Simo saying '*Vos istaec intro auferte: abite.*' 'You, take those things into the house'. We can also see Sosia among the other servants coming towards his master when he is addressed: '*Sosia ades dum paucis te volo.*' 'Sosia, stop here: I want a few words with you'.

Thus, in less than two lines, Terence has successfully set the scene. We can picture the house from outside; we can imagine the slaves taking some objects inside as well as Simo calling for Sosia, and the latter walking towards his master.

Nothing similar happens in *Calimachus*, although Hrotsvitha uses the same formula in her very first line: *Calimachus* says '*Paucis vos, amici volo*'. However, we do not know where *Calimachus* and his friends are, or how long they have been together. We could assume they are in the street because *Calimachus* says: '…. *Vos interim sequestrari aliorum a collegio.*' 'In the meantime, I will take you from the presence of others.' From this we may assume they are in a public place, but which? The idea of the public place is reinforced by '*Accedamus in secretiora*

loca, ne aliquis superveniens interrumpat dicenda.' 'Let's go to a secret place lest somebody who comes interrupts what is to be said.' As I said above, unlike in *Andria*, we do not know whether, when Calimachus utters the first sentence of the play, he was already with his friends, or he was arriving and that was his greeting statement. Nothing is explained or evident.

Another noteworthy point is that although the word 'friends' is in the plural, we do not know how many characters there are present in the scene; apparently only one speaks with Calimachus, as we cannot assume that they answer to him in a chorus. This doubt remains unresolved, for if we go back to *'Paucis vos, amici volo'*, we might think it possible that *amici* is in the genitive singular. However, all translations I have come across show *amici* as plural vocative, presumably since it is difficult to see how the genitive singular could be construed in such an utterance.

On the other hand, his friends invite him to participate in their conversation *'nostro colloquio'* and *'nobis est sequendum'*, 'it is for us to follow'. Probably, Hrotsvitha tried to make the scene livelier by adding more characters, but she was not able to handle the conversation among all of them. She did not even identify Calimachus' friends by their names, while all the characters in *Andria* do have a name, even the ones that are never in the scene, and only refered to. The scene in Hrotsvitha ends with the friends' exchange *'Ut libet'*, 'As you like' which is line 9. It is a really short scene, but it is not unlike Hrotsvitha to create such scenes, as we will see.

4.2.2. Scene 2

In the next scene Calimachus explains to his friends his love for Drusiana. Although the scene has 27 lines, the conversation Calimachus has with his friends does not describe

Drusiana through Calimachus' eyes. Most of the scene goes lost in a guessing game of the friends trying to understand who Calimachus' object of love is, instead of describing the woman or narrating the circumstances in which Calimachus fell in love with her. All the reader knows by the end of the scene is that Drusiana is *'Rem pulchram, rem venustam'* 'Something beautiful, something charming'. And that she is married to prince Andronicus and has been baptized: *'...est lota baptismate.'*. This lack of description of Drusiana's feminine qualities coincides with the fact that in scene three, when Calimachus is in front of her and explains why he loves her, all he can say is *'tui pulchrito'* 'Your beauty'.

In Calimachus description of Drusiana, we can easily feel the stiffness of the language and the lack of experience in the life outside the monastery on the part of Hrotsvitha. Moreover, there are no exclamations or interjections; neither do we come across parenthetical expressions or interruptions, so typical of speech filled with emotion, and so frequent in Terence. This lack of expressivity makes Calimachus a very poorly developed and not credible character, for he is supposed to be a lustful, willing-to-sin-character, who, however, for some reason speaks to the object of his passion using the words that a pious man uses when speaking to God[23].

It is important to remember that the word *pulchram* has the same root of the Spanish words *pulcro*, clean –a synonym of immaculate-, *pulir*, to polish, and the Italian word *pulito*, clean and *pulire*, to clean[24]. It is very suggestive that Hrotsvitha would choose such a word to describe a virgin. However, she uses *venusta* the same as Terence uses to describe Glycerium. If we compare the above to the way Simo describes the two women to Sosia; Chrisydis *'egregia forma atque aetate integra'* 'distinguished look and in the prime of life' meaning fully

---

[23] The reader could argue that Hrotsvitha does not use other words because she does not want to offend her pious audience but if this was the case she should have never conceived the idea of necrophilia.

[24] According to Ernout and A. Meillet: 1979 the word *pulcher* did not stay in the Romance languages and it was replaced by the words *bellus* and *formsus* but if this is true I find it very strange that all three languages adopted the same word later on and with the same meaning.

developed; and then Glycerium '... *adulescentulam forma...*.' 'the look of an adolescent' interrupted by Davos' emotion: '*Bona fortasse*' ' That could be good' and he goes on: '*et vultu, Sosia, adeo modesto, adeo venusto, ut ... nihil supra!*' 'And the face, Sosia, so modest, so beautiful, nothing could be better' and he goes further yet '... *quia erat forma praeter ceteras honesta ac liberali...*' 'because her look was more honest and freer than the others'. In these lines Terence serves himself with anacoluthon to express the enthusiasm of two men towards the beauty of young women. This could not be more different that the words of Calimachus, even though he is burning for his beloved, according to his friends: '...*ea ipsa quam ardes*'. We do not know if Hrotsvitha chose the word *ardes* to remind the reader that that kind of passion is condemned to afterlife burning in hell or because it is the only way she can express how Calimachus feels towards Drusiana. Not once is an anacoluthon to be found in *Calimachus*, although it is a very effective and common literary device to express strong emotions.

Again, in this scene in *Calimachus*, we have no idea of where the characters are, and nowhere in the play is there any kind of explanation on how the characters know each other. This is very different from *Andria*, where Terence skillfully goes on with the same first scene and makes Simo praise Sosia, while reminding him that he has granted him freedom, probably to let the public know what the relationship among them is, and what kind of story they share.

On the other hand, still in scene one, Simo explains about the false wedding he is organizing for his son, but in a way that the story unfolds in three dimensions: the present, the future, and the past. He explains to Sosia how he feels about his son, while the audience gets to know what Pamphilus is like, and what the feelings the two of them have towards one another are. The whole past, in all its many layers (life before Chrisidys funeral, her

death, what happened during her funeral and after as well), and almost all the important characters are presented in the first scene. At the same time Terence has the characters discuss future events in a way that, already from the very beginning, permits the audience to start having feelings for all of the characters, and, indeed, to begin taking sides regarding the conflicts to come.

4.2.3. Scene 3

Calimachus' exchange almost at the end of the previous scene '...*ipsam adibo eiusque animo mei amorem blandimentis persuadebo*' 'I'll go to her in person and I will persuade her of my love with my charms and feelings' suggests that the place where the scene takes place is not far from Drusiana's. However, we do not know whether Drusiana is by herself or with somebody else. It is only in the fifth scene that the reader gets to know that there are witnesses to the conversation (I explain this point in 4.2.5).

Once in front of Drusiana, Calimachus explains why he loves her but all he can say is '*tui pulchrito*'. Nothing else is stated by Calimachus about the reason of his love for Drusiana. Later on when he expresses self-pity, he does not say the very common in Terence '*Me misero*' but '*Pro dolor*', another very Christian expression, like the one in the end of the scene '*Pro deum atque hominum fidem!*' 'In the name of God and the men's faith!'. It is very different from the *Pollox*, and *Hercles* repeated over and over in pre-Christian *Andria*.

The opening line in scene 3 is '*sermo meus ad te* ....', 'my speech to you...' when Calimachus tries to talk to Drusiana about his love. It is worth remembering that the word *sermo* in Romance languages is only used to indicate the speech of a priest during the religious service (*sermón* in Spanish, *sermon* in French, *sermone* in Italian). The word is nowhere to be found in *Andria*; when people refer to speech or conversation they use different words,

i.e. line 45 Sosia asks Simo *'quin tu uno verbo dic quid est quod me velis.'*, 'Why don't you tell me in a word what you want me to do?'. Further down in the same scene, in Terence, Simo tells Sosia that he will tell everything to him by saying *'te praedico tibi'*. And on line 22 even further Simo tells Sosia *'...a principio audies'*, '...first, listen'. The word *sermo* is not found in Andria. However Drusiana uses the word *verba* in the scene when she calls Calimachus off because she finds his words are mixed up with full devilish deception *'...verba commiscere, quem sentio plenum diabolica deceptione'* (3.5.2).

Unlike in *Andria*, where the audience gets to know all the details on how Pamphilus and Glycerium met, the circumstances in which Calimachus and Drusiana met are unknown to the reader. Neither do we know who Calimachus or his friends are: their social status, their age or any other information that would help build the characters.

4.2.4. Scene 4

The fourth scene begins with Drusiana by herself praying for her death. The language she uses to God before her death: *'...intende quem patior dolorem'* '...see the pain that I suffer' (4.1.11) is exactly the same language Calimachus uses to talk to her: *'Pro dolor!'* (3.1.12). That is to say that the passion a man feels for a woman is expressed with the same language a person uses to speak to God in Hrotsvitha's usage.

In the same scene, and immediately after Drusiana's words to God, Andronicus appears complaining about the death of his wife and the reader is left with a number of questions: Where was he? Was he a witness of the conversation between the two or has he just arrived? How much time has gone by between the death of his wife and the moment he finds her dead? The reader cannot answer these questions until later on as the story unfolds. As for the words used in the scene we find, here again, some differences: He does not say

'*me misero*', as it is so common in *Andria*, but '*mihi infortunato*' which is a very unlikely expression in Terence. In *Andria* the word *fortuna(s)* is found three times but never with the prefix *in*. It is as unlikely as his '*Curro, sanctumque Iohannem advoco*', 'I run to fetch St. John'. If we compare how people are summoned in *Andria* we find a very different set of expressions:

Andr. 3. 2. 512
> *Da. (...) iam prius se e Pamphilo*
> *gravidam dixit esse: inventumst falsum nunc, postquam videt*
> *nuptias domi adparari, missast ancilla ilico*
> *obstetricem accersitum ad eam et puerum ut adferret simul.*
> Da. Some time ago she said that she was pregnant by Pamphilus; this has been sown to be false. Now, when she sees wedding preparations being made at home, she immediately sends her maid to summon the midwife and bring a baby at the same time.

Andr. 3. 3. 546
> *Chr. (...) accersi iube.*
> Chr. (...) have her fetched[25].

The word advoco does not appear in *Andria*.

4.2.5. Scene 5

At the beginning of the scene there are no indicators of where St. John and Andronicus meet and there are no greetings. However, this lack of niceties is justified because the latter is crying. Nevertheless, the way St. John asks if Drusiana is dead is very Christian: *Estne homine exuta?* 'Has she been deprived of her humanity?' By contrast, Terence has his characters refer to death using the verb *morior* on 1.1.105 Simo tells Sosia that '...this neighbor, Chrysis, dies' '...*Chrysis, vicina haec moritur*'. In the last scene, when Crito tells how he knows Glycerium's origin, he tells that the man who took care of the girl died he uses the same verb '... *is ibi mortuost.*' (5.4.923).

---

[25] Chremes refers to his daughter.

78

As for the funeral, the word used by Terence is always *funus, funeral* while Hrotsvitha uses *funus* but also *exequias*, a word never used by Terence. Both words are still in use in the Romance languages. Of course we find a difference on rites in the celebration of funerals, since pagan Chrysides is burned, while Drusiana is buried according to Christian rites.

Still focusing on the vocabulary, we can see that the words 'tears' and 'weep' are repeated in Terence and in Hrotsvitha's plays, although the latter spells them with 'i' while the former, in keeping with Archaic Latin practice, with a 'u'. Compare Terence 1.1.109 *'Nonnumquam conlacrumabat.'* 'Sometimes he wept', and on 1.1.126 *'Hinc illae lacrumae...'* 'That's why the tears!' In this word again we see the influence of the phonological evolution in Hrotsvitha: on 5.1.1 St. John asks Andronicus *'Cur fluunt lacrimae?'* and on 5.1.6:

> Iohannes· *Multum disconvenit· ut pro his fundantur lacrimæ· quorum animas credimus laetari in requie·*
> John. It is very inconvenient that someone should shed tears for the souls of whom we believe rejoice in peace.

Because of this phonological evolution the word 'tear' in Spanish, Portuguese and Italian is spelled with 'i' *lágrima, lagrima* and *lacrima.*

It is also in *Andria's* scene 1 where the word *peccavi* is used by Pamphilus and if we compare its meaning in this context with the meaning given by Hrotsvitha we can easily see that in Terence's times it meant 'mistake' while Hrotsvitha uses it with the same meaning it has today in our Romance languages: 'sin, to sin' Ital. *peccato, peccare,* Sp. *pecado pecar,* Fr. *péché, pécher.* etc.

If we turn our attention to *Calimachus'* plot, it is only when Andronicus tells St. John that he heard Drusiana praying for death, that we learn that he has been a witness. Nonetheless, we do not know how much he has heard. We suppose he must have heard everything, because to St. John's question as to the reason for her prayers, he answers that he'll explain later on, when he is less sick with grief. Compare to Davus '... *at ego hinc me ad*

forum ut conveniam Pamphilum, ne de hac re pater inprudentem opprimat.' '...I am off to the forum from here; I will meet the unaware Pamphilus so that his father doesn't take him by surprise on this subject' (1.3.226).

At the end of the scene, St. John invites Andronicus to celebrate the funeral and he points out that they have a marble grave near there (5.1.18) *'Marmoreum in proximo sepulchrum habetur...'* at least there is some reference to where the two men are headed. However, the reader does not participate in the funeral and in the next scene we find Fortunatus and Calimachus suddenly together.

4.2.6. Scene 6

In this scene, when Calimachus meets Fortunatus there have been no previous indications that Calimachus is going to see him or visit Drusiana's grave. As in earlier scenes discussed above, there are no words of greeting here; the two men start their conversation with the important part of the story, and when they do go to the grave, the reader is left with some unanswered questions such as: Where are they? How did they meet? Did they know each other before this encounter? Moreover, in scene 5, Andronicus' announces that Fortunatus shall guard Drusiana's grave. Then why does Fortunatus say 'let's go' if he is guarding her grave? Why is he far from it? And, how far do they go?

As for the language, all the sentences uttered by the two men follow the Romance languages' word order except for the end of one uttered by Fortunatus (4.1.3) '(...) *sed leti ut experiebare febre est solutum'* where the words *leti* and *febre* should be one continuous constituent. i.e. *leti febre* or *febre leti.*

Now, for this scene and the next one I would like to add something that has no direct relationship to the study I am carrying out, but which I feel compelled to mention: In

her preface Hrotsvitha tells the readers that she writes her plays so that people will not have to read the lascivious pagan author, but nowhere in Terence is to be found a conception of love more perverted than we find at this point in Hrotsvitha's play. Hrotsvitha conceives of necrophilia. Where did she read about this? I dare say that her repression was so great that she may have dreamt of having some man take her without her being responsible, and this desire inspired her for the scene. This scene, even though the act was not accomplished, is the most perverted I have come across reading classical comedy.

4.2.7. Scene 7

In this short scene I would like to discuss two facts that are very telling, but at the same time samewhat contradictory. First of all, that all the sentences follow the Romance word order, and that the vocabulary is such that any person with good knowledge of a Romance language and some linguistic skills can understand the general meaning of the scene. At the same time, we find a sentence which is nearly an exact copy from *Andria*.

Andr. 2. 1. 310
>   By. *age age, ut lubet.*
>   By. All right, all right, as you like.

This is very much like *Calimachus'* phrase: 7. 1. 15

Fortunatus· (…) *Abutere ut libet·*
Fortu. (…) Abuse as you like.

The above is another example of the phonological change u >̣[26] mentioned in 4.2.5.

---

[26] Here again I would like to add a comment on the development of the story. According to what has been going on until now, Fortunatus has just answered to Calimachus requirements, yet in this scene, Calimachus accuses him of talking him into this atrocious did. There is some incoherence in the plot.

The other coincidence with Terence in this scene –unlike scene 5- is that all references to dying are expressed with different forms of the verb *morior* just as in *Andria*. However, we should mention that the word is still used in most Romance languages. Ital. *morte, morire*, Sp. *muerte, morir*, Fr. *mort, mourir*, Port. *morte, murrer*.

4.2.8. Scene 8

On the subject of the regional diversity of Latin Adams explains:

> *Already in the last centuries BC in literary texts we find a concept of regional variation well developed (...), along with a view that the Latin of Rome had prestige whereas the Latin of Romans such as rustics might even be comical[7].*

The importance of this scene is that here we can see clearly that unlike Terence, or many other playrights contemporary to him, who has different idiolects according to social class, age and sex[28], Hrotsvitha uses the same expressions for both sexes. It is difficult to say the same about social class, because we do not know anything about the social background or the status of Hrotsvitha's characters. St John calls for Jesus saying '*Domine Iesu...*' just as Drusiana does in scene 4 when she asks for death. Likewise, when God appears in front of Andronicus and St. John, the saint describes him with the same adjective Calimachus describes Drusiana in scene 2 and 3. The only difference is that he uses the superlative for God. '*Ecce invisibilis Deus nobis apparet visibilis, in pulcherrimi similitudine iuvenis.*' There! The invisible God makes himself visible for us in the beautiful appearance of a young man[29].'

Of course Hrotsvitha could not be familiar with the regional varieties of Latin the way Terence was, neither was she able to differentiate socialects since the Latin she was familiar with belong to only one class: the religious community.

---

[27] 2007:2

[28] For more on idiolects in Terence see E. Karakasis 2005:5 & 101-120.

[29] We wonder here whether the nun describes God as a beautiful young man to make him more appealing to the nuns since all the images of Genesis that have been painted from the very early days of Christianity show a white haired and white beard old man.

4.2.9. Scene 9

Scene 9 is the longest scene of all in *Calimachus*. In fact it takes half of the play, and it is the most distant from Terentian style of all. It is in this scene where all the miracles take place: the appearance of God talking to St. John and Andronicus, Calimachus, Drusiana and Fortunatus' resurrections, the re-infestation of Fortunatus wounds, and with these events all the praises to the Lord and the condemnation of the sinner.

It is in this scene where the amount of Christian religious words is overwhelming: *caelistis gratiae* (the word *gratia* appears in *Andria* but it is always referred to people while in Hrotsvitha it is always celestial), *constrictor, gemo, doleo, patior doloris, dolente condolers, paenitet, trasmutari, divinae, benedicta, redemption, peccatorum, resuscitet,* among others.

It is also here where we get to know that Andronicus has heard the entire conversation between Drusiana and Calimachus, because when he and St. John see the bodies next to Drusiana's, he explains '*Coniecto quid significet. Is ipse Calimachus Drusianam, dum viviret, illicite amavit, quod illa aegre ferens in febrem prae tristitia incidit et mortem ut veniret invitavit.*' 'I know what it means. This is Calimachus who loved Drusiana illegally when she was still alive; she suffered for this, she was taken by the fever as she invited death to come.' (9.1.21). Please, note that here again, the construction takes the modern Romance order[30].

Regarding the coherence of Hrotsvitha's plot, it is difficult to believe that in medieval times a man would discretely witness another man trying to seduce his wife instead of coming forward to her rescue. Moreover, further in the same scene, Andronicus expresses his surprise because Calimachus has seen his resurrection announced by the Divine Voice, while his accomplice has not. '*In hoc tamen illud est vel maxime admirandum, cur huius que pravum*

---

[30] I must say that although this word order in Spanish and Italian is still found, it is very literary and not the first choice of speakers. However VS order is the rule in subordinated clauses. Some rules apply but as this is not the objective of this work I will not go any further with the explanation.

voluit resuscitantia, magis quam eius qui consensit, divina sit voce praenuntiata....' (9.2.16). How does he know this? What are the signs the reader is left without? This kind of information gap is not found in Terence where everything is clearly explained through the dialogue among characters or through soliloquies to the audience.

At this point it is worth noting that although, as previously mentioned, there is a great number of words that have to do with Christianity, when Calimachus tells that the snake has bitten Fortunatus, Andronicus uses the same expression uttered by Sosia when Simo tells him about Chrysis' death in *Andria* 1.1.105 *'O factum bene!'*. It seems as if the nun is trying to give some Terentian flavor to her all Christian Medieval composition.

4.3. Conclusion

As we can see from the above, Hrotsvitha is far from imitating Terentian style in her *Calimachus*: None of the elements analyzed show anything in common with the Roman playwright. The length of the play is less than half, the division of scenes does not follow that of her model, the language is very different, although it is still Latin, and the plot is very far from the Terentian conception of playwriting. In *Andria*, we find the very first seeds of modern TV sitcom. Characters are funny, and each one of them has their unique characteristic. They make mistakes, there is confusion and misunderstanding, the narrative is colorful, all quite unlike what we find in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus*. The story in *Andria* starts years before the actual play begins, when Glycerium was taken away by her uncle and when Sosia was bought as a slave during his childhood. The time references are precise, and yet not indicated as something crucial, they appear casually and naturally when they are needed, lending more reality and solidity to the plot. Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* is a succession of scenes that have no foundation in past events. The few past events referred to during the play are

past within the play besides being incomplete and vague. However, the reader is not left wanting for more. Her characters and dialogues are so bland that we do not care to know more about them. The story is a straight line, no twists or turns, no intrigues as in *Andria*. There is no emotion or credibility. The plot is so simple that it can be summarized in a few lines without leaving any detail unsaid: Calimachus is in love with Drusiana, a Christian virgin who keeps chaste even from her husband. After he confesses his lustful love to her, she prays for death and dies. Calimachus, sick with passion, wants to take her even though she is dead. God prevents him by killing him and Fortunatus, the accomplice, right before the deed. Finally, Drusiana's husband, Andronicus, and Iohannes, the saint, go to visit Drusiana's grave, and they find the three dead bodies. God appears for a few seconds to answer their questions, Calimachus is granted resurrection and is transformed into a devoted Christian, Drusiana comes also back to life by the grace of God and Fortunatus, after being resurrected and rejecting virtue, gets his wounds re-infested and dies again to burn in hell. But Calimachus' soul has been gained to the glory of God. End of the play. No details were left unsaid.

Evidently, the objective of Hrotsvitha was not to give us a vivid development of the story or an accurate description of characters but to praise the virtue of her chaste and Christian characters, and to warn the audience against the lascivious thoughts which would condemn them to hell. But if her goal was to imitate the pagan author Terence, as she claimed, her work is far from satisfactory.

CHAPTER 5 - Closed Categories and Infinitives

5.1. Introduction

5.1.1. Closed Categories

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Hrotsvitha did not have the rich creativity or the wealth of resources needed to make her plays as varied and lively as Terence had done twelve centuries before her. We have already discussed the vocabulary and the lack of depth in her unidimensional narrative, as well as the absence of time and space references. These words and expressions are one of the close category groups that I discuss below.

As a result of the limitation on the part of the nun her text seems to be lacking a large number of references to time and place, as well as exclamations, interjections, indeclinable words, and very many devices used in colloquial language.

In what follows, I will present evidence concerning the use of infinitives, time and place markers, as well as prepositions in our texts. I go over the two plays and provide some statistics comparing the use of these elements in both texts. Not surprisingly, it is when we turn our attention to the use of prepositions that we find most of the coincidences between the two authors.

5.1.2. Infinitives

In Romance languages the use of the infinitive is mostly reduced to several patterns: (1) infinitives can be preceded by a verb that includes the subject information or by both an explicit subject and the verb; (2) infinitives can be preceded by a preposition; (3) infinitives can also be used as the subject of another verb; or (4) infinitives can be found as the verb in a sentential direct object.

However, in Terence we find 15 different surface patterns, as well as some other constructions where the absence of a higher verb, its distance from the infinitive or even the presence of more than one verb makes it difficult to conclusively determine the structure of the clause (see example 5). This does not happen in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* where the further distance between the infinitive and its referent is only one constituent apart as in (6).

(1) a. It. *(Lui/Lei) ci a fatto sofrire molto.*
    b. Sp. *(Ella/El) nos ha hecho sufrir mucho.*
    c. Port. *(Elhi/Elha) muito nos fez sofrer.*
    d. Fr. *(Il/Elle nous a fait beaucoup souffrir.*
        He/she made us suffer a lot[31].

(2) a. It. *Ho dimenticato di parlare con Maria.*
    b. Sp. *Me he olvidado de hablar con Maria.*
    c. Fr. *J'ai oublie de parler à Marie.*
    d. Port. *Eu esqueze de falar com Maria.*
        I forgot to talk to Maria

(3) a. It. *Fumare fa male a la salute.*
    b. Sp. *Fumar es malo para la salud.*
    c. Fr. *Fumer fait mal a la sante.*
    d. Port. *Fumar e ruin pra a saude.*
        Smoking is harmful to your health.

(4) a. It. *L'ho visto piangere.*
    b. Sp. *Lo he visto llorar.*
    c. Fr. *Je l'ai vi pleurer.*
    d. Port. *Eu o vi chorar.*
        I have seen him cry.

(5) *Andr.* 1. 5.253

> *Pa. nam quid ego dicam de patre? ah*
> *tantamne rem tam neglegenter agere!*
> Pa.And my father, what am I to say of him? Think of his handling a matter
> of all this consequence in that off-hand way!

---

[31] Please, notice the difference in order of the adverb *muito* in Portuguese and *beaucoup* in French. They are a residue of the much freer Latin word order.

(6) *Cali.* 3.1.25

> *Drusiana· Quid meam velis Calimache· {sermonibus} agere vehementer admiror*
> Dru. Why should you want to have conversation with me, Calimachus; I'm
> strongly astonished.

In the example (5), we cannot determine the higher verb for *agree* because there is no

higher verb. We can define the subject of the infinivite as being *patre* because of the context.

Unlike Terence, Hrotsvitha never constructs a sentence with an infinitive that refers to a

subject or a verb outside its limits in her *Calimachus*. In the example (6) the infinitive is only

one constituent apart from its referent and it is the subject of the sentencial direct objet of

the verb *velis*.

Another important aspect of infinitives is that in Latin there were six different types

of infinitives: The Active Infinitives: Present: *amare*, Perfect: *amavisse*, and Future: *amaturum*,

and the Passive Infinitives also Present: *amari*, Future: *amatum iri*, and Perfect: *amatum esse*,

while in Romance languages known to me there is only the Present infinitive active. In this

section, I compare the use of infinitives by the two authors and draw my conclusions based

in part on the elements of the Romance languages which I have mentioned above[32].

5.2. Closed Categories

5.2.1. Time and Place Markers - Indeclinable Forms

There are a number of indeclinable forms that are non existent in Hrotsvitha's

writing, due to her narrative style. We have already gone through the way she presents her

scenes. Unlike Terence, she does not need some time markers, since they are needed only to

unfold the stories in different directions and along different time dimensions, which

---

[32] Bennett 1910:367-427 explains very well the different functions of infinitives in Early Latin and he exemplifies in detail all of
them with data from different authors.

88

Hrostvitha does not do. Thus *iam, tum, postquam, numquam, interea, postridie,* and *denique* she

does not use anywhere near as much as her model does.

Compare the richness of this exchange:

Andr. 1. 1. 144

> *Si. venit Chremes postridie ad me clamitans:*
> *indignum facinu'; comperisse Pamphilum*
> *pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam. ego illud sedulo*
> *negare factum. ille instat factum denique*
> *ita tum discedo ab illo, ut qui se filiam*
> *neget daturum*
>
> Si. Cremes came to me the next day making a terrible fuss. It was outrageous, he said. He'd discovered that Pamhilus was treating this foreign woman as a wife. I strenuously denied that this was the case. He insists that this was the case. In the end we parted with the understanding that he was withdrawing his consent to his daughter's marriage.

In just six lines and only one exchange, all these expressions regarding time and place

make the dialogue natural, rich and credible. There are two time markers that place us

exactly where we need to be. On the contrary, there is not a single sentence in Hrotsvitha's

Calimachus to which we can compare it. The best example is the one on 7.1.14 when

Fortunatus tells Calimachus that he can take Drusiana's corpse because it does not look as a

cadaver and her limbs have not yet decayed. In this case, as in all the others, the reader is left

without knowing if Drusiana is still uncorrupted by death because she died a few minutes

ago, or because she is the object of a miracle. '*Ecce corpus: nec facies cadaverosa, nec membra sunt*

tabida; utere ut libet.'

Likewise, *Calimachus* text lacks place markers that we find so frequently in *Andria*:

quorsum, ibi, ubi, tum, inde, as well as expressions typical of colloquial conversation such as *sic,*

immo, ita, tam, etis, hem, em, item, num that make the exchanges among characters livelier. Such

expressions are repeated over and over again in Terence's dialogues.

5.2.2. Prepositions

It is when we turn our attention to the use of prepositions that we find most of the coincidences between the two authors. However, this coincidence is not due to Hrotsvitha's skills in imitating Terence.

Prepositions have existed for millennia and some of them have come down almost untouched and unmodified from the Indo-European language until today. Not only have they survived but they contributed to the whole evolution of Latin to the Romance languages. Because of their great versatility, they can be found in many syntactic positions, functioning not only as prepositions, but also as prefixes and preverbs. They occur in both pre- and post-position. Some of them have become adverbs. And even though some of them have been phonologically modified, their semantic load is intact[33]. Thus, we could argue without reservation that the use of the prepositions on Hrotsvitha's part is the result of following the general trend, rather than her desire to imitate Terence. Nontheless, the nun managed to modify things here too: Terence uses 15 prepositions of which Hrotsvitha uses 10. On the other hand, in her *Calimachus* she uses 6 that are not present in Terence' *Andria.* The chart in the next page illustrates the number of prepositions in both plays:

References:

* Prepositions only found in Terence

** Prepositions only found in Hrotsvitha

---

[33] For more information about prepositions see Baldi (1999) & (1979), Coleman (1991), Cousin (1944), Ernout and Thomas (1964), Gaeng (1984), Janson (2004), Klausenburger (2000),Lapesa (1985), Lehmann (1983), Löfsted (1959), Meillet (1928), Norberg (1980), Palmer (1954), Rosén (1999), and Théoret (1982)

In Terence:	In Hrotsvitha:
1. ab(s) -ac-	1. a- ab –
2. ad-	2. ad-
3. ant(e) –	3. ante –
4. apud*	4. (me)(te)cum –
5. (me)(te)cum –	5. de –
6. de –	6. ex-
7. ex-	7. in-
8. in-	8. inter-
9. inter- intro- intu'*	9. iuxta**
10. ob*	10. per-
11. per-	11. post**
12. praeter*	12. prae**
13. pro-	13. pro-
14. propter-	14. propter**
15. sin- sine-	15. sin- sine
16. usque*	16. sub**
	17. super**
	18. ultra**

For this subject, besides looking into *Calimadus*, I looked into all Hrotsvitha's plays and the chart in the next page shows her complete use of prepositions.

Looking at the chart in the next page and casting a superficial glance at Spanish, Italian, French, and Portuguese prepositions, we can say without error that the prepositions the nun did not use or used very rarely are the ones that do not exist in these languages anymore: *abs, ac, apud, praeter, usque,* as well as *ex, intro, into, and ob,* which are found as prefixes but not as prepositions. In the case of prepositions, I studied their development from Indo-European to the Romance languages – I looked into their evolution and change, and how they replaced the nominal case system as it collapsed. I did not compare bare case clauses against prepositional clauses between the two authors or how each one of them constructed the sentences with them. I would like to do that at a later stage of my research. However, by casting a general glance at the way prepositions have survived through millennia, we can easily argue that the similarities between Hrotsvitha and Terence in this area are more the consequence of the language's evolution, than they are due to the success of the nun.

91

In Terence's *Andria*	In Hrotsvitha's *Chalimachus*	In all Hrotsvitha's plays
1. a 0	1. a 11	55
2. ab 14	2. ab 11	184
3. abs 8	3. abs 0	0
4. ac 13	4. ac 0	10
5. ad 58	5. ad 31	134
6. ant(e) 6	6. ante 1	8
7. apud* 7	7. apud 0	1
8. cum 17	8. cum 4	49
9. mecum 3	9. mecum 1	12
10. tecum 2	10. tecum 1	13
11. de 18	11. de 4	30
12. ex 26	12. ex 0	34
13. in 85	13. in 44	292
14. inter 21	14. inter 1	1
15. intro 5	15. intro 0	0
16. intu'* 4	16. intu' 0	0
17. juxta 0	17. juxta** 5	16
18. ob* 8	18. ob 0	4
19. per 63	19. per 23	33
20. post 0	20. post** 3	10
21. prae 1	21. prae** 5	19
22. praeter* 8	22. praeter* 0	0
23. pro 9	23. pro 5	8
24. propter 7	24. propter** 1	3
25. sin- sine 2-3	25. sin- sine 1-5	1-15
26. sub 0	26. sub** 1	16
27. super 0	27. super** 2	6
28. ultra 0	28. ultra** 1	14
29. usque* 4	29. usque 0	6
Total of used prepositions 22	Total of used prepositions 20	Total of used prepositions 25
Prepositions only used by Terence: *abs, ac, apud, ex, intro, intu', ob, praeter, usque*	Prepositions only used by Hrotsvitha in Calimachus: *a, juxta, post, sub, super, ultra*	Prepositions used by Terence but never used by Hrotsvitha in her plays: *abs, intro, intu', praeter*

5.3. Infinitives

Limitations of time and space do not allow me to go through each case thoroughly in this context, I present an overview of the subject, together with the conclusions I have come to, focusing on the issue of word order. I set out to look into the subject, assuming that infinitives can be defined with respect to a verb that I will call the governing verb (GV).

Subjects – which, as we know, in the case of an infinitive are in the accusative case, can be pre-posed or post-posed, as, of course, can be the Governing Verb. In all cases the verbal phrase can be made up of continuous or discontinuous elements.

I also assume that some infinitives can be defined by both elements at the same time, in which case I define the construction as having a double marker. And, taking into account the facts discussed above about the Romance languages, I also predict that subjects can be a nominal phrase. I do not take into account whether or not any of the constituents is sentence final. The following chart shows the possible patterns and the number of instances of every pattern in each author. Patterns 1 to 12 are the ones I had predicted and 13 to 16 are the non-predicted ones.

1.- Accusative Subject + infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
20	2

2.- Accusative Subject + ...+ infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
31	7

3.- GV + Infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
36	20

4.- GV+ ...+ Infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
19	7

5.- Infinitive + GV

Terence	Hrotsvitha
23	13

6.- Infinitive +..... + GV

Terence	Hrotsvitha
7	0

7. Infinitive + Acc.S

Terence	Hrotsvitha
8	0

8. Infinitive + ... + Acc.S

Terence	Hrotsvitha
6	0

9. Double marker with Acc. S

Terence	Hrotsvitha
8	3

10. Double marker with Nom. S

Terence	Hrotsvitha
4	0

12. Constructions with Nominative S

Terence	Hrotsvitha
8	0

11. Constructions with indeclinable form as Subject

Terence	Hrotsvitha
3	0

13.- GV+ GV+ ... + Infinitive - The two GVs here modify the infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
0	2

14.- GV+ Infinitive + Infinitive - The GV serves modify both infinitives.

Terence	Hrotsvitha
2	0

15.- Accusative Subject Split by the infinitive

Terence	Hrotsvitha
1	0

16. Implied or uncertain subject

Terence	Hrotsvitha
14	0
Total 194	54

The first fact to take into consideration when making this type of statistics is the length of the works we are comparing. In the case of these two works we have 1003 lines in *Andria* and 427 in *Calimachus*. We should then find a about 40% of the number of infinitives in the latter. However, we find only around 25%, as Terence constructs sentences with infinitives 196 times while Hrotsvitha constructs sentences with only 54 infinitives in her *Calimachus*. This difference is not surprising if we take a look at the table above and see how limited the use of patterns is in *Calimachus*.

1. Of the 54 infinitives in *Calimachus*, we find 17 present infinitives passive, 2 future infinitives passive and the remaining 35 are present infinitive active. Terence on the other hand constructs 19 sentences with perfect infinitive active, 2 with future

94

infinitives active, 34 with present infinitives passive of which three are archaic forms
–all of which disappeared in the Romance languages- and the remaining 141 with
present infinitive active. The chart illustrates these facts:

Type of infinitive	Terence	Hrotsvitha
Present infinitive active	141	35
Present infinitive passive	34	17
Future infinitive active	2	-
Future infinitive passive	-	2
Perfect infinitive active	19	-
Perfect infinitive passive	-	-
Total	196	54

2. Of all the instances of infinitive in Terence's *Andria*, there are 14 constructions with
    subject implied or uncertain; in Hrotsvitha's *Calimachus* all the constructions are easily
    analyzed.

3. From all the patterns found, there are 15 patterns constructed by Terence 8 of which
    we find repeated in Hrotsvitha. That is to say that she avoids, or, in any event, fails
    to use 7 of Terence's patterns.

4. The two most used patterns in Hrotsvitha are 3 and 5, with 20 instances the former
    and 12 instances of the latter (from a total of 54 instances of infinitives in the whole
    play). Once we realize that pattern 3 is practically the universal pattern used with
    infinitives in the Romance languages, we can argue that the frequent use by the nun
    was likely to have been more influenced by the emerging Romance languages of her
    time, than it was by that of Terence. Moreover, this pattern is not the most used in
    the pre-Christian author, who constructs only 36 sentences with it. That is a big
    difference 20/54 vs. 36/196. As for pattern 5 –also used regularly until not long ago
    in Romance languages- the difference is 13/54 in *Calimachus* vs. 23/196 in *Andria*.
    This clearly shows by what the nun was influenced.

5. There are no constructions with Nominative Subject in *Calimachus* while in Terence's *Andria* this construction is found 8 times.

6. Hrotsvitha never separates constituents if the GV or the S is post-posed. She postposes without separating and separates without altering the regular order of the Romance languages. This is exactly the same as we have seen when discussing possessive adjectives.

7. The nun never postposes a Subject to an infinitive.

As we can see in the case of infinitives too, Hrotsvitha was closer to the Romance languages constructions than to Terentian Latin.

5.4. Conclusion

As I mentioned before, this is a work in progress. I plan to go over the facts listed in this chapter and analyze them more closely in future work. Nonetheless, based on my findings, it is evident that elements such as time and place markers in *Calimachus* are not as frequent as in *Andria*, because the narrative style and the dialogue construction are very different from one author to the other. The only closed category that has similarity between the two authors is the one of prepositions, the reason being the stability of these small particles. As for infinitival constructions, it has been seen that the patterns used by Hrotsvitha are closer to the Romance language patterns than the Terentian ones. The patterns from Terence which she *seems* to be successfully imitating are the ones still used today.

CHAPTER 6 – Further Research

As stated in the previous chapters, this is a work in progress. There are many topics towards which I would like to direct my further studies. On the subject of possessive adjectives, we have seen in 2.1.3.2 that Hrotsvitha avoids using Pattern 2 (which is the universal pattern in modern Romance languages) in the accusative. Instead, the nun constructs her phrases using a genitive pronoun with an accusative head noun. It would be interesting to look into other texts of the same period to determine whether these constructions are a creation of Hrotsvitha, or a common feature of the language of her time.

On the same topic, it has also been seen that in Italian the only way to distinguish a possessive adjective from a possessive pronoun is by word order, since they look exactly the same, although they have different functions. The questions that stem from this fact include: (a) - Was this the beginning of the fusion of possessive pronouns and adjectives in Early Italian? (b)- How long did the process take? and (c) - Why did it take place only in Italian?

Another interesting aspect to research is the fact that for the ablative construction Terence uses prepositions more frequently than Hrotsvitha (2.1.2.3). The question to ask is whether Hrotsvitha was avoiding the prepositional construction because she was aware of its modernity (since we know that prepositional constructions ended up by totally replacing the bare case constructions as the language evolved).

It has also been mentioned in 2.2.2.2 that, unlike Terence, Hrotsvitha never constructs a sentence with a possessive adjective without a noun. In my earlier discussion, I mentioned how strange this seems, since the modern Romance languages allow the use of possessive pronouns by themselves. Moreover, if we turn our attention to Italian syntax, the absence of this construction is even more peculiar (for the reasons stated above). Then one might ask why Hrotsvitha did not use this pattern. Was its use too widespread already? Did

she find it too modern too imitate Terence? For answers on this topic we should, again, look into the texts of the period and compare.

On the matter of prepositions I did not compare bare-case constructions vs. prepositional constructions between the two authors or how each one of them constructed in both cases. Based on my following argument, I would like to further study the subject.

The prepositional system taking over some of the functions of the nominal system; there was a period of redundancy, in which Hrotsvitha's life time falls, where case endings and prepositions were used at the same time. However, the prepositional constructions were not made up of nominal phrases without case marking: during many centuries the paradigms of the nominal system were such that they could not be avoided. i.e. there was not an invariant noun form that would fit everyone of the many syntactic functions as we know them today in most modern Indo-European languages. Already in Early Latin each preposition took one case –except for *in*, *sub*, *subter*, and *super* that could take accusative and ablative[34]. The best kept cases were the nominative, which functions as subject, the accusative, which functions as direct object, the dative, functioning as indirect object, and the genitive indicating possession. By the III century B.C. all the other cases had begun to collapse. Of the eight cases reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, six were still used in Classical Latin (the ablative and instrumental having merged early in Italic). Ernout and Thomas explain that the vocative being just a call placed outside the phrase was left outside the series of cases, although in the end it was associated with the nominal case. Together the nominative and vocative made the group of *casus recti* while all the others (accusative, dative, genitive, and ablative) made the group of *casus obliqui*. While the former never act as complements, the latter always do. As we can see, even disregarding prepositions, there was

---

[34] cf.: Kennedy, B H: 1976, 143

already more than one option to express the same idea within the bare-case construction. Boundaries in use of cases were not always fixed since there was some overlap in the functions of the cases; e.g, the ablative expressed duration and distance, as could the accusative. There was a genitive of quality as well as an ablative with the same function. The dative offered an alternative to the genitive of possession. The accusative of movement coexisted with the ablative of separation. Finally, even the accusative and the nominative had some points in common, since the accusative of exclamation and absolute accusative were often very similar in use to nominatives [35].

This overlapping of functions occurred without the intervention of prepositions. However, at the same time, in this period of transition, prepositions were already in use to disambiguate case uses. With all this evolution taking place, and remembering that by the VIIIth century the cases had been reduced to two, I would like to further study the texts contemporary to Hrotsvitha in order to better understand the nature of her usage of these types of constructions, thus putting me in an even better position to assess her relationship with Terence's in terms of style.

As for infinitives, I would like to further study the importance of word order in Terence constructions. In chapter 3 it has been determined that the position of *ut* in the clause indicates different degrees of focus in the elements within that clause. Following this idea, I would like to explore the importance of word order in infinitival construction as a way of casting some more light on the matter of Latin word order, which has been until now claimed to be mostly free. In this thesis, it has already been seen, although this was not its main objective, that Latin word order has its restrictions. By exploring this hypothesis, I would like to contribute to the better understanding of the evolution of Latin morphosyntax.

---

[35] cf: Ernout et Thomas: 1964 §7, §8, §9, §30, 31, 32 and §166

CHAPTER 7 – Conclusions

In her *Calimachus*, Hrotsvitha did not succeed in imitating her model, Terence. The influence of the syntax of the emerging Romance languages is so evident in the way she constructs her sentences that one must look upon her Latin language as some sort of hybrid Neo-Latin dialect.

In chapter 2, it was stated that her construction of possessive nominal phrases is closer to those found in the Romance languages than to those found in Archaic Latin. I have demonstrated that although she tries to imitate Terence, her linguistic awareness is not sufficient to allow her to succeed. It has been seen that she separates her possessive adjective from its head noun, but only keeping the Romance language order, and when she inverts the order, she keeps the two elements side by side. In other words, she never separates constituents in an inverted order. When she separates constituents she never places them further than a constituent apart. She never uses a possessive adjective without its head noun, but she constructs possessive nominal phrases with genitive pronouns (i.e., without agreeing in case with its head noun). She detaches herself even more from the Terentian style by attaching *que* to the possessive or to the noun before, although this construction is nowhere to be found in Terence's *Andria*. She also avoids the two most frequently used patterns 1 {(...)MEUS N##} and 2 {(...)MEUS N...##}, both of them the standard pattern for the modern Romance languages, with the most frequent case-forms, nominative and accusative, probably because by her time they were already established as the standard patterns, although Terence also uses them.

The biggest coincidence between authors is the patterns they avoid using: Terence uses patterns 1 to 8; Hrotsvitha uses 1 to 6. This means that they coincide in six patterns, although the details of the context of usage are all different. The only one that coincides is in

the vocative case and, as pointed above, there are not many optional structures to address a person.

In chapter 3, it was determined that although Hrotsvitha was well aware of all the semantic possibilities of the *ut* and the *ut* (...)*ne* subordinating constructions, she did not dare or was not able to modify the word order as Terence used to do. It was also seen that she used *nullus/nulla* in certain negative contexts which are not to be found in similar use in *Andria*. In addition, the verb within the *ut* constructions enjoys a much freer distribution. This freedom of the verb is not a sign of Hrtosvitha's success in imitating her model, but a characteristic of most Romance languages, which allow this type of construction, especially in poetry and in refined prose.

In chapter 4 the discussion on division and development of scenes has also assessed the existing gap between the two authors. None of the elements analyzed in Hrotsvitha coincide with those of the Roman playwright, neither the length of the play nor the division of scenes. Hrotsvitha's language, although still Latin, is very different from Terence's. The plot and the development of the scenes, the depiction of characters, etc. are all very far from Terentian conception. *Calimachus'* vocabulary is enormously reduced compared to *Andria's*, and it is filled with new Christian terms, and with words which, while they already existed in Terence's times, now have a new religious meaning. Although the nun copies some of the sentences exactly as in Terence, the overall result is far from the Roman playwright's style. In *Andria* there is humor, variety of idiolects to better depict the social levels of the different characters, but in *Calimachus* all exclamations sound like celestial ones. The confusing and amusing situations in *Andria* provoke laughter in the audience, while the dryness of the dialogues in *Calimachus* leaves everyone untouched.

In chapter 5 it has been demonstrated that Hrotsvitha's narrative lacks the color and liveliness found in *Andria* not only because she does not use colloquial language, but because there is no depth in the way she develops the story. We have seen that this fact is mostly evident for the absence of indeclinable time and place markers so frequent in *Andria*. This lack of colloquialisms, this inability to tell a story unfolding different layers of time, and the uniformity of characters speech leave the reader unable to feel any emotion and leave the play with no credibility or interest. Evidently, Hrotsvitha's play was intended to encourage Christian practices.

As for prepositions it has been pointed out that the similarities between the two authors depend more on the stability of these small particles than the linguistic skills of the nun, since she uses only the ones that would survive in the Neo-Latin languages, and avoids the ones that have disappeared: *abs, ac, apud, praeter, usque,* and *ex, intro, into, and ob* (which are found as prefixes but not as prepositions in Spanish, Italian, French, and Portuguese).

In the same chapter a general overview of the use and word order of infinitives also revealed that Hrotsvitha's syntax was much closer to that of the Romance languages than to that of Archaic Latin. As pointed out above, she uses present infinitive active 35 times out of 54, not only because it was also the most used type of infinitive by Terence, but because it is the only surviving infinitive in the Romance languages. As for the patterns she uses, we established that the two most frequent ones in Hrotsvitha are those of category 3 and 5. When we realize that pattern 3 is practically the universal pattern used with infinitives in the Romance languages, we can argue that its frequent use by in *Calimachus* was more influenced by the language of Hrotsvitha's times than by Terence.

As I mentioned before, this is a work in progress. I plan to go over the facts listed in unit 6 in order to study them more closely. Nonetheless, based on my findings I can say

without doubt that I agree with Arthur J. Roberts who said "Terence and Hroswitha both wrote plays, each wrote six, and there the similarity ends"[36]

I cannot say that Hrotsvitha succeed in imitating her model but I can very well say that she used Latin lexicon and morphology mixed with Romance syntax. I would like to conclude this agument with my last thought: If Hrotsvitha had not mentioned in her preface to her plays that she was imitating Terence, nobody would have ever thought of connecting the two authors in order to find similarities.

---

[36] Roberts: J cited in Tarr 2004:55

Bibliography
Editions

Hrotsvitha

Berschin, Walter, (ed.) 2001. *Hrosuit: Opera Omnia.* Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Munich and Leipzig: Saur.

Strecker, Karl, (ed.) 1980. *Hrotsuithae Opera.* Leipzig: Teubner. [First published 1906].

Terence

Barsby, John, (ed.) 2001. *Terence: The Woman of Andros.* With an English translation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. [First published 1912].

Kauer, Robert and Lindsay, Wallace M., (eds.) 1965. *P. Terenti Afri: Comoediae.* With supplementary apparatus by Otto Skutsch. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [First published 1926; reprinted with additions 1958].

Shipp, G.P. (ed.) 2002. *Terence: Andria.* Edited with Introduction and Commentary. 2nd ed. London: Bristol Classical Press. [First published 1939 by Oxford University Press; 2nd ed. 1960].

References:

Adams, J. N. 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600.* Cambridge: University Press.

Baldi Philip. 1999. *The Foundations of Latin in Trends in Linguistics - Studies and monographs 117.* Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

----------. 1979. "Typology and Indo-European Prepositions" in *Indogermanische Forschungen.*Vol.: 84, 49-61. Pennsylvania: Pennsilvania State University.

Bennett, Ch. E. 1982. *Syntax fo Early Latin I/II.* Georg Olms Verlag (ed.). New York: Hildesheim

Blom, Benjamín (ed.) 1966. *The plays of Roswitha.* New York: Benjamin Blom.

Coleman, Robert. 1991 "Latin prepositional syntax in Indo-European perspective" *in New Studies in Latin linguistics: selected papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin linguistics Amsterdam.* Philadelphia : J. Benjamins Pub. Co.: 323-338.

Cousin, Jean. 1944. *Evolution et structure de la langue latine.* Paris: Societe d'edition 'Les belles lettres'.

Devine, A.M. & Stephens, Laurence D. 2006. *Latin Word Order – Structured Meaning and Information.* New York : Oxford University Press.

Ernout, Alfred and Thomas, Francois. 1964. *Syntaxe Latine.* Paris : Editions Klincksieck.

Ernout, A and Meillet A. 1979. *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*. Paris : Éditions Klincksieck.

Gaeng Paul. 1984. *Collapse and Reorganization of the Latin Nominal Inflection as reflected in epigraphic sources*. Potomak, Maryland: Scripta Humanistica.

Giovini, Marco. 2003. *Rosvita e l'imitari dictando terenziano*. Genova:Publicazioni del AR.FI.CL.ET.N.S, n. 210

Gollancz, Sir Israel (ed.). 1966. *The Plays of Roswitha*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers. Inc.

Haight, Anne Lyon (ed.). 1965. *Hroswitha of Gandersheim:her life, times, and works-a comprehensive biography*. New Your: Hroswitha Club.

Janson, Tore. 2004. *A natural history of Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karakasis, Evangelos. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kennedy, Benjamin H. 1976. The Revised Latin Primer. [First printed in 1962]. Hong Kong: Dai Nippon Printing Co (H.K.) Ltd.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1985. *Historia de la lengua española*. Madrid: Gredos.

Lehmann, Christian. 1983. "Latin linguistics and linguistic theory: Proceedings of the first international Colloquium on Latin Linguistics". Amsterdam; J. Benjamins Pub. Co.: 145-161

Löfsted, Einar. 1959. *Late Latin*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press: 162-180

Meillet, A. 1928. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*. 1966 reprint. Paris: Editions Klincksieck .

Palmer, L. R. 1954. *The Latin language*. London: Faber and Faber.

Pascal, Paul. 1985. *Bryn Mawr Latin Commentaries, Hrotsvitha Dulcitius and Paphnutius*. Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr.

Roberts, J. 1929. "Did Hroswitha Imitate Terence?" MLN 16 (1901), col. 480 in Tarr Judy : 2004.

Rosén, Hanna. 1999. *Latine loqui Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Shipp, G.P. 2002. *Terence Andria -Edited with introduction and Commentary*. London: Booksprint

Théoret, Michel. 1982. *Les discourse de Cicéron – La concurrence du tour casuel et du tour prépositionnel*. Sherbrooke : Éditions de L'Université de Sherbrooke, Montreal: Les presses de L'université de Montreal.

Talbot, Robert. 2004. "Hrotsvit's Dramas: Is There a Roman in These Texts?" In *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances* Edited by Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A.. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.

Tarr, Judith. 2004. "Terentian Elements in Hrotsvit" (55-61) In *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*. Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A.. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson (eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.

Wilson, Katerina. 1987. *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim Rara Avis in Saxonia?* (A collection of essays compiled and edited by) Michigan: The University of Michigan.

Amacker, Rene. 1986. *Structures et convention: essai sur la morphologie de la proposition en latin: Etude de syntaxe et des texts d'Ovide et the Tite-Live.* Torino: Albert Meynier Editore.

Bauer, Brigitte L. M. 1995. *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French.* New York: Oxford Oxford University Press.

Grandgent, C. H. 1962. *Vulgar Latin.* New York: Hafner Publisher.

Herman, Joseph. 1967. *Le Latin vulgaire.* Paris : Presses Universitaires de France

Kurzová, Helena. 2000. *From Indo-European to Latin, The evolution of a Morphosyntactic type.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia, J. Benjamins Pub. Co. [First Publish in 1993].

Web Pages

Alessio, Gian Carlo. 2007 "Civiltà e letteratura latina medievale" Universita Ca' Foscari Venezia online www.unive.it/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=18803. February 10, 2009

Norberg, Dag 1980. "Latin at the End of the Imperial Age" http://www.orbilat.com/Languages/Latin_Medieval/Dag_Norberg/01.html. June 8, 2007