

'and' provides a precise equation for *ut* in the "third set". The fact that RV *utá* in joining sentences regularly appears at sentence initial makes the restructuring of this particle as an introductory clause marker plausible. Moreover, this equation has become less distant and tenuous with the demonstration by K. H. Schmidt (*Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 26, 1976, 392; 28, 1979, 200) elaborating the keen observation by A. Tovar (*ZCPH* 34, 1975, 11) that Celtiberian (Botorrita) attests *utā* 'and, also'¹², thus sharing this particle with Indo-Iranian and now with Latin. It is a pity that the interpretation of Umbr. *pusi* in Tab. Iguv. VIa 20 is so obscure; one cannot be sure whether the construction is basically one of purpose or result.

One may finally wonder what the original vowel of RV *utá* was; we may of course place Celtiberian *uta* in relation with Avest. *uti*¹³ and Lat. *ita*, with IE final schwa. If RV *utá* was the reflex of **utó* (cf. *ἄπό*, etc.), we might then derive *utei* from **uto + i > utoi*.

A Note on the Phonostylistics of Latin: (s) in Plautus

By REX WALLACE, Columbus (Ohio)

In an article in *BSL* (1973) Wolfgang Dressler discusses many of the problems one is likely to encounter in an attempt to describe the phonological differences between informal and formal styles in the texts of "dead languages". He also discusses a number of possible strategies which would enable the investigator to overcome these problems and draw provisional conclusions about stylistic differences. He then attempts to illustrate these strategies

¹²) See tentatives in this direction by Lejeune and by Javier de Hoz and Luis Michelena, *La inscripción celtiberica de Botorrita*, Universidad de Salamanca 1974, 41 footnote 2, 60 footnote 2. See now most recently A. Tovar, *Contrebia Belaisca I: el bronce con alfabeto "ibérico" de Botorrita*, Universidad de Zaragoza 1982, 66.

¹³) For the Sogdian outcomes of Iranian *uta* 'and' see I. Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford 1954, 13 §§ 96 and 97, 18 § 135, 307 ad § 96.

by describing likely stylistic differences in Latin. One of the major problems with Dressler's attempt, as he himself notes, is the lack of statistical evidence upon which to base conclusions. For example, when attempting to show that the deletion of final *s* in archaic Latin inscriptions is sensitive to differences in style, Dressler is unable to point to the number of times *s* has been retained as opposed to deleted in a particular genre of inscription; rather he must simply point out that one type of inscription, e.g. *sacral*, tends to retain final *s*, while another, e.g. *funerary*, tends to delete it. This difference may of course grossly indicate some stylistic difference, but it is not in itself sufficient to be convincing. We propose to begin to rectify this rather serious lack of a statistical base upon which to build hypotheses about phonostylistics in Latin by offering statistical evidence concerning the deletion of *s* in the Roman playwright Plautus and by describing the correlations which exist between *s*-deletion and style.

One of the strategies suggested by Dressler is to compare formal and less formal styles which are documented in texts and then draw provisional conclusions based on the differences. This strategy is legitimate because phonological processes are less constrained in casual styles, but more constrained in formal styles (see Donegan and Stampe 1978; Stampe 1969; and Zwicky 1972). As a result differences in the rate of occurrence of a particular process in two texts of different styles can reasonably be attributed to phonostylistics.

Fortunately Plautus is a very accessible testing ground for this particular strategy. Traditionally, in the language of Plautus one is able to distinguish three styles: spoken, recitative, and sung. Each style corresponds to particular metrical patterns, e.g., spoken style corresponds to iambic senarii, and these metrical differences are said to correspond to degrees of linguistic formality. This results in a nice hierarchy: spoken is less formal than recitative, and recitative is less formal than sung.

If this traditional division is accurate there should be statistical differences between all three styles with respect to the deletion of final *s* (hereafter we refer to 'spoken' style as style I, 'recitative' as style II, and 'sung' as style III).

In the traditional description (see, for example, MacCary and Willcock 1976, Appendix 1) styles I and II are said to be very similar. One is spoken without musical accompaniment (style I) while the other is spoken with musical accompaniment (style II).

Our initial impression, after scanning the twenty plays of Plautus¹⁾ (for a list of the texts scanned and the results obtained for each text see Table 1) and collecting the data, was that there would be

Table 1: The deletion of *s* by style for each text of Plautus

<i>Text</i>	<i>Style I</i>		<i>Style II</i>		<i>Style III</i>	
	(s:ø)	(s:s)	(s:ø)	(s:s)	(s:ø)	(s:s)
<i>Amphitruo</i>	13	10	30	38	8	17
<i>Asinaria</i>	6	8	22	39	1	1
<i>Aulularia</i>	10	8	16	18	7	10
<i>Bacchides</i>	24	13	51	22	3	8
<i>Captivi</i>	27	18	27	20	11	9
<i>Casina</i>	9	13	20	10	13	13
<i>Cistellaria</i>	9	1	20	3	1	5
<i>Curculio</i>	11	7	24	18	2	3
<i>Epidicus</i>	9	3	23	11	8	7
<i>Menaechmi</i>	9	6	20	19	11	7
<i>Mercator</i>	16	10	29	21	3	2
<i>Miles Gloriosus</i>	14	9	72	42	—	—
<i>Mostellaria</i>	13	14	31	21	11	13
<i>Persa</i>	10	6	49	20	9	4
<i>Poenulus</i>	21	19	53	20	—	12
<i>Pseudolus</i>	18	10	48	28	14	12
<i>Rudens</i>	12	11	27	27	4	13
<i>Stichus</i>	5	1	36	23	3	3
<i>Trinummus</i>	14	12	45	12	3	1
<i>Truculentus</i>	14	7	36	25	3	7

little difference between the two styles in terms of the rate of *s*-deletion. Indeed, after we computed the results for each style and compared them, this impression was borne out²⁾. In style I

¹⁾ The play *Vidularia* was not considered for the purposes of this investigation because of the highly fragmentary state of the manuscript. Only some 120 lines are extant, and most of these lines are incomplete metrically. For similar reasons the *Fragmenta* have also been omitted from consideration.

²⁾ For an analysis of the deletion of *s* in Plautus in terms of modern variationist techniques see Wallace (1981) *The Variable Deletion of Final s in Plautus* (Ohio State University Master's Thesis) and Wallace (Forthcoming) "A Variable Rule in Plautus: the Deletion of Final *s*".

there were 450 total instances of the (s) variable³). The variant (s:Ø) occurred 264 times, thus the rate of deletion of *s* in style I was 58,7%. In style II, on the other hand, the variable (s) occurred 1116 times. The (s:Ø) variant was attested 679 times yielding a deletion rate of 60,8%. This suggests of course that there is no substantial difference in linguistic formality between these two styles. This finding is apparently in keeping with the results obtained by Drexler (1966) in his study of iambic shortening in Plautus (among others). As a result we feel justified in grouping these two categories of metrical composition into one linguistic style, call it style I & II.

When we group these two categories of metrical composition into one style we have a total of 1566 instances of the (s) variable. This includes 943 examples of the variant (s:Ø), and a 60,2% rate of deletion for style I & II.

Traditionally, style III is said to correspond to a greater degree of linguistic formality. Because the variant (s:Ø) is an innovation, we would predict a lower rate of deletion for style III. We identified a total of 262 instances of (s) for this style. There were 115 cases where final *s* was deleted. Thus the rate of *s*-deletion in style III was 43,9%, a difference of approximately 17% between the two styles.

A chi square test confirmed that the differences in rates of deletion between the two styles was statistically significant. As a result we conclude that *s*-deletion is sensitive to stylistic differences in Plautus and that in style III there is a significantly lower rate of deletion than in style I & II.

This discovery is of course exactly what the strategy predicts we would find—since I & II is a less formal style the deletion process should be less constrained, and it is; since style III is more formal the deletion process should be more constrained, and it is.

On the basis of this study of the rate of *s*-deletion for different styles in Plautus the following general conclusions are offered.

³) Phonological variables, i.e., structural units which have two or more different realizations, are represented by parentheses in the standard notation. Thus (s) represents the phonological variable word-final *s* in Old Latin. Hudson (1980) extended this convention by writing the variant after the name of the variable in question. Using Hudson's extension of the notation, (s:Ø) represents the zero realization of (s), e.g., *nimis* 'too much' pronounced [nimi] Plautus *Amphitruo* 218; (s:s) represents the [s] realization of the variable, e.g., *nimis* pronounced [nimis] *Amphitruo* 903.

124 Rex Wallace, A Note on the Phonostylistics of Latin: (s) in Plautus

1. We have provided substantial evidence for the value of Dressler's first strategy in obtaining evidence for stylistic differences in the texts of "dead languages". Moreover, the principle on which this strategy is based is correct and thus this is a feasible way in which to gain insights into stylistic differences.

2. There is probably no difference in 'style' corresponding to the traditional division between 'spoken' and 'recitative'.

3. We have provided statistical evidence that the deletion of *s* in Plautus (and, we would argue, in Old Latin) was sensitive to differences in style (for a summary of results see Table 2 below). Provisionally at least, we claim that the deletion of *s* increases as linguistic formality decreases.

Table 2: % of *s*-deletion according to style in Plautus

	(<i>s</i> : \emptyset)	(<i>s</i> : <i>s</i>)	(<i>s</i>)	% of deletion
Style I & II	943	623	1566	60,2%
Style III	115	147	262	43,9%
Totals	1058	770	1828	—

References

- Donegan, P. and David Stampe. 1978. "The Study of Natural Phonology." In *Current Approaches to Phonological Theory*, pp. 126–173. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dressler, W. 1973. "Pour Une Stylistique Phonologique du Latin A Propos des Styles Negligents D'une Langue Morte." *BSL* 68, pp. 129–145.
- Drexler, H. 1969. *Die Jambenkürzung*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Hudson, R. A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCary, W. T. and M. M. Willcock (eds.). 1976. *Critical Text of the Casina of Plautus, with commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stampe, D. 1969. "The Acquisition of Phonetic Representation." In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 443–454.
- Wallace, R. (Forthcoming). "A Variable Rule in Plautus: the Deletion of Final *s*."
- (1981). *The Variable Deletion of Final s in Plautus*. Ohio State University Master's Thesis.
- Zwicky, A. M. 1972. "On Casual Speech." In *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 607–615.